

Irish Writers and the British Periodical Press 1880-1900

Nora Moroney

Submitted to the School of English
Trinity College Dublin
In fulfilment of the award of
Doctor of Philosophy

2019

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and it is entirely my own work.

I agree to deposit this thesis in the University's open access institutional repository or allow the library to do so on my behalf, subject to Irish Copyright Legislation and Trinity College Library conditions of use and acknowledgement.

Nora Moroney

Table of Contents

Summary

Acknowledgements

Introduction: Positioning Irish Writers in the Periodical Press	1
Chapter One: Irish Literary Ventures in London: The Case of <i>The New Review</i>	36
Chapter Two: The Periodical Writings of W.E.H. Lecky	71
Chapter Three: <i>Nineteenth Century</i> : Irish Writing and its International Context	102
Chapter Four: Emily Lawless and Hybrid Identities in the Press	149
Chapter Five: <i>Fortnightly Review</i> : ‘A Thoroughly Serious Periodical’	187
Conclusion: ‘An Ireland Busier and Broader’?	220
Bibliography	230

Summary

This project assesses the extent and significance of Irish contributions to the British periodical press of the 1880s and 1890s. It examines the cultural and historical context of some fifteen writers, situating them in a transnational framework of periodical discourse during a period when the political and colonial entanglements of Ireland with Empire were bringing pressure to bear on exclusivist conceptions of Irish and British identity. This research specifically focuses on literary journalism in Britain as opposed to the newspaper press, positing the writers under consideration as elite opinion-formers who took a central part in, and to various degrees shaped and represented, the intellectual culture of late Victorian Britain.

The thesis comprises five chapters. Three of these focus on individual journal titles – *The New Review*, *Nineteenth Century* and *Fortnightly Review* – while the remaining two present single-author case studies on W.E.H. Lecky and Emily Lawless. Drawing on the tools and methodology of periodical criticism, it situates each article within its specific material and cultural context and utilises a range of primary sources alongside textual and historical analysis to discern any underlying ideology in relation to the journals. By focusing on both periodicals and case studies the project aims to come to a deeper understanding of the significance of certain types of press discourse, not only in each writer's conception of their work as an essayist but in the many negotiations of national identity in the press at the time. This is explored in relation to (among other things): the Home Rule crisis, questions of censorship and cultural authority, European literary trends and British Liberal ideology. Authors such as George Moore and J.P. Mahaffy are also examined in the context of growing professionalisation and academic disciplinisation, and the pressures that these developments exerted on both the periodicals and the Victorian 'man of letters' tradition. They are appraised alongside fiction writers such as W.B. Yeats, Sarah Grand and Standish O'Grady and the political interventions of Justin McCarthy and Horace Plunkett. I seek to demonstrate how, despite the growing influence of cultural nationalist rhetoric, the 1880s and 1890s provided a fertile and encouraging space for Irish writers to articulate their various diverse interests within some of the most influential British cultural organs of the day.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without an Irish Research Council Government of Ireland Postgraduate Scholarship from 2014 to 2018. I have also received funding for conference travel from the Research Society for Victorian Periodicals and Trinity Trust Travel Grant, whose contributions I gratefully acknowledge.

I wish to thank the staff of Early Printed Books and Manuscripts in Trinity College Library, as well as those in the National Library of Ireland and Marsh's Library Dublin for their help with many aspects of this project. I have also been kindly allowed access to collections in the British Library, City of Westminster Archives, Bodleian Library Oxford, University College London Special Collections and University of British Columbia Research Library.

The School of English at Trinity College has been a rewarding place to study and work, and I would like to thank Diane Sadler, David O'Shaughnessy, Paul Delaney, Chris Morash and Tom Walker for their input and help over the years. I am also particularly grateful to Ciaran O'Neill in the Department of History for his long-standing guidance and assistance in this project. I have been lucky enough to meet many wonderful scholars at conferences in Ireland and abroad during my PhD, and though too numerous to list, a special word of mention is due to Annemarie McAllister, Margaret Kelleher, Julie Birkholz and Heidi Hansson for their constructive comments and advice.

My experience during this PhD would not have been the same without an exceptional group of friends and colleagues at Trinity. Thanks especially to Stephen O'Neill, Jane Mahony, Colm MacGearailt, Kate Smyth, Ellen Finn, Conor Linnie and Gavin Doyle for reading parts of this work, and providing invaluable support in so many ways.

I have been fortunate to have had an outstanding supervisor in Eve Patten, whose patience, insight and enthusiasm has been an inspiration throughout the four years of this project, and indeed during my undergraduate dissertation. Without her continuing advice and generosity of time and knowledge this thesis would not have been started, let alone completed.

Finally, a large debt of gratitude is owed to my family – my mum Cáit, dad Michael, John and Ann, for their unfailing support and understanding during eight years of college – and to Eamonn, for enduring the world of periodicals with a very Victorian mixture of sympathy, fortitude and humour, and for being the best distraction from such a world that anyone could hope for.

Introduction

Positioning Irish Writers in the Periodical Press

Michael Wolff's seminal 1971 article on 'Charting the Golden Stream', often seen as inaugurating the discipline of periodical studies, asks us to consider the nineteenth-century press as occupying 'an unrivalled position as repositor[y] of the general life of Victorian England'.¹ He paints an evocative picture of unexplored treasures, a vast web of interconnecting histories that both responded to and shaped the world around it, where 'an attitude, an opinion, an idea, did not exist until it had registered itself in the press'.² Writing at a time when the scale and importance of such a press was only beginning to be understood, Wolff's article was a vitalizing call to arms that established periodical studies as a serious pursuit within the academy, following on from the formation of the Research Society for Victorian Periodicals and the *Victorian Periodicals Review* (then the *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*) in 1968. Of course, periodical essays as subject of study prior to this were far from a neglected topic. The ubiquity of almost every major cultural figure of the mid- to late Victorian period in the pages of magazines and journals had long signalled the status of such titles. But as a structured field of enquiry they had eluded the attention of historians and literary critics, perhaps in part due to 'kaleidoscopic contingent identities' that they espoused; how 'slippery, ungainly, dynamic, competitive and resistant to categorisation' periodicals are.³ Or perhaps it was the seemingly 'completed' and therefore diminishing appeal of reviews in terms of relevance or critical worth, a quirk that prompted Wolff in his article to remark that

The great pioneering reviews have been mined, their files are in most scholarly libraries, they have been thought of as providing matchless evidence even at a time

¹ Michael Wolff, 'Charting the Golden Stream: Thoughts on a Directory of Victorian Periodicals', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 4.3 (Sep 1971), p. 26.

² Ibid.

³ Laurel Brake, 'Periodical Formats: The Changing Review' in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 48.

when their actual influence had levelled off and when other journals and other types of journalism had become more prominent.⁴

This is a provocative statement. The idea that a periodical can be satisfactorily ‘mined’ – even when many of its contributors may remain unknown or hidden behind pseudonyms – presents a challenge to the literary historian operating in the decades after cultural theory has warned us of the impossibility of fully ‘knowing’ a text or genre. Wolff was making the point that at the time the study of periodicals (such as it was) had disproportionately focused on the intellectual ‘heavyweights’ of Victorian Britain, the stoic quarterlies and, latterly, the self-important monthlies that sought to establish themselves in the literary rather than journalistic fields. It is true too that, despite a remarkable flourishing of all kinds of periodical and journalistic scholarship in the years since, there still remains an imperative to broaden our knowledge of regional, religious, trade and professional titles.⁵ Nevertheless, to lose focus on the monthlies, especially of late Victorian Britain, would be to miss important aspects of developing theories on polity, culture and, to paraphrase Wolff, national self-consciousness.⁶ Indeed it is a striking illustration of the weight of Wolff’s pronouncements that there has been relatively very little new work specifically on the nineteenth-century monthly journals in the last two decades.⁷ Viewed, perhaps, as tying into a rather old-fashioned idea of intellectual history that concentrates on elite discourses to the neglect of popular and historically marginalised ones, they have largely fallen foul of the impulse or ‘*proper leaning*’ of the field, in the words of one critic, ‘towards cultural material approaches that have been democratising [and] positively disruptive of canon hierarchies’.⁸

These are all overdue and welcome developments. But one of the more exciting – indeed energising – aspects of studying periodicals is their ever-unfolding potential for new readings. As one recent study of the area has put it, ‘periodicals occupied complex and

⁴ Wolff, ‘Charting the Golden Stream’, p. 28.

⁵ Alexis Easley, Andrew King and John Morton, ‘Introduction’, *Researching the Nineteenth Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), p. 6.

⁶ Wolff, ‘Charting the Golden Stream’, p. 26.

⁷ Laurel Brake is a notable exception in this regard – see for example her article ‘Culture Wars? Arnold’s *Essays in Criticism* and the Rise of Journalism 1865-1895’ in Dinah Birch and Mark Llewellyn (eds.), *Conflict and Difference in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 201-212, and many of her edited collections. Joanne Shattock has also published widely in the area, significantly with her most recent edited volume *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), though this focuses on a range of periodical genres.

⁸ Fionnuala Dillane, ‘Researching a Periodical Genre: Classifications, Codes and Relational Terms’ in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), p. 78.

shifting positions in the literary marketplace', and this is nowhere more in evidence than the sector of the press that sought to define and influence the contours of public debate.⁹ The monthly reviews that emerged from 1860 onwards have long been a staple of historical and literary scholarship, due to their centrality to political discourse and the predominance of cultural, political and intellectual luminaries that appeared in their pages. Any student of Gladstone's Home Rule campaign or the development of scientific rationalism, for example, will be familiar with the debates that were waged in the *Nineteenth Century* or the *Fortnightly Review*. But references to the publications frequently do little more than acknowledge their title, with scant attention paid to the vagaries of commercial strategies, editorial decisions, periodical genre and the various shades of liberal discourse that these two journals, for instance, espoused. More recent scholarship is alive to the problems of transparent readings of well-known authors' periodical work, with a tendency to either relegate their journalistic enterprises to peripheral importance (George Bernard Shaw's journalism, for instance, has only recently been the subject of a substantial analysis¹⁰), or else to 'rescue' their writings from obscurity 'by republishing their works from the date-stamped pages of a periodical into book form, with little reference made to the original publication context'.¹¹ If, however, we shift our focus away from the idea of these journals as portals or mirrors, and towards their position in a certain strand of periodical studies, we can begin to structure our analysis around the specificities of their genre conventions as well as individual differences between them.

The importance of genre and publication history, then, is central to this thesis, which takes as its primary focus the writings of Irish authors and journalists in a selection of the most influential journals of the late Victorian period. It aims to chart the contributions of these writers between 1880 and 1900, establishing a firm methodological framework within which to study writings either forgotten (in the case, for instance, of E.L. Godkin's articles on British liberalism) or frequently decontextualised (W.B. Yeats's folkloric pieces are one example). The significance of 'charting', in its widest and most exploratory sense, is both a methodological underpinning of this project and a conscious reference to Wolff's 1971 article. It reflects and underlines what recent scholarship has seen as the 'desire to map and organise complex periodical relations.'¹² It also brings us to an understanding of how Irish writers used the press in the late-nineteenth century, as a means

⁹ Easley, King and Morton, 'Introduction', p. 5.

¹⁰ Nelson O'Ceallaigh Ritschel, *Bernard Shaw, W. T. Stead, and the New Journalism: Whitechapel, Parnell, Titanic, and the Great War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

¹¹ Dillane, p. 75.

¹² Easley, King and Morton, 'Introduction', p. 6.

to access networks of influence within elite cultural and political spheres (as represented by these journals) that were essential for establishing a public presence and publishing career. Mapping these Irish contributions is thus ideal for exploring the periodical press as a dynamic system that, in conjunction with thorough biographical retrieval, can reveal previously obscured patterns of interaction and intersection.

This project proposes to take as its central focus three of the most significant ‘serious’ journals of the later nineteenth century: *The New Review*, *Fortnightly Review* and the *Nineteenth Century* (with references to *Macmillan’s Magazine* and the *Contemporary Review* throughout the chapters). As a group, they contain much of the influential journalism published in England in the 1890s, and are thus a useful means to establish currents and ideologies within the intellectual press of the time. Although broadly homogenous in their form, readership and pricing (the *Fortnightly* and *Nineteenth Century* charged two shillings and six pence, and *The New Review* just under two shillings), these journals also display a cross-section of party loyalties, cultural biases and editorial policy. They were at the forefront of educated debate across a range of spheres, distinguishable from newspapers by eschewing a specialist or partisan viewpoint and indeed actively sought a wide variety of contributors. Providing a remarkable record of contemporary thought in every field, this genre of monthly journal has been hailed as not only covering every major question of the day, but incorporating a range of opinion ‘exceeding what could be found ... in such books as were devoted to the topic’.¹³ In this sense they provide a good base for methodological studies of the periodical genre. Despite the problems various theorists have seen in trying to compartmentalise a proliferating, multifarious Victorian press, this intellectual strata of publications was sufficiently self-contained to allow at least a basic understanding of its commercial motivations, contributors, and *modus operandi*.

In the first instance, and most importantly, these periodicals are relatively easy to group in terms of temporal development. Most of them emerged more or less simultaneously in the 1860s, a period marked by the change in educated public appetite from the long-established, prestigious quarterlies (exemplified by the *Edinburgh Review* and *Quarterly Review*) to the more culturally responsive monthly review. All of the journals under consideration belong to this latter stable – the misleadingly titled *Fortnightly* included – whose form permitted a greater serialisation of both fiction and political

¹³ Walter E. Houghton (ed.), ‘Introduction’ to *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900*, 5 vols (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), I, xv.

discussion.¹⁴ This is not to presume, however, that they saw themselves as somehow inferior or of lower standard than their quarterly forbearers. Writing some months after the founding of the *Fortnightly Review*, George Eliot noted the ‘exceptional dignity’ of the new publication, describing it as ‘a thoroughly serious periodical, intended for the few who will pay a high price’.¹⁵ In a similar vein, the *Nineteenth Century* was self-consciously elitist in its cultivation of prized contributors (the ‘star system’ so successfully endorsed by editor James Knowles), while *The New Review* plainly fashioned itself after these weighty forbearers. Taken together, then, these journals display a high calibre of writing and editing along with an undoubtedly strong reputation among the educated elite – incidentally two of the main criteria used by the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* in its selection of influential titles.¹⁶ It also relates to a more immediate reason for choosing to study these elite periodicals. The *Nineteenth Century* and its ilk were undoubtedly the literary ‘heavyweights’ of the 1880s and 1890s, and owing to this elevated status much of their contributors’ records, papers and correspondence still survive today. The mass of critical output on the intellectual press of nineteenth century has often less to do with scholarly biases than the simple matter of expediency and geographical accessibility.

There were, however, several other uniting factors in this sample of journals. While naturally competitive in an economic sense, by the late 1880s all of them commanded relatively similar levels of readership. These figures rarely passed the 10,000 mark but managed to retain a consistency among the middle- to upper-classes. This could relate to what Margaret Beetham has termed the ‘closed system’ of periodical production, in this case a self-referential, circulating company of distinguished contributors and readers.¹⁷ Most of these magazines shared the same journalists, publishers and even editors, as in the case of James Knowles moving from the *Contemporary Review* to found the *Nineteenth Century* in 1877. It was therefore made easier for a potential audience to identify publications that signified ‘quality’ journalism. The tradition of ‘great men’ writing about weighty contemporary issues, though weakening, still had much currency in publishing houses of the 1890s, and the self-reflexivity so common to writings featured here ensured that this *belles-lettres* maintained a visibility throughout the upheavals of press expansion at the end of the century.

¹⁴ Alvin Sullivan (ed.) ‘Introduction’ to *British Literary Magazines, vol. 3: The Victorian and Edwardian age, 1837-1913* (London: Greenwood P., 1983), p. xvii.

¹⁵ George Eliot, *Letters*, ed. by G.S. Haight, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), IV, p. 211.

¹⁶ Houghton, ‘Introduction’ II, xv.

¹⁷ Margaret Beetham, ‘Open and Closed: The Periodical as a Publishing Genre’, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 22.3 (Fall 1989), pp. 96-100.

What usually links these journals together in periodical criticism, however, is their attested commitment to the policy of signature. The *Fortnightly Review* became the first major periodical to repudiate anonymity when it launched in 1865, and by 1877 when the *Nineteenth Century* appeared, these monthlies were widely heralded as harbingers of a new era of signed articles. It was an issue that commanded much attention both within and beyond the journals' pages, as all were grappling with urgent contemporary debates over the changing nature of authority and criticism. Suspicion was a common early response to this new policy, with *Punch* magazine at one stage advising the editor of the *Contemporary Review* to ensure anonymity because 'this adds to the mystery. It may only be poor old Professor Fitz-Boodle, of Stoke-Poges University; but, if no name is mentioned, rumour will ascribe the article ... to the Marquis of Salisbury, or Mr Gladstone, or Professor Huxley.'¹⁸ But it also attracted many supporters, not least because the new journals often went to considerable lengths to ensure the appearance of such Gladstones and Huxleys within their annals. By the 1890s, *Macmillans* and *The New Review* had joined the widespread editorial recognition of the circulation-enhancing advantages of big-name, 'celebrity' journalism. As Alvin Sullivan has argued, the success this new generation owed much to a growing intellectual climate emphasising 'openness and individualism in the Millite sense, as well as to a more sophisticated notion of 'public opinion''.¹⁹ Anthony Trollope, one of the most important and prolific writers on the Victorian periodical scene, associated the practice of signature with a heightened sense not only of individuality but masculinity.²⁰ For him, the moral aspects of critical writing were best served in a system that deliberately chose the most elite of viewpoints with full disclosure as to their identities.²¹ This served Irish writers well for the most part, as many depended on elite intellectual press to consolidate a name for themselves in metropolitan publishing circles – an issue discussed in greater detail below. It was also a topic with which many engaged in their writings, as demonstrated by *The New Review*'s high-profile symposium on 'Anonymity' in 1889/1890 – featuring contributions from George Bernard Shaw, Justin McCarthy and George Moore.

These journals were also particularly appropriate as publishing vehicles for aspiring writers due to their general scope in terms of subject matter. During the 1880s and 1890s, for instance, they naturally included Irish affairs alongside a variety of other geographical,

¹⁸ As quoted in Houghton, 'Introduction' II, xviii.

¹⁹ Sullivan, 'Introduction', p. xiv.

²⁰ Sarah Nash, 'What's in a Name? Signature, Criticism and Authority in the *Fortnightly Review*', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 43.1 (Spring 2010), p. 72.

²¹ Ibid.

imperial and political topics. Similarly, choosing to study these three periodicals provides a suitably broad context, as they attracted a larger audience and drew from a wider pool of contributors than their more specialist magazine or newspaper counterparts. Their mixed form allows for a more representative sample of both the writers who submitted pieces to various journals and the issues that were attracting attention and debate. It highlights, moreover, the value of ‘non-specialist forms of discourse’, particularly in reading across periodicals to pinpoint historical and ideological patterns not always evident at first glance.²² But the prevalence of these kinds of general-interest publications cannot be taken for granted in an age of steadily increasing academic and discursive specialisation. Writing in his *New Review* in 1894, editor Archibald Grove bemoaned the failing of other magazines and quarterlies for having ‘been, for the most part, too expensive, frequently too ‘special’, and only occasionally sufficiently attractive to appeal to the enormous reading public that has grown up out of a liberal legislation in educational matters’.²³ A defining feature of each of these journals, then, is a conversational rather than scholarly tone. Even the most serious of political or sociological arguments still cleaved to the ‘open platform’ style so feted by the *Nineteenth Century*, subscribing to what one critic calls the ‘broad church of intellectual enquiry’.²⁴ This generality of both style and content was at the core of many of the periodical’s *raison d’être*, as the mission statement of the *Fortnightly Review* reveals. The founders pledged to ‘remove all these restrictions of party and editorial “consistency” ... The consistency will be one of tendency, not of doctrine’.²⁵ In many ways heterogeneity was important on an ideological level for these periodicals, as the rapid development in theological, intellectual and political thought gave way to increased questioning and scepticism. As John Morley wrote, ‘it was the age of science, new knowledge, searching criticism, followed by multiplied doubts and shaken beliefs’.²⁶ But more immediate, pecuniary motivations should not be ignored either, as magazines struggled to attract and retain readers in an increasingly saturated marketplace. A generic platform for wide-ranging discussion managed to combine both the financially sensible with the philosophically challenging.

²² Kay Boardman, ““Charting the Golden Stream”: Recent Work on Victorian Periodicals’, *Victorian Studies* 48.3 (Spring 2006), p. 513.

²³ Archibald Grove, ‘Special Announcement’, *The New Review* 10 (Jan 1894), p. 127.

²⁴ Laurel Brake and Marysa Demoor (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library, 2009), p. 266.

²⁵ ‘Special Announcement’, *Saturday Review*, 25 March 1865, p. 362.

²⁶ John Morley, *Recollections*, vol I, (London: Macmillan, 1917), p. 100.

While each of these journals adhered to the mixed format of the open platform, they also offer a cross-section of the various political and cultural loyalties underlying the periodical press near the close of the century. As Helen Small has remarked, the *Nineteenth Century* and the *Fortnightly Review* were arguably ‘the two journals which did the most to provide the late Victorian intelligentsia with open forums for debate on science, literature, politics and religion’.²⁷ And yet, she goes on, ‘the political and intellectual stances of these two journals were to a significant degree the product of the markedly different publishing contexts from which they emerged’ – despite both being seen as rather interchangeable mouthpieces for a Liberal elite.²⁸ For its part, the *Nineteenth Century* emerged from the Metaphysical society and its members constituted the initial bulk of contributors. Many of the journals had to contend with accusations of political sympathies that could often be damaging to circulation, as in the case of the *New Review* with its imperialist and Conservative leanings. Even the socially liberal *Fortnightly Review* faced criticism for tending too much towards a Liberal platform of progress and tolerance.²⁹ Of course, within the relatively small circles of the intellectual press, inspiration for new periodicals was often drawn directly from their competitors. In some cases journals were founded to explicitly counteract perceived biases; thus, the liberal *Fortnightly* stood in contrast to the more Tory-oriented *Blackwood’s Magazine*, while the *Contemporary* was seen as a foil to Knowles’s later ventures with the *Nineteenth Century*. Even if a journal had no overarching political loyalties, editorial decisions (along with the less-studied publishers’ wishes) tended to push its viewpoint in certain directions. *Macmillan’s Magazine*, for example, maintained a progressive stance on political, social and cultural matters throughout its lifespan, however closely modelled it was on more conservative publications. This diversity proved a boon for many writers, not least Irish ones, enabling them to target their works by choosing their audiences.³⁰ The advantages for both publisher and author are perhaps best expressed by Alexander Macmillan, who wrote in relation to his magazine and the *Cornhill* that they were ‘very distinct in character – distinct enough to make it possible to have often

²⁷ Helen Small, ‘Liberal Editing in the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Nineteenth Century*’ in Kyriaki Hadjiafxendi and Polina Mackay (eds.), *Authorship in Context: From the Theoretical to the Material* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 56.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 72.

²⁹ See Houghton, ‘Introduction to the *Fortnightly Review*’, *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals*, no pagination. <http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk/toc/toc.do?id=JID-FORTR&divLevel=1&action=new&queryId=#scroll> [Accessed 7 May 2016].

³⁰ Sullivan, ‘Introduction’, p. xii.

the same purchasers'.³¹ In reality, of course, they were drawing from the same pool and their distinctiveness became blurred with time. But this does help to emphasise how important the varied spectrum of religious, political, social, literary and commercial motivations were to the late Victorians and the economy of their publishing markets.

Significantly, however, most of the journals under consideration here had a strong and continuous literary slant. Throughout the latter part of the century the intellectual press placed enormous value on high-quality fiction, frequently, we may assume, in order to gain competitive edge over their rivals. With the growth of cheap shilling monthlies and the seemingly insatiable public attitude for 'sensational' serials, the most sought-after names in the publishing industry were those authors who had become household names – Trollope, Eliot, Moore, James and Pater among them. All of these were regulars in the periodicals studied here, and commanded some of the highest fees paid by publishers. *Macmillan's*, for example, marketed itself as a distinguished literary mouthpiece and went to considerable trouble to secure the fiction of Trollope and Henry James in its early years. Yet these periodicals were not only vehicles for celebrated writers and their works, but important means by which literary culture was shaped in the late Victorian period. In particular, *The New Review* essentially sustained one of the most important movements of the day in its 'vigorous campaign for the realist tradition'.³² Although much has been written on the literary journal and serial fiction form, at the most basic level these publications were involved in a two-way dialectic: both pushing the boundaries of contemporary literary practices and reflecting the emergence of new trends and writers like Meredith, Swinburne and Rossetti.³³ By the late 1890s, notwithstanding pressures from a newer *fin de siècle* fashion in press publishing (avant-garde and Aesthetic publications garnered large amounts of publicity), these monthlies had built up the cultural clout to remain major literary forces in their own right.

In these ways, then, an analysis of this small section of the elite periodical press may facilitate a means of looking at literary and publishing networks in the late nineteenth century. How, for instance, did publishers' and contributors' relations develop, expand, or impact upon a publication's success, and why were Irish authors drawn to certain titles?

³¹ As quoted in Houghton, 'Introduction to *Macmillan's Magazine*', *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals*, no pagination. <http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk/toc/toc.do?id=JID-MAC&divLevel=1&action=new&queryId=#5> [Accessed 28 July 2018].

³² Anne Murtagh, 'The New Review: A Glimpse at the Nineties', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 14.1 (Spring 1981), p. 12.

³³ Houghton, 'Introduction to the Fortnightly Review', *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* [no pagination].

The role of editorial stewarding and networking was undoubtedly crucial in this respect, as was the financial means of the publisher. But movement between publications could also build up an editor's portfolio, as seen in the 'Henley Regatta', a collection of aspiring writers whom the charismatic editor W.E. Henley gathered around him from his time at the head of (among others) *The National Observer*, *Scots Observer* and *The New Review*.³⁴ Personal and professional relationships often fed into this, where success would depend on the loyalty of one's subeditors and regular journalists. James Knowles was no doubt aware of the benefits that a connection with the Metaphysical Society would bring to his *Nineteenth Century*, while Frank Harris met his longstanding associate John Verschoyle through English-Irish networks in 1880s London.³⁵ In a reductive reading, these networks could be seen as little more than the old boys' club, especially given Walter Houghton's definition of the 'mass of influential people': those from the London clubs, the Foreign Office, country houses, town councils, the universities, Bench and Bar, and leaders of industry.³⁶ But in limiting the web of interactions to this, underlying connections with potential significance can be easily missed. In one example, the author Elizabeth Robins published a short story in *The New Review* which caused both controversy and an ensuing drop in circulation of the magazine – but which was originally placed there by none other than Frank Harris, one of her acquaintances.³⁷ In this sense, one of the great advantages of the *Wellesley Index* is in making available the writing and identities of a body of professional networkers, whose work comprises the bulk of the elite reviews. Irish authors were inextricably bound up in this patchwork of influential figures by virtue of their periodical writings, and unquestionably benefited from the opportunities, contacts, invites and associations that inclusion in these three eminent journals afforded.

This examination, however, is not meant to be exhaustive and there are titles which may seem striking by their absence. Considerations of space have meant focusing on a small selection of easily comparable publications, all publishing within the same timeframe. Within these parameters, however, there are still a number of regrettable omissions. *Temple Bar* and *Pall Mall Magazine* were two journals whose contributors numbered amongst them some of the foremost Irish literary figures of the day. But the

³⁴ Ibid., p. 16.

³⁵ Esther R. Houghton, 'John Verschoyle and the *Fortnightly Review*', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 3 (1968), p. 18.

³⁶ Walter Houghton, 'Victorian Periodical Literature and the Articulate Classes', *Victorian Studies* 22.4 (June 1979), p. 394.

³⁷ Sue Thomas, 'Elizabeth Robins and *The New Review*', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 28.1 (Spring 1995), p. 63.

quality of the publications never achieved the same high standard as, say, the *Nineteenth Century*, and their slightly cheaper price (one shilling or less) meant they were not accepted into the same stable of serious, influential thought. They were also directly modelled on existing journals (the *Cornhill* and *Pall Mall Gazette*, respectively), and thus played a lesser role in pushing boundaries on a formal literary and philosophical level. The *Cornhill Magazine*, for its part, was a major literary player in the late Victorian period, yet by the 1890s its circulation was declining rapidly. Various critics have speculated that this was due to its shift from conversational to empirical presentation of material – something that the *Fortnightly* and its ilk decisively resisted.³⁸ Nevertheless, this loss of prestige is perhaps reflected by the fact that very few Irish writers published consistently in it, with even literary authors preferring the platform of *The New Review*.

Ultimately, the criteria for choosing any context for literary research must rest on its relevance and contemporaneity. The media environment of late Victorian England was a fast-paced, hectically challenging place for any periodical, and the ones included here stand testament to their continued importance in the cultural, social and political dialogue of the day. As James Mill put it in an insightful article of 1824: ‘Periodical literature depends upon immediate success. It must, therefore, patronise the opinions which are now in vogue ... must catch at immediate applause’.³⁹ A commitment to contemporaneity was still in evidence by the 1880s and 90s, as demonstrated by the aptly – if somewhat short-sightedly – titled *New Review*, and remained a consideration for the *Fortnightly Review* even after it became a monthly by a title that ‘reinforced its claim to speed and news’.⁴⁰

Timeframe

The years between 1880 and 1900 thus provide a useful timeframe for investigating these aspects of the periodical press. The late Victorian period encapsulated a variety of cultural moments in which both Irish writers and the monthly journals were significant and unavoidable players. In Britain (and to an extent Ireland) the vast increase in literacy from 1870, and the attendant acceleration of all forms of printing and publishing ventures gave rise to the seemingly unstoppable flourishing of the periodical press and its place at the heart of almost every political, cultural, social and religious issue of the day. The evolution of this ‘dimension and character of the reading public and the ever-greater productivity of the publishing industry’ ensured that forums which were attentive to the fast-paced and

³⁸ Boardman, ‘Charting the Golden Stream’, p. 514.

³⁹ James Mill, ‘Periodical Literature: *Edinburgh Review*’, *Westminster Review* 1 (1824), p. 209

⁴⁰ Brake, ‘Periodical Formats’, p. 47.

changing flavour of public life adopted positions of elevated importance.⁴¹ In particular, these years also witnessed the centrality of Irish voices in major press debates, not merely as regional ‘flavour’ but as authorities in their own right on everything from politics to theatre criticism. Building on an earlier generation of Fleet Street journalists such as T.P. Gill and D.P. Moran, the Irish in London’s press scene by the 1880s could legitimately claim an influence that extended far beyond the hack work characteristic of popular assumptions around the mid-century ‘mick on the make’.⁴² If, as has been argued, the Irish press remained a political press long after its English counterpart had become more or less wholly commercial, making the move from Dublin to London in 1880 was both professionally expedient and financially attractive.⁴³

It was also, for many of the writers considered here, a necessity for their chosen career paths. For fiction writers such as Sarah Grand, Emily Lawless and W.B. Yeats, the domestic publishing market in the 1880s and 90s was paltry compared to the opportunities which London offered, particularly in its range of formats. Despite the continuing demise of the three-volume novel, English publishers such as Macmillan and Thomas Fisher Unwin were important vehicles for the early work of both Lawless and Yeats and most likely contributed to the two authors’ personal and professional residency in the city during these years.⁴⁴ This in turn provided important contacts and networking opportunities for the writers, exposing them to the social and cultural milieus that sustained a vibrant periodical culture.⁴⁵ The 1890s, also, saw the foundation of important literary movements such as New Woman writing, a cultural feminist movement that was integral to the periodical output of Sarah Grand in *The New Review*. Although the influence of Irish women writers was crucial to this project – in effect an attempt to ‘legitimise [women’s] authority in the

⁴¹ Kelly J. Mays, ‘The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, in John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (eds.), *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 165.

⁴² See R.F. Foster, *Paddy and Mr Punch: Connections in English and Irish History* (London: Allen Lane, 2003); Michael de Nie, *The Eternal Paddy: Irish Identity and the British Press, 1798–1882* (Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin Press, 2004).

⁴³ Michael Foley, ‘How Journalism Became a Profession’ in Kevin Rafter (ed.), *Irish Journalism Before Independence* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p. 28.

⁴⁴ For a thorough examination of Irish novelists and their London publishing houses, particularly the historiographical question of how ‘at the precise juncture ... when the London publishing market was providing greater commercial opportunities than ever for writers, and the novel dominated the book trade, Revivalist incentives exiled it to the periphery of Irish cultural activity’, see Jane Mahony, ‘Irish Writers and their London Publishers, c. 1884–1922’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2016), p. 3.

⁴⁵ Macmillan’s publishing house was also the home of the titular *Magazine*, both of which were important publishing outlets for Irish writers and attracted many of the contributors examined here – including Stephen Gwynn, who worked for them for some years and increased the number and visibility of Irish writers on their lists. See Chapter Five for more detail.

public sphere' – it was a largely Anglo-American phenomenon that played out through representations in the English popular and intellectual press during the years 1889-1897.⁴⁶ As an example of a discursive formation that significantly influenced material events and was in turn highly reactive to such events, it perfectly encapsulates the power of the periodical press in this period, and how individual authors used this power to advance their varied and often competing agendas. It thus illustrates one of the interlocking strands that made this period of British periodical industry a particularly vital one for studying Irish writers' periodical works.

Another element that became a continuous flashpoint for Irish writers over these two decades was the debate, in its many forms, over literary and journalistic authority in the press. The phenomenon of New Journalism had consolidated itself in the popular press some years earlier, but its effects rippled throughout the literary culture of 1890s London, finding expression in the contributions of T.P. O'Connor in *The New Review*, for example. The related question of 'proper' forms of discourse and the dictates of public taste also pervade the theatre criticism of George Bernard Shaw, the literary reviews of Stephen Gwynn and the political histories of W.E.H. Lecky. Self-reflexivity, particularly in relation to the role of the literary journalist, is therefore a recurring trope throughout these twenty years and can help to contextualise some of the many disparate writers attended to here. The last two decades of the century also offer an important lens for charting the rise in professions and disciplinary specialisations, and how these were refracted through the highbrow journals. The pressures on the traditional Victorian intellectual (or the mid-century 'man of letters') and his worldview made themselves felt throughout the fabric of these contributions, from Lecky's clashes with Froude in the early 1880s to J.P. Mahaffy's defence of the academic generalist in articles from 1898. The 1890s, in particular, offer a fascinating case study in the interface between late Victorian and modern cultural climates. Although *fin-de-siècle* anxieties and reformulations have less of a presence in these reviews than their contemporaries *The Yellow Book* and *Woman's World*, there are echoes of this new shift in art and culture throughout, for instance, Frank Harris's years as editor of the *Fortnightly Review*.

⁴⁶ Tina O'Toole, *The Irish New Woman* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 17

Ireland and her Writers Abroad

While an appraisal of every single Irish writer who was in some way associated with the periodical press in Britain during these years would be impossible, this study does attempt to measure the extent as well as relative importance of Irish contributions in these three journals. The criteria supporting the choice of writers, then, is a minimum of three articles published in any of the periodicals under consideration between 1880 and 1900 (this quantitative approach means that each article is therefore detailed in full in the bibliography). As the journals were issued monthly, each containing between ten and fifteen articles and with a high degree of variety and turnover amongst contributors, these criteria are indicative of at least minor recognition among editors and readers. Nevertheless, this is not designed to be an authoritative overview, for a number of interlocking reasons. Despite the stated intention of all of these journals to eschew anonymity and promote the celebrity status of their contributors, pseudonymous articles still appeared with some regularity throughout the 1880s and 1890s.⁴⁷ As this thesis has relied for a large part on the collation efforts of the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals*, which has endeavoured to confirm the identity of each article's author, its qualification that this is a project still beset by unknowns is one that must necessarily apply here. In other words, there may well be Irish authors writing for these monthly journals who were either unattributed or whose pseudonyms have not been discovered.⁴⁸ The novelist Emily Lawless, for example, published both under her own name in the *Nineteenth Century* and under the initials 'L., E,' in *Macmillan's Magazine*. Whether this was the case with other authors, or whether Lawless herself published under other pseudonymous names will, inevitably, continue to be an ongoing challenge for periodical researchers.

Even within these parameters there are some purposeful – albeit significant – omissions of writers on the basis of length and stylistic considerations. Perhaps the most important one to flag here is Edward Dowden, the Irish critic and poet, whose collected contributions to periodicals during these years numbered nearly thirty articles – by far the most extensive range of any Irish author under consideration. To adequately assess and contextualise these writings (spanning literary criticism, political commentary and journalistic reflections) is beyond the scope of this thesis, and in any case has been

⁴⁷ For further discussion on issues of anonymity and celebrity in late Victorian literary life (in the context of gender), see Alexis Easley's two studies on *First-Person Anonymous: Women Writers and Victorian Print Media, 1830–1870* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004) and *Literary Celebrity, Gender, and Victorian Authorship, 1850–1914* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011).

⁴⁸ See Houghton, 'Introduction' I, xvi.

meaningfully attempted elsewhere.⁴⁹ Other notable absences include Michael Davitt, whose eight articles for the *Nineteenth Century* constitute a considerable body of material on the Irish land crisis (a subject which itself is deliberately outside the purview of this thesis) and demands a separate, sustained examination of its own merits. The same can be said for the unionist politician T.W. Russell, who, although a contributor to all three journals surveyed here, is considered only tangentially in relation to the political debates of the *Fortnightly Review*. Despite being a figure of no small importance in both Westminster and the English press, his arguments largely echo those of other unionist writers and are thus excluded for demands of space. Lastly, Michael MacDonagh was an Irish parliamentary reporter who made his career in the newspaper press of Fleet Street and contributed a number of ‘light’ pieces to these journals. Unfortunately he is largely forgotten today, and his relative unimportance has meant both a lack of secondary material and an ambiguous position within the literary hierarchies of the intellectual press. This of course does not mean that his work should be neglected, but rather that it sits outside the intended aim of this thesis. All four authors are deserving of further excavation, and demand a more focused analysis than this project can offer.

The writers that *are* included, then, may not comprise the full extent of Irish periodical contributions but together offer a comprehensive picture of the range of topics that came within an Irish intellectual orbit in England. Indeed, grouping these diverse writers together has sometimes proved a methodological challenge – how can one connect Hannah Lynch and Horace Plunkett, for example; or J.P. Hennessy and Alice Stopford Green? One way to approach this question has been to think about each group of writers as standing in a similar relation to a readership as well as to an editorial and commercial ethos. Their backgrounds may have been widely divergent, ranging from colonial bureaucrat to professional novelist, but appearing alongside each other (figuratively if not always literally) in the same publication anchored these writers together in the eyes of their readers. By this I mean they each abided by the same generic conventions demanded by the format of the monthly review, exercising conscious choices about material, ideological choices in regard to the specific journal (part of a liberal tradition whether they admitted it or not) and positioning themselves as essayists. It must be remembered, too, that each writer here was either commissioned or put themselves forward as an authority on their chosen subject,

⁴⁹ Kathryn R. Ludwigson, *Edward Dowden* (New York: Twayne, 1973); Terence Brown, ‘Edward Dowden: Irish Victorian’, in Brown (ed.) *Ireland’s Literature: Selected Essays* (Mullingar: Lilliput, 1988), pp. 29-48; Eve Patten, ‘A “general crowd of small singers”: Yeats and Dowden Reassessed’, in Warwick Gould and Edna Longley (eds.), *Yeats Annual 12. That Accusing Eye: Yeats and his Irish Readers* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 29-45.

buying into an elite publishing structure that patronised successful writers. Conceptualising of Irish writers as a whole, then, does not mean playing down their many different and divergent outlooks, but instead understanding them in relational terms – as part of their place within the ‘communicative purpose’ of the journal.⁵⁰ By this token, ‘small differences – perhaps even more so than broader differences – can help us understand how periodicals carefully shaped their own identities and attempted to find, retain and increase their own readership.’⁵¹ We could quite easily substitute ‘Irish writers’ for ‘periodicals’ here and arrive at a similar conclusion.

In allowing for such flexible criteria (the three articles could, and often did, include both fiction and non-fiction, mirroring the mixed format of the reviews themselves) we can begin to chart the abundance of Irish critical and creative concerns in a period just prior to (and during) the Gaelic Revival’s entrenchment of cultural nationalism. The intention here is twofold: firstly, to illuminate often-elided currents of Irish intellectual and literary endeavour and to profile them in the context of a London publishing industry; and secondly, to initiate a more rigorous conversation about journalistic and periodical pursuits within an Irish milieu. This latter purpose is meant as a deliberate counterpoint to the predilections of literary historians for the ‘extractive approach’, and follows Fionnuala Dillane’s caution against reading a writer’s journalistic enterprises as ‘an aesthetic blueprint or transparent handout for the fiction’.⁵² Thus the following study is careful to profile the press articles of major figures such as George Bernard Shaw and George Moore against the standards of contemporary journals and their own lesser-known peers like Hannah Lynch and T.P. O’Connor, and not merely in the context of their fictional output. Like recent studies of Irish literary history, this thesis makes room for various forms of literary expression, in light of the way in which ‘generic ambiguity’ (particularly the ‘tendency to challenge, subvert, redefine and/or merge traditional genres’) can be seen as ‘one of the major forces that gives Irish literature its distinctiveness and validity’.⁵³ A figurative and material closeness between fiction and non-fiction was also defining feature of the

⁵⁰ Dillane, ‘Researching the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press’, p. 79.

⁵¹ Beth Rodgers, ‘Researching the Relationship between Two Periodicals: Representations of George Eliot in the *Girl’s Own Paper* and *Atalanta*’ in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), p. 91.

⁵² Fionnuala Dillane, ‘Marian Evans the Reviewer’ in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 361.

⁵³ Margaret Kelleher and Philip O’Leary, ‘Introduction’ to *The Cambridge History of Irish Literature, Volume I: To 1890*, ed. by Margaret Kelleher and Philip O’Leary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 5.

periodical press, and this thesis is keen not to impose an artificial division between the two in its analyses.

The question of national identity is also of central importance to consider when assessing these writers' careers. Many of them challenged entrenched narratives about what constituted appropriate subject matter, not only for literary journalists but also for late nineteenth-century Irish writing in general. The narrative of the contemporaneous Irish literary revival is itself a hierarchical and largely retroactive imposition of a literary heritage which has tended to ignore those 'hyphenated' writers whose literary form and concerns sat outside the neatly designated, proto-nationalist space of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ireland. The orthodoxies of this turn towards a Gaelic-inspired literature were in large part prompted by W. B. Yeats's distrust of his 'jaded and culturally tarnished predecessor[s],' who, in his view, opted for second-rate English novels over artistic and heroic representations of Irish life.⁵⁴ Douglas Hyde, in his seminal 1892 piece on 'The Necessity for De-Anglicising Ireland,' articulated these concerns within the framework of cultural nationalism, a movement that would develop into one of the most compelling forces for change in the first decades of the twentieth century. For their part, most of the writers considered here did sit (in both a literal and rhetorical sense) outside this carefully circumscribed tradition for much of their early careers. In this sense, they fit John Wilson Foster's description of a neglected constituency of the Irish Revival — 'the ambitious provincial who knew that opportunities reside in [the] cultural capital and nearest metropolis, which was, where each of these writers were concerned, London. . . . All violated equally the tacit 'Residency Requirement' of the Revival'.⁵⁵ This narrative, however, ignores the fact that the geographical beginnings of the Revival were very much a product of the English publishing scene of the 1880s and early 1890s and that much of the Irish political history of those decades actually took place in London.⁵⁶ Foster has also highlighted the continued historiographical neglect of a whole class of mid-level Irish bureaucrats and writers who travelled overseas during the nineteenth century, in essence showcasing the social mobility of the middle and upper classes of Victorian Ireland.⁵⁷ Figures as diverse as Charlotte Grace O'Brien and Edwin Lawrence Godkin, for instance,

⁵⁴ Eve Patten, 'Ireland's 'Two Cultures' Debate: Victorian Science and the Literary Revival', *Irish University Review* 33.1 (Spring 2003), p. 2.

⁵⁵ John Wilson Foster, *Irish Novels, 1890 -1940: New Bearings in Culture and Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 35.

⁵⁶ See, for example, R. F. Foster's examination of Yeats's early influences and self-fashioning in the British capital, particularly how the 'protest that "London can give me nothing" was wearing thin.' R. F. Foster, *W. B. Yeats: A Life. Vol. 1, The Apprentice Mage: 1865–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 81.

⁵⁷ J.W. Foster, *Irish Novels*, p. 11.

were prominent Irish nationalists whose accounts of their time in North America appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* and were indicative of an unexplored transnational outlook all too often subsumed within broader political ideologies.⁵⁸

In this sense, Irish literary expatriates occupy a complex cultural dislocation within canonical accounts of Irish literature and history.⁵⁹ While it is prudent to acknowledge the various guises that the Irish Revival took, and how it interacted and intersected with many different forms of literary output, a large number of the writers considered here were peripheral to its scope. And although many did partake in and shape the ‘intense phase of intellectual rejuvenation that fashioned a new civic culture’ synonymous with the Revival years, many others eschewed its dominant ideological and formal impetuses in representing Ireland.⁶⁰ Perhaps to escape the parameters being laid down by certain cultural nationalists in the 1890s, many of these periodical contributors avoided defining themselves primarily as novelists (Irish or otherwise) or professional authors. Instead, their work demonstrates the complexities of a particular national narrative in the face of the cosmopolitan nature of the publishing world, and shows how Irish entanglements with empire were bringing pressure to bear on exclusivist conceptions of Irish identity. Their literary identities were not insular or necessarily self-reflective but frequently outward-looking in their commitment to a generalised discourse, embodied in the *belles-lettres* influence of figures such as J.P. Mahaffy or William Lecky. Engaging in a European literary tradition, moreover, meant that writers like Hannah Lynch, George Moore or Yeats were as likely to look to Paris as a cultural centre in these years as they were to London or Dublin.

This analysis, however, ends here in 1900. Selected not only for its neat rounding off of the century and, effectively, of the Victorian era, it also marks a point when Irish cultural production took on a noticeably nationalist tint. This can be most clearly discerned in the writings of Stephen Gwynn and George Moore in the *Fortnightly Review*, which moved from general literary criticism towards a focus on Irish material with a Revivalist slant around the turn of the century.⁶¹ The period immediately preceding this, then, offers a

⁵⁸ See for instance in the *Nineteenth Century* Michael Davitt’s April 1892 article, ‘Impressions of the Canadian Northwest’, and Godkin’s reports from America in February 1886 (‘An American View of Popular Government’), June 1886 (‘American Home Rule’), and August 1887 (‘American Opinion on the Irish Question’).

⁵⁹ Whitney Standlee, *‘Power to Observe’: Irish Women Novelists in Britain, 1890-1916* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 24.

⁶⁰ Declan Kiberd and P. J. Mathews, *Handbook of the Irish Revival: An Anthology of Irish Cultural and Political Writings 1891-1922* (Dublin: Abbey Theatre Press, 2015), p. 24.

⁶¹ See, for instance, his review of ‘The Autumn’s Books’ in December 1900 as compared with the February 1901 article on ‘The Life of a Song’.

more rounded perspective on Irish interests in the periodical market. This is not to say that nationalist-inflected writings do not appear here: Yeats's folklore tales in *The New Review* are a fine example of his early glances to a Gaelic past, but are also situated within their specific publishing context. While arguing that these contributions cannot be taken as a simple reflection of 'larger' concerns in the authors' literary work, journals were, however, monitoring and responding to changes in cultural iterations just as they were to those in education, the civil service and universities. Irish writing in England during these two decades, in turn, was little different. Self-consciously engaging in what Luke Gibbons has termed the 'politics of representation', Irish writers are viewed in context of their anti-exceptionalism; that is, outside the restrictive boundaries of the 'cultural imaginary'.⁶² It is true, also, that many of the writers featured here, among them Yeats, Katherine Tynan and Standish O'Grady, 'had by the early 1890s already pre-defined the era ahead of them as one in which literature would act as an expedient tool to remedy Irish political inefficiencies'.⁶³ But many others sought inspiration elsewhere, including figures like Sarah Grand and George Moore who in the 1890s 'felt qualified, and secure enough in their identity, to depict and illuminate the neighbouring island of Britain'.⁶⁴ Meanwhile a prolific cohort of nationalist and unionist politicians sought a different means of expression, advocating a firm vision of a political future for Ireland in line with modern European states and a developing liberal ideology.

Another major consideration that presents itself in a study of this kind is what, exactly, constituted Irishness, and on what basis to include writers who had varying levels of connection to Ireland. For many, subject matter and political or cultural affiliations are obvious pointers, as in the case of the various politicians who submitted articles on the Irish question. For others, the designation of 'Irish' was not so direct. A considerable number of the writers featured in these pages had a shifting and ambivalent relation to their home country, complicated by factors such as literary exile (self-imposed or otherwise), the growing momentum of cultural nationalism, and the ambiguous status of Ireland within both the United Kingdom and the broader British Empire. Thus on one end of the scale we may place a writer like W.B. Yeats, perhaps the most famous exponent of Irish exceptionalism, and on the other end Sarah Grand, herself a pseudonymous disguise for an author who left Ireland early and who retained almost no links with or apparent interest in the country. While rightly wary of the fractious politics of canon formation (itself an issue

⁶² Luke Gibbons, *Transformations in Irish Culture* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996), p. 9.

⁶³ Standlee, 'Power to Observe', p. 13.

⁶⁴ Foster, *Irish Novels*, p. 10.

under much contention in the late nineteenth century), this thesis is guided by the auspices of current scholarship that seek to radically expand the parameters of what Irish writing actually consisted of in these years. Following on from Tina O'Toole's precedent, for example, the writings of Sarah Grand are traced in the context of the Irish female voice in early feminist writings circles of *fin de siècle* London. Despite a similar avoidance of overtly Irish topics in his periodical articles, and his dismissive comments on his 'accident of birth, which occurred to me in Ireland', George Bernard Shaw has long been claimed by an Irish literary heritage.⁶⁵ Discussions of his work in Chapter One, then, are careful to contextualise this equivocal author in his relation to both a London-based publishing scene and the networks of Irish writers that operated within it. Both authors represent a faction of Irish writing that strained against the constrictions of insular nationalism, using their respective gendered and cosmopolitan identities as ways to negotiate around the 'Irish question'.⁶⁶

The specific contributions of Irish (male) writers to the British political and intellectual establishment is discussed in more detail below, but a no less authoritative vision of how a modern civil society might operate was expressed by Irish women in the periodical press. Indeed, a close attention to matters of gender is a key methodological underpinning in this thesis. Many of the women who appear in these chapters have been central to the ongoing flourishing of 'retrievals' in nineteenth-century Irish literary studies around marginalised figures and genres.⁶⁷ Emily Lawless, Hannah Lynch, Alice Stopford Green and Charlotte Grace O'Brien, for instance, have only recently attracted more sustained attention and now occupy prominent positions in canonical revisitations of the late Victorian period.⁶⁸ While these are all necessary and overdue developments, a rather narrow focus on gender can risk overlooking some of the wider social, cultural and

⁶⁵ George Bernard Shaw, 'The Socialist Ideal I: Politics', *The New Review* (Jan 1891), pp. 10-11.

⁶⁶ Equally, however, we must acknowledge that 'the appropriation of writers and artists from outside of London as British once they arrive in the metropolis is a common trope within criticism, as if the legacy of those at the cutting edge of avant-garde artistic production is tainted by acknowledging their roots outside the centre'. At various points Sarah Grand, Shaw, Oscar Wilde and George Moore have all been claimed for an English tradition of letters, a tendency which Irish studies criticism is still assiduously combating. Niall Carson, 'Transnationalism, Ireland and *The Bell*', *Éire-Ireland* 51.1 (Spring 2016), p. 174.

⁶⁷ A selection of recent studies in this area include Anna Pilz and Whitney Standlee (eds.), *Irish Women's Writing 1878-1922: Advancing the Cause of Liberty* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016); Matthew Reznicek, *The European Metropolis: Paris and Nineteenth-Century Irish Women Novelists* (Clemson: Clemson University Press, 2017); Elke d'Hoker, Raphaël Ingelbien and Hedwig Schwall (eds.), *Irish Women Writers: New Critical Perspectives* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010); Standlee, 'Power to Observe'; Rolf Loeber and Magda Loeber, *A Guide to Irish Fiction, 1650-1900* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006).

⁶⁸ Foster, *Irish Novels*; James H. Murphy, *Irish Novelists & the Victorian Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

publishing contexts in which these women were operating. It is a condition articulated by Foster in discussing the ‘hybridity’ of many of these writers, specifically ‘the intricacy of Anglo-Irish relations cross-hatched by class, gender, language, culture and race’.⁶⁹ These paradigms, then, are crucial to the approach adopted by this thesis, which aims not only to include a large proportion of women contributors but also to liberate them from limiting ‘rescue’ projects. It is a course epitomised by the chapter on Emily Lawless, where a consideration of class and networks is arguably as important as that of gender and where her status as a socially mobile and elite woman helped her enter into largely male-dominated debates in the highbrow press.

Writing women back into the political discourse of the day is also a central objective in the following chapters. Alice Stopford Green and Charlotte Grace O’Brien were directly involved in campaigns for social justice in their pieces for the *Nineteenth Century*, which proved that Irish women were active in the public sphere and, furthermore, sought to convey a sense of social conscience and responsibility that would inform the wider worldview of the publication as well as influencing currents of British intellectual debate. But, as Anna Pilz and Whitney Standlee have pointed out, a wider definition of political activism is also needed for these women, ‘one that abandons the tendency to prioritise nationalist or unionist agendas ... and, in the process, to open up political agendas that include educational reform, the family, commercialism, language, religion, suffrage and cosmopolitanism’.⁷⁰ Chapter One’s discussion of the New Woman fiction of Sarah Grand, therefore, focuses on this move to politicise the traditionally ‘feminine’ spheres of domestic life and art. Moreover, networks of influence and acquaintance were vitally important arteries for women writers in gaining publication, and this thesis rests on a significant amount of biographical excavation to properly situate these figures within their contemporary journalistic and literary-political milieu. The cosmopolitan nature of much of their work (particularly in the case of Hannah Lynch and Sarah Grand) is read here as a conscious career choice, emblematic of a cultural mobility that bypassed the strictures of early Irish nationalism and was intrinsic to their publishing success. The visibility of their press interventions, especially in the 1890s, meant that these women writers inhabited ‘distinct social and professional imperatives’ and were therefore not only important figures in themselves but stood as part of the texture of journalism.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Foster, *Irish Novels*, p. 9.

⁷⁰ Pilz and Standlee, ‘Introduction’, in *Irish Women’s Writing*, p. 8.

⁷¹ Standlee, ‘Power to Observe’, p. 7.

Political Context

One of the main reasons for attending to this period is because Ireland and its writers remained a defining feature of British intellectual life from 1880 onwards. As Eugenio Biagini reminds us, the ‘claim that neither [Britain] nor the politicians wanted to know about Ireland in 1885 is hardly reconcilable ... with the attention devoted to the Irish question by journalists, political economists and land reformers’.⁷² Indeed it is no overstatement to say that Irish history (in its constitutional guise) happened in Britain during these years, and to a large degree happened in the journals of the British liberal establishment. The crises of land ownership and tenant rights in the early 1880s, Gladstone’s adoption of Home Rule as a cause, the co-operative movement in agriculture in the last years of the century: all received significant coverage across a broad section of the British press. This critical mass of political and public debate foregrounded Irish voices, whose substantial contribution can be traced throughout the development of both nationalist and unionist movements.⁷³ In doing so they help to undo assumptions about Ireland’s contested colonial status, in particular asking us to reconsider who was talking to whom in the public sphere. Gladstone, as is discussed in Chapters One and Two, engaged in complex public negotiations with writers such as W.E.H. Lecky, Justin McCarthy and Richard Barry O’Brien, refining and reshaping his views on governmentality, liberalism and Irish history through these periodical debates. It should also not be forgotten, as Donal Foley has remarked, that at one stage the Irish Parliamentary Party in Westminster had more journalists within its ranks than any other political party – increasing from one in 1880 to fifteen in 1895.⁷⁴ The political discourse around Home Rule, then, was not only mediated but determined and bracketed by Irish interests in the highbrow press.

There is, of course, the intractable problem of measuring ‘influence’ in the periodical press, but in an industry that marketed itself to the politically powerful and educated classes we may presume that the eminent names appearing in the journals’ pages brought a certain level of visibility within influential spheres. In this reading, Ireland

⁷² Eugenio F. Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism 1876-1906* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 13.

⁷³ Paul Bew, *Conflict and Conciliation in Ireland, 1890-1910: Parnellites and Radical Agrarians* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987); G.K. Peatling, *British Opinion and Irish Self-Government, 1865-1925: from Unionism to Liberal Commonwealth* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2001); F.S.L. Lyons, *Culture and Anarchy in Ireland, 1890-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979); Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule: an Irish History, 1800-2000* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003); Patrick Maume, *The Long Gestation: Irish Nationalist Life, 1891-1918* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1999); James Loughlin, *Gladstone, Home Rule and the Ulster Question, 1882-93* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1986).

⁷⁴ Foley, ‘How Journalism Became a Profession’, p. 31.

occupied a crucial place in the narrative of British political liberalism at the end of the nineteenth century. Home Rule was not, as Biagini asserts, merely a peripheral or isolated aberration, but ‘fired the public imagination of the peoples of the United Kingdom and came to dominate their understanding of liberty and citizenship’.⁷⁵ This imaginative significance can be further understood in relation to the premium placed on forms of ‘literary’ discourse in the monthly reviews, differentiating itself from political hack work and echoing a kind of Arnoldian intellectualism in political and persuasive rhetoric.⁷⁶ In the same vein, Irish writers on constitutional nationalism brought a creative and often imaginative slant to their discussions, a practice suited to the essay-style format of the illustrious reviews. Justin McCarthy, for instance, was perhaps as well known as a novelist as a politician, and his son Justin Huntly similarly combined his two pursuits of author and nationalist MP in his articles. Standish O’Grady and Horace Plunkett, on the other hand, articulated a complex, resonant vision for an alternative Ireland based on collaborative unionism. Indeed, with his Revivalist connections O’Grady attempted to energise Plunkett’s somewhat dry economic outlines of the co-operative aspirations; a case of, in Plunkett’s words, ‘hitch[ing] your wagons to a star’.⁷⁷

There were also, of course, strong transnational dimensions to Irish and British political discourse during these years. In Chapter Three, I argue that E.L. Godkin and John Pope Hennessy complicate the accepted British/Irish binary by writing respectively from an American and colonial perspective for the *Nineteenth Century*. Both figures reflect the broad geographical scope of the periodicals as embedded in the increasing trends towards international material in their pages – trends which were heightened in the years leading up to the Boer War of 1899. European parallels, however, feed into the journals as well. In G.K. Peatling’s analysis, there is a need for reminders on ‘how much Britons were swimming with and not against the tide of European influences’, citing the example of W.E.H. Lecky as a writer of not only British and Irish importance but ‘an audacious historian of European moral and intellectual development’.⁷⁸ Indeed, to read the *Nineteenth Century* or the *Fortnightly Review* during the late 1880s and 1890s is to come up against the juxtaposition of Irish and European, imperial or commonwealth material at almost

⁷⁵ Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*, p. 4.

⁷⁶ A good discussion of this is in Kate Campbell, ‘W. E. Gladstone, W. T. Stead, Matthew Arnold and A New Journalism: Cultural Politics in The 1880s’, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 36.1 (2003), pp. 20-40.

⁷⁷ As quoted in Margaret Digby, *Horace Plunkett: An Anglo-American Irishman* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949), p. 165.

⁷⁸ G.K. Peatling, “‘Continental Crossings’: European Influences on British Public Opinion and Irish Politics, 1848-2002”, *History of European Ideas* 27.4 (2001), p. 376.

every turn. Tracing the development of political ideas among an Irish milieu, then, means situating the writers in both the material and discursive contexts of the journals they appeared in, and the different shades of liberalism that each title espoused.⁷⁹ The ‘open platform’ style of debate, furthermore, arguably encouraged a pluralistic, ambiguous and often shifting understanding of both Irish constitutional nationalism and Gladstonian Liberalism, allowing for a broader reach among audiences with differing conceptions of national interest.⁸⁰

Much of this rhetorical wrangling over the ‘national’, of course, was rooted in the contingencies of vastly divergent readings of Irish history. If Gladstone was adept at using the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* to promote his vision of a progressive Union, then ‘history in the service of an ideological mission’ was an essential component of the campaign for an intellectual and moral high ground.⁸¹ How history was understood and debated became a matter of not merely academic interest for the readers of these journals in the latter years of the century, but a livewire of often contentious spats between some of Britain’s most eminent thinkers. The implications of this for Irish contributors were manifold. The ‘construction and propagation of a suitably edifying and morally redemptive version of the Irish past’, as Gearoid Ó Tuathaigh states, was not just a central tenet of the Gaelic Revival but, like many of that movement’s ideological manoeuvres, had a significant debt to its Victorian intellectual predecessors.⁸² In terms of the political context, Biagini argues that ‘by promoting a certain vision of the Irish past Gladstone selected – perhaps even invented – the historical associations which he regarded as ‘binding’ if politicians wanted to encourage the further development of popular constitutionalism.’⁸³ Irish history thus developed a premium that aided the cultural and political profile of its adherents in the periodicals, enabling both Liberals and conservative Unionists to orient themselves in respect to an ongoing discussion around historiography.

This function linked in with broader ideas about historical narratives and their contestants in the public sphere of late Victorian Britain. These journals certainly acted as types of interpretative structures, through which versions of Irish history could be focalised and refracted. The Irish historian William Hartpole Lecky, subject of Chapter Two, was a

⁷⁹ Ann Parry offers an intriguing study of the intellectual currency of home rule during the 1880s and 90s, and how it was mapped across three Liberal journals in ‘The Home Rule Crisis and the ‘Liberal’ Periodicals 1886-1895: Three Case Studies’, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 22.1 (1989), pp. 18-30.

⁸⁰ Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*, p. 16.

⁸¹ Gearoid Ó Tuathaigh, review of Lawrence W. McBride, *Reading Irish Histories: Texts, Contexts And Memory in Modern Ireland* (2003), *Victorian Studies* 48.1 (2005), p. 169.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*, p. 16.

case in point: his early concurrence with the aims of Irish nationalism gradually developed into a conviction of Ireland's place within the British empire, and this reformulation of views can be traced throughout his press interventions from the late 1870s. This 'working through' of a historical standpoint was by no means rare within the pages of intellectual reviews – Gladstone is an obvious parallel – but was only one element of Lecky's contribution to historical and political debate. The major scholarly disputes waged between him and James Anthony Froude also became important pointers on opposing theories of race, empire and interpretations of Ireland's colonial past. Indeed, the idiosyncratic Froude stood as a crucial antagonistic figure for many Irish writers, with John Pope Hennessy and Justin McCarthy joining Lecky in explicitly denouncing his portrayals of sixteenth and seventeenth century Irish history. Hailed by one critic as an 'invaluable gift' to a strand of Irish nationalism, the indignant response to Froude's writings (in the press as in the broader publishing sphere) served 'an important rhetorical purpose' in pushing the school of late-century Irish history towards a high-political narrative.⁸⁴ In Ciaran Brady's reading, this exculpatory tone 'sought to deflect Froude's charge [that the Irish had always displayed the features of an inferior race] by the simple but subtle means of privileging linear continuous narrative over analysis and explanation'.⁸⁵

This reasoning, however, can be challenged in relation to one important aspect of history writing in periodicals; namely, its periodicity. The monthly publication of the *Nineteenth Century*, *Fortnightly Review*, *The New Review* and many others constituted a temporal framework that provided for – indeed encouraged – a 'call and response' version of history. No doubt a commercial boon for editors and owners with an eye on waning readership levels, the attacks and counter-attacks between Lecky and Froude (or between Gladstone and his political opponents) ensured a continued pressure for new interpretations of the period under discussion. Periodicals, too, opened up new ways of conceiving of the past, providing fertile terrain for expressions of national identity as informed by current historical debates. Irish writers, particularly those on the side of Home Rule, had by the 1890s perfected the practice of turning various periods of the past into 'self-contained demonstrations of a moral or aesthetic principle'.⁸⁶ As the centenary of the 1798 rebellion approached, Lecky became a frequent commentator on the need for caution around

⁸⁴ Ciaran Brady, 'Arrested Development: Competing Histories and the Formation of the Irish Historical Profession, 1801 – 1938' in Tibor Frank and Frank Hadler (eds.), *Disputed Territories and Shared Pasts: Overlapping National Histories in Modern Europe* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 293.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 295

⁸⁶ John P. Farrell, review of A. Dwight Culler, *The Victorian Mirror of History* (1985), *Victorian Studies* 30.3 (Spring 1987), p. 430.

jingoistic and romantic renderings of a fraught period of Irish history. This also highlighted his view of history writing as a serious scholarly pursuit, relying on archival sources and actively positioning the author as a researcher as well as informer or populariser. In this way, Lecky, much like Froude or A.M. Sullivan, was attempting to bring Irish historiography into the realm of the categorisable, a counter balance perhaps to the overt romanticism of the cultural nationalist movement at the end of the century. We can see this in light of the so-called ‘archival turn’ in popular history writing during these years, with a growing emphasis on accurate historical accounts based on a mastery of source material and rigorous primary research.⁸⁷

More broadly, this concentration on methods, categories and definitions made itself felt across the periodical press in the growth of academic specialisations and disciplinary fracturing in the closing decades of the century. Allied to the development and spread of university departments, the general narrative of this era has tended to posit both the academy and the professions encroaching on high-Victorian forms of discourse that periodicals upheld – specifically the fading influence of the public intellectual of the *belles-lettres* tradition.⁸⁸ But journals such as the *Nineteenth Century* were in fact close observers of these trends, commenting on and responding to the societal and cultural shifts that could have a direct impact on their market. In this context it is little surprise that literary reviewing remained a lynchpin in the journals’ conceptions of themselves as intellectual authorities. Emerging as a cultural force outside the sphere of the specialist, reviews retained their elevated significance in part due to the nature of the Victorian print industry, particularly in the ‘shift from “intensive” to “extensive” reading: from repeated and extensive rumination over a few traditional texts to a quicker consumption of a wider range of changing titles’.⁸⁹ This can be seen in the collected contributions of George Moore, Hannah Lynch and Justin Huntly McCarthy, whose wide range of reference and generalist knowledge signalled a literary calibre characteristic of both the monthly reviews and a new class of reader.⁹⁰ Mark Hampton, however, has put forward a slightly different reading of

⁸⁷ Herman Paul, ‘The Heroic Study of Records: The Contested Persona of the Archival Historian’, *History of the Human Sciences* 26.4 (2013), p. 69.

⁸⁸ See Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) and Phillippa Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

⁸⁹ James Wald, ‘Periodicals and Periodicity’ in Simon Eliot and Jonathon Rose (eds.), *A Companion to the History of the Book* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), p. 423.

⁹⁰ It can be argued that these journals actually incorporated aspects of the New Journalism most obviously in their reviews, as a gesture towards the demands of a changing marketplace. Matthew Arnold’s (famously disdainful) account of New Journalism on account of its ‘ability, novelty, variety, sensation, sympathy,

the place of the intellectual journal. Viewing the 1880s as ushering in an era that saw the waning of a ‘mid-Victorian “educational” ideal of the press’ in favour of the New Journalism-inspired ideal of the press as a ‘representative agency’, he points to the more complex picture of fissures that were opening up around the concept of a public intellectual.⁹¹ Far from being anachronistic throwbacks to more straightforwardly elitist society, writers such as Lecky and J.P. Mahaffy were in fact prominent thinkers in the British public sphere who continued to argue for the periodicals as educational agents. In doing so, they were not simply engaging with the debates in front of them (whether they were defences of Irish imperial identity or archaeological discussions) but rather with larger forces of economic, cultural and journalistic authority. Irish writers were thus integral to the negotiations around transformations that ‘meant that, increasingly, many who spoke of the “influence of the press” intended something quite different from the Gladstonian ideal of rational persuasion’ by the end of the century.⁹²

Transnationalism

Perhaps the most important framework within which this project is undertaken is that of transnationalism. If, as argued above, ‘Irish’ was a fissured category during the late Victorian period, then there is a need for widening our conception of Irish writing in these years. The difficulties entailed in trying to impose a national context on literary output reveal themselves most forcefully in a study of this kind, where the boundaries between Britain, Ireland and the rest of the world were being consistently tested and renegotiated within the pages of periodicals. Transnationalism, therefore, is a uniquely productive way of approaching these writers and texts, and is understood here as more of a perspective or ‘way of seeing’ than any overarching analytical or historical paradigm.⁹³ Niall Whelehan’s useful 2015 study posits a ‘transnational frame of reference’ as one that ‘balances larger contexts with smaller-scale analysis ... [as] a means to challenge impressions of national

generous instincts’ had in fact become a marked feature of many literary reviews by the 1890s, as ‘these virtues remained in place as professional requirements ... for literary journalists and critics as they were for writers on political and social matters’. John Stokes and Mark W. Turner, ‘Oscar Wilde, New Journalist’ in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 374.

⁹¹ Mark Hampton, *Visions of the Press in Britain, 1850-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004), p. 75.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁹³ Niall Whelehan (ed.), ‘Introduction’ to *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 1

uniqueness and exceptionalism'.⁹⁴ As a theory and form of scholarly practice, it has gained much traction in Irish studies in recent years for these reasons. Intersecting with diaspora and migration studies, transnationalism has found a natural home in nineteenth-century history as a way of opening up the often-myopic focus on the nation state and movements of cultural and physical force nationalism. Ciaran O'Neill and Enda Delaney have pointed to the many areas that are ripe for this kind of analysis, including 'labour history, Irish imperial history, the networks of Irish elite groups and histories of Irish consumption'.⁹⁵ 'Doing' transnational history, then, means not only a recalibration of traditional forms of historical and literary analysis – in essence opening up the archive to new and diverse readings – but engaging with types and fluidities of Irish identity as they were expressed across a range of formats.

Transnationalism is also, by necessity, often interdisciplinary in nature. The consideration of texts as cultural entities that are shaped in reference to more than one national tradition is a reading that has obvious benefits for this thesis. Indeed, as the theory emphasises the two-way flow in cultural currencies over a given time period, it allows scholars in the field of Irish studies to employ a vocabulary beyond that of Irish-British 'emigration', with its implicit assumptions of class and economic push factors. Many of the current conceptualisations of transnationalism focus instead on a 'circular' motion (of goods, people or ideas) which prioritises lines of influence that extend beyond regional and national boundaries, and helps to undo the rather stale periphery-metropole binary. If the literary text is by definition a largely transnational phenomenon, then periodicals, with their 'circulation, transmission and reception of ideas' emerge as key forums for the manifestation of transnational thought.⁹⁶ As Niall Carson has observed, Irish journals, 'are often 'worldly' in their outlook, co-created by writers from across the globe, and engaged in debates around art and culture that traverse national boundaries'.⁹⁷ This is no different for their English counterparts, and indeed is heightened in the context of London's relatively internationalised publishing industry of the late nineteenth century. While some of the writers considered here are already thought of in terms of their transnational outlook

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ciaran O'Neill and Enda Delaney, 'Introduction: Beyond the Nation', *Éire-Ireland* 51.1 (Spring 2016), p. 9.

⁹⁶ Whelehan, 'Introduction', p. 2.

⁹⁷ Carson, 'Transnationalism, Ireland and *The Bell*', p. 173.

(Faith Binckes's and Kathryn Laing's treatment of Hannah Lynch is a good example⁹⁸), others demand a re-examination around their contribution to a literary culture both within and without the 'national'; major figures such as George Moore, W.B. Yeats and J.P. Mahaffy are perhaps the most obvious. The thesis is careful not to merely reinstate the overworn binary between Britain and Ireland, but investigates instead the 'flows and connections that cross borders, historical process that 'are constructed in the movement between places, sites and regions'' in their most international sense.⁹⁹

The interaction of Irish writers with different literary and political cultures in the pages of intellectual magazines is a project that is transnational in itself, but some of the most useful and insightful applications occur here in specific analyses. Liminal figures in the Irish literary canon, such as Lynch or Lawless, are often thus marginalised because of their uneasy fit with any clearly definable tradition or national discourse. This can also explain why someone like John Pope Hennessy – perhaps the most striking instance of a transnationally mobile writer featured here – has been critically neglected for so long, as the history of Irish colonial enterprises has yet to be accommodated within either Irish or British historiography.¹⁰⁰ Thus examining writings that traverse boundaries enables us to grasp some of the extent of Irish transnational influences, or in John Wilson Foster's words, the simultaneous 'geographical mobility of the Irish imagination and the social mobility of the Irish'.¹⁰¹ We can use these tools and methods of analysis to explore 'a multiplicity of imagined communities' generated by transnational networks and articulated in the major journals of the period.¹⁰² From about 1888 onwards, for example, George Moore's endeavours to introduce French naturalism to the English reading public saw him utilise the *Fortnightly Review* for experiments in form and criticism, variously speaking both to and from different national standpoints. In doing so Moore was 'invested in the multiple points of identification and belonging' which denoted writing 'that places Irish identity in

⁹⁸ Faith Binckes and Katherine Laing, 'A Vagabond's Scrutiny: Hannah Lynch in Europe' in Elke D'hoker, Ralph Ingelbien and Hedwig Schwall (eds.), *Irish Women Writers: New Critical Perspectives* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2011), pp. 111-132.

⁹⁹ As quoted in Niall Whelehan, 'Playing with Scales: Transnational History and Modern Ireland' in Whelehan (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 8.

¹⁰⁰ This is being rectified, albeit slowly, by the work of Philip Howell, Thomas Herron and David Lambert. See Chapter Three for more details, especially the work by David Lambert and Alan Lester (eds.), *Colonial Lives across the British Empire: Imperial Career in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

¹⁰¹ Foster, *Irish Novels*, p. 11.

¹⁰² Roger Waldinger and David Fitzgerald, 'Transnationalism in Question', *American Journal of Sociology* 109.5 (Mar 2004), p. 1178.

dialogue with other cultural, national or ethnic affiliations'.¹⁰³ These complex negotiations recognise that literary impetus arises from a variety of sources and national traditions.

The confluence of readerships and literary practices that characterised the intellectual periodicals of the day, moreover, engaged Irish writers in discursive forums that necessarily transcended the national. As Tucker and Casey have noted, 'literary texts [in this case periodicals] not only serve as representations of transnational subjects and themes related to cross-border movements, networks and affiliations; they become transnational connectivities themselves'.¹⁰⁴ This is certainly the case with the transatlantic reach of the *Nineteenth Century*: its collected papers in the Westminster Archive in London demonstrate the importance of its American publisher and distributor Leonard Scott, who earned twenty one pounds per 1,000 copies sold in the US.¹⁰⁵ *The New Review*, also, deliberately courted an international field of contributors to endow a sense of cosmopolitan 'newness' to its output, with even Yeats's Celticism just one exotic strand in a 'pre-established current within the 'neo-romantic' mood pervading London'.¹⁰⁶ Of course, the afterlife of texts is always to some extent transnational, but the structural arrangements to cater to an audience beyond either Britain or Ireland both embody and portray the transnational experience of these journals, mirroring that of their elite, socially and geographically mobile writers.

There are further elements of transnationalism that found expression within the Irish contributions to these periodicals. The non-national aspects of nationalism, in particular, have been recently highlighted in an insightful and provocative reading by Tucker and Casey, who trace how Irish nationalism was formed alongside commitments to other nationalist or imperialist causes like the Boer War.¹⁰⁷ Alice Stopford Green's engagement with this conflict was not only a gesture towards the international scope of her political thought, but a nascent articulation of how sympathy with the South African Boers would come to shape anti-British feeling in the years after 1900. This in turn has important implications for a reassessment of Irish political and constitutional discourse during the 1880s and 1890s, its global circulation and its place in these journals alongside an abundance of material from across the empire and commonwealth. It also opens up lines of enquiry that reaffirm the centrality of previously peripheral figures such as E.L. Godkin,

¹⁰³ Amanda Tucker and Moira E. Casey (eds.), 'Introduction' to *Where Motley is Worn: Transnational Irish Literatures* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2014), p. 2.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁰⁵ Papers of James Knowles, City of Westminster Archives, MS 716/127.

¹⁰⁶ Alexander Bubb, *Meeting Without Knowing It: Kipling and Yeats at the Fin de Siècle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 118.

¹⁰⁷ Tucker and Casey, 'Introduction', p. 9.

whose interconnectivity with Irish, American and British traditions of Liberal politics highlights how ‘the ability of Irish historical figures ... to assume multiple national affiliations hinges on imaginative reach’.¹⁰⁸ His writings in the *Nineteenth Century* are perhaps the most overtly transnational political discussions examined here, and remind us that to ignore the transatlantic dimensions of Irish constitutional history would be to miss a vital feature of its far-reaching resonance in the late nineteenth century.

There are, however, limitations to a transnational framework of cultural history, and it is a term used throughout this thesis with a certain degree of caution. Problems of definition have plagued the theory from its inception, with various theorists keen to assert its distinctiveness from global, international and comparative frames of reference.¹⁰⁹ Part of the issue lies in its slipperiness, as well as its application in different disciplinary contexts – sociologists, for example, have productively used transnationalism to study multinational structures or global networks, whereas literary scholars tend to point up the eclecticism and disruptive potential it holds for traditional narratives of cultural production. This thesis largely adopts the latter approach, emphasising its looseness while asserting that transnational theory provides a practical vocabulary for a reinterpretation of Irish writing abroad. Furthermore, it is distinguished from the rather vague term ‘cosmopolitanism’ by a sustained focus on biographical and historical context. While many of the writings here could also be described as cosmopolitan – Sarah Grand’s *New Woman* fiction and J.P. Mahaffy’s cultivated appreciation of classical cultures come to mind – this study concentrates instead on the currents of intellectual exchange between Irish and British (and indeed European and North American) literary practices. Ultimately aiming to illustrate the various complex identity negotiations in which the authors were engaged through their publishing choices, this perspective situates them within the traffic of cultural representation and national(ist) self-fashioning that underpinned the anxieties and aesthetics of late Victorian London.

Thesis Outline

The body of this thesis comprises five chapters, each focusing on a particular periodical or writer. The first chapter focuses on the often-overlooked journal *The New Review*, in publication from only 1889 to 1896, and subjects it to a more comprehensive analysis than that which it has received from scholars thus far. Contrary to the *Athenaeum*’s verdict that

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁰⁹ See O’Neill and Delaney, ‘Introduction: Beyond the Nation’, pp. 7-9, and Patricia Clavin, ‘Introduction: Defining Transnationalism’, *Contemporary European History* 14.4 (Nov 2005), pp. 433-439.

The New Review represented an experiment ‘commercial rather than literary’, it in fact reflected a literary calibre unafraid to face the cultural and political upheavals of the decade.¹¹⁰ This chapter, indeed, argues that the ideological development of the Gaelic Revival had its roots in the London publishing scene, something that can be traced throughout the contributions of W.B. Yeats and Standish O’Grady in *The New Review*. Helping to collapse the distance between the traditional distinctions of art and polemic, politics and fiction, O’Grady showed that they often existed in a symbiotic relationship in the periodical press. Yeats’s folklore and O’Grady’s tales of Gaelic Ireland exemplify the various efforts of turn-of-the-century Irish writers to legitimise a cultural legacy for Irish fiction – something that can also be seen in the lively selection of Irish non-fiction writing that the journal featured from its inception. This chapter, then, considers the wide array of Irish authors, journalists, politicians and critics that carved out a position for themselves within its pages. It contextualises Sarah Grand’s New Woman stories in relation to a burgeoning feminist movement, and T.P. O’Connor’s self-reflexive commentary on the periodical press in relation to the increasing challenges from the New Journalism. Meanwhile, new censorship, new drama and the new art criticism all come under the scrutiny of two of Ireland’s most influential literary expatriates, George Bernard Shaw and George Moore, who helped to define and shape many of the ‘new’ forms that they discuss in their articles. Reflecting the impulses towards continuous relevance in a crowded press market, *The New Review* represented the embryonic potential of Irish literary production in a formative era of nascent artistic, cultural and intellectual movements.

The historian William Hartpole Lecky is the focus of the second chapter. Although his reputation today tends to place him firmly within the ranks of highbrow intellectual historians, Lecky was very much involved in the business of press publicity. In recalibrating attention towards this aspect of his work then, we can begin to chart the symbiotic relationship that existed between author and publication process in the late nineteenth century. For Lecky, as indeed for many other leading intellectuals at the time, the periodical press was where his political ideas were formulated and where they found their most memorable expression. His contributions – comprising not only politics but history, ethics and contemporary liberal ideology – mark him out as a kind of ‘intellectual hermaphrodite’, the polymath who, by the late nineteenth century, still wielded a considerable influence on public opinion.¹¹¹ Furthermore, he complicated the accepted

¹¹⁰ *Athenaeum*, June 8 1889, p. 728.

¹¹¹ Donal McCartney, *W. E. H. Lecky: Historian and Politician, 1838-1903* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1994), p. 193.

narrative of exclusive disciplinisation at the end of the nineteenth century. An academically trained and rigorous historian, yet unaffiliated and diverse in breadth of interests, Lecky remained a singularly influential man of letters in an era associated with the rise of the specialist. The writing and (re)interpretation of the Irish past had serious intellectual currency during the latter years of the century, as can be clearly seen in his fractious interactions with Froude in *Macmillan's Magazine* and with William Gladstone in the *Nineteenth Century*. Indeed, Lecky was not only concerned with representations of Irish history in the press, but with the forms which all kinds of political thought should take. The articles considered here display an engagement with context and yet are rooted in history; they capture the contemporary mood by reflecting on both the past and future of the imperial British state and Ireland's place within it. Ultimately, they place Lecky within the currents of intellectual self-fashioning and heterogeneity that increasingly came to define the late Victorian periodical journalist.

These were tenets, moreover, that remained fundamental for the subject of the next chapter. During these years it was James Knowles's *Nineteenth Century* that arguably did the most to further the repudiation of anonymity and pursue liberal discourse in its widest and most sophisticated sense. Knowles's experience as an editor meant that the *Nineteenth Century* commanded an impressive reputation from its outset, making it an attractive publishing venture for Irish writers, journalists, politicians and bureaucrats seeking to establish themselves within the literary and intellectual culture of the time. This chapter considers, then, the interconnectedness of Irish writing with broader currents of thought the public sphere, where the *Nineteenth Century's* structured diversity of debate offered the chance to display an intellectual rigour on a platform commensurate with that of Westminster. The writers featured here were *transnational*, therefore, in both their movements and subject matter. Edwin Lawrence Godkin, the Wicklow-born editor of New York's the *Nation* newspaper, wrote for the *Nineteenth Century* on the American view of the Irish question as shaped by his sympathy for British liberalism, while John Pope Hennessy contributed articles from his colonial postings around the globe. This type of outward-looking perspective was embodied in the writings of two other Irish writers, Alice Stopford Green and Charlotte Grace O'Brien, during the 1880s and 1890s. As women writers engaging in internationally-focused highbrow journalism they were tangential to the traditional orientation of Irish national narratives, yet their place within one of Britain's most influential monthly journals enabled them to articulate a vision of social justice that went to the heart of contemporary political foreign policy. Furthermore, they testify to the

kind of public appetite that welcomed both specialist and general interest material, a tendency that also favoured the Irish professor and man of letters John Pentland Mahaffy. Mahaffy's impassioned interventions in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* spoke to his broader interests in the cosmopolitan cultures of Europe and the classical world. His contributions – the most prolific of any Irish writer in these years – encapsulate some of the breadth of the material that came within the purview of the Irish 'man of letters' in the periodical press. Establishing himself as an authority on archaeology and classical civilisation, the international impulse of these articles underscore the foundational vision of Knowles's journal in reflecting the highest level of journalistic and literary discourse of the day, and furthermore, highlight the neglected interfaces between Ireland and the wider world in the intellectual press.

Emily Lawless was a writer who could be productively read within the purview of such a project. She was an Anglo-Irish author with an ambiguous relation to matters of gender and national identity, and thus an indeterminacy of both place and identity occurs as a major element of Lawless's periodical writings in the form of her historical fiction – most strikingly in questions of historical appropriation and cultural translation. The fourth chapter deals with the formulation and use of voice in her narratives, and how Lawless deliberately moves away from attempts at authoritative representation in recourse to what was perceived as Ireland's Gaelic past. The interaction with colonial and Celtic Revivalist concerns, meanwhile, demonstrates an awareness on Lawless's part of contemporary national discourses, but also works to undermine their ideological significance in historical representations. The natural world and entomology, meanwhile, which form the basis of three of her contributions, analyse notions of imperialism and gender as displaced onto natural environments. The instability and constant flux that mark the flora and fauna of Ireland's west coast mirror the author's complex identification with the region, and with broader aspects of national affiliation. The chapter places Lawless alongside other geographers and nature writers in the *Nineteenth Century*, and explores how the specific publishing context can be brought to bear on her published fictions of Ireland's past and accounts of the natural landscape. Lastly, the textual instability that typifies Lawless's periodical oeuvre is read in context of the queer potential of her *Macmillans' Magazine* stories. These little-known stories speak to the author's ambivalence around normative tropes of sexuality, highlighting the intimacies of male friendship and the liberating possibilities of exotic environments. They paint Lawless as a writer with unexplored

capacities, a shrewd observer of the ambiguities and fissures of contemporary culture and a periodical essayist in vital need of re-evaluation.

The final chapter, on the *Fortnightly Review*, looks at both literary criticism and political commentary from Irish figures within the journal. George Moore, Hannah Lynch and Stephen Gwynn feature as regular reviewers of European and Irish literature, while Standish O'Grady, Horace Plunkett and Justin McCarthy represent an Irish perspective on social and economic matters. This diverse set of writings in many ways reflects the 'open platform' format of the *Review*, where no one writer confined themselves to too narrow a niche. This generality of both style and content was at the core of many of the periodicals' *raison d'être*, as the mission statement of the *Fortnightly Review* reveals. The founders pledged to 'remove all these restrictions of party and editorial 'consistency' ... The consistency will be one of tendency, not of doctrine'.¹¹² In many ways heterogeneity was important on an ideological level for periodicals like the *Fortnightly*, as it functioned as a nexus for those intellectual and social luminaries in London who were committed to a broadly liberal idea of journalistic expression. Many of the Irish writers featured here (George Moore and Hannah Lynch in particular) networked with a trans-European elite and prided themselves on their grasp of Parisian salon culture. Developments in their periodical thought, therefore, are traced throughout the span of their contributions, and the chapter aims to frame its themes with detailed historical reference. In particular, it considers how George Moore, Hannah Lynch and Stephen Gwynn used their writings on literature and the arts to establish their names within the *Fortnightly*. Moore, particularly, was involved in shaping discourses that reverberated beyond the journal's pages: the debates over censorship and the state of modern theatre, but also efforts to bring the French and English literary movements closer together. Meanwhile, politics and journalism became closely entwined for many Irish public figures during these years, and the second section of this chapter examines the manifestations of Irish political and social thought throughout the journal. In the final two decades of the nineteenth century, Horace Plunkett and Standish O'Grady provided two of the most influential voices on matters pertaining to the Irish situation. Engaging with broader aspects of representation as well as with details of policy and legislation, they articulate a vision of social progress based on cross-class cohesion, carving a space for Irish opinion in the political milieu of late Victorian elite society.

¹¹² 'Special Announcement', *Saturday Review*, 25 March 1865, p. 362.

Chapter One

Irish Literary Ventures in London: The Case of *The New Review*

Criticisms of the periodical press in the 1890s – that it was in decline, that the established monthly reviews were no longer catering to a new reading public – were by and large borne out by diminishing sales, readership, and the emerging aesthetic trends of the *fin-de-siècle*. In broad-brush terms, stalwarts such as the *Contemporary Review* and the *Nineteenth Century* were losing ground to bold, genre-defying publications such as Aubrey Beardsley's *Yellow Book* and the flashy, fast-paced journalism of *The Star* and the *Pall Mall Gazette*. It was within the context of this competitive market that *The New Review* emerged onto the press scene in 1889. Feted by the *Athenaeum* as 'a bold attempt to supply for sixpence a magazine similar to the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Nineteenth Century*, in which the articles are written by persons whose names are well known', it was an ambitious publishing venture from the outset.¹ Established and edited by Archibald Grove, the review was published monthly between June 1889 and December 1897, for a total of 103 issues. Despite its highly respectable network of contributors, however, which included at various times Henry James, Olive Schreiner and Cardinal Manning, it remains at best a footnote in literary history. A child of the 1890s yet formally and ideologically more indebted to the reviews of 30 years earlier, *The New Review* fits no neat timeline of Victorian periodical publication. Its aim was to 'place within reach of all a critical periodical of the first order, which ... will yield to none in the eminence of its contributors'.² In ploughing this kind of middle path, encompassing both a popular appeal and highbrow writing, the *Wellesley Index* concludes that it 'fell between two stones' – that of the affordable illustrated magazine and the elite monthly review.³

¹ *Athenaeum*, 8 June 1889, p. 728.

² 'Prospectus', *Saturday Review*, 25 May 1889, p. 652.

³ 'Introduction' to *The New Review*, *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900*

[<http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk/toc/toc.do?id=JID-NEWR&divLevel=1&action=new&queryId=#scroll>
Accessed March 15, 2017]

Indeed, during its lifespan *The New Review* was forced to rebrand itself more consciously to the market. In January 1894 Grove published a 'Special Announcement' that stated:

the review - as distinguished from the magazine, in so far as it discusses actualities, and more seriously and authoritatively the problems of life - has, up to the present, budged only in the slightest degree from the severe position it occupied when periodical literature appealed merely to a very small class of people. It is true that with the easy methods of transmission through the post office, railroads, etc., the old quarterlies have been in a great way replaced by monthly reviews. But they have been, for the most part, too expensive, frequently too "special," and only occasionally sufficiently attractive to appeal to the enormous reading public that has grown up out of a liberal legislation in educational matters ... It is now proposed still further to widen the scope, and in every way to modernise *The New Review*. It will be its aim always to be rather the Review of to-morrow than the Review of yesterday.⁴

Grove was, in a sense, proving here the dangers of calling anything 'new', especially within the context of a rapidly evolving marketplace. Yet the journal merits a more comprehensive analysis than that which it has received from scholars thus far. Contrary to the *Athenaeum's* verdict that *The New Review* represented an experiment 'commercial rather than literary', it in fact reflected and analysed some of the most novel issues and cultural upheavals of the decade.⁵ Ireland, and its contribution to public opinion and the spheres of intellectual and political discourse, was to occupy a central position in this.

The commercial and ideological structure of the periodical in these years, meanwhile, stood a fine line between a commitment to the realist tradition in fiction and advancing the careers of authors who would promote a distinctly modern style within the bounds of acceptable, if not conservative, literary forms.⁶ This careful positioning was continued and built upon under its second editor, William Ernest Henley, who took control from 1895. Henley was a versatile man of letters with an established editorial reputation, and he brought to *The New Review* a keen eye for new fiction – though again, largely

⁴ Archibald Grove, 'Special Announcement', *The New Review* 10 (Jan 1894), p. 127.

⁵ *Athenaeum*, June 8 1889, p. 728.

⁶ Anne Murtagh, 'The New Review: A Glimpse at the Nineties', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 14.1 (Jan 1981), p. 14.

avoiding anything to do with the avant-garde or decadent movements. As the long-standing editor of the *National Observer*, he was also active in literary society. The coterie of artistic luminaries that he cultivated around him, labelled the ‘Henley Regatta’, were united by ‘their shared principles of cultural legitimacy and their admiration for Henley’s strident purism’.⁷ Many of these he took with him to *The New Review*, including George Wyndham, whose connections to the Conservative party helped give the *Review* a slight Tory flavour, reminiscent of Henley’s years at the overtly-Conservative *Observer*.

More significantly for our purposes, Henley was also a proponent of Irish writing. The year 1896 alone saw short fiction appearing from Standish O’Grady, W.B. Yeats and Sarah Grand, affirming Yeats’s description of the editor as ‘a Vulcan ... perpetually forging swords for other men to use’.⁸ As a young writer on the London publishing circuit, Yeats was indebted to Henley for the opportunity to appear (quite frequently) within the pages of the *Observer*, with material which he was later to develop in *The New Review*. Alexander Bubb has suggested that Henley had an ‘appetite for Irish glamour’, especially in the guise of Celtic mythology.⁹ In many ways, too, the ideological development of the Gaelic Revival had its roots in the London publishing scene, something that can be traced throughout the contributions of Yeats and Standish O’Grady in *The New Review*.¹⁰ But to focus exclusively on this would be to miss the lively selection of Irish writing that the journal also featured from its inception in 1889. This chapter, then, considers the wide array of Irish authors, journalists, politicians and critics who carved out a position for themselves within its pages. Covering almost every major debate of the day, Irish voices lent themselves to matters from Irish politics to *fin-de-siècle* aestheticism, from the New Woman to colonial questions, while including a large degree of self-reflexive commentary on the periodical press itself.

The Irish writers featured within its pages were not only at the cutting edge of movements from New Criticism to the New Woman, they were also directly involved in discussions over broader practices in journalism at the time. T.P. O’Connor’s 1889 article on the New Journalism was an important early definition of the phenomenon, and remained emblematic of how new practices, cultures and publishing formats had found their way into

⁷ Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 33.

⁸ W.B. Yeats, *Autobiographies*, ed. William H. O’Donnell and Douglas N. Archibald (New York: Scribner, 1999), p. 123.

⁹ Alexander Bubb, *Meeting without Knowing it: Kipling and Yeats at the Fin de Siècle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 145.

¹⁰ See R.F. Foster, *W. B. Yeats: A Life. Vol. 1, The Apprentice Mage: 1865–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) for a detailed description of the young poet’s social and artistic influences in London.

‘high’ journalism by the latter years of the decade. This sea change in journalistic culture also had echoes in Tighe Hopkin’s two-piece series on ‘Anonymity’ in the same year. Indeed, of all the Irish contributions, ‘Anonymity’ stands as perhaps the most crucial example of what it meant to write for the late-nineteenth century press industry in general, and in particular *The New Review*. It was a flagship colloquium for the newly-founded journal that in format mirrored the prestigious *Nineteenth Century* symposia and in content brought in voices from across the newspaper, magazine and periodical press. In various ways it was representative of Irish writers’ relation to the journalistic profession, as a means of asserting their voice within an authoritative and influential discourse. It also gave weight to Irish voices within the cultural arena at a time when one critic has noted ‘the increasing self-consciousness of literature and journalism’ as leading to ‘their simultaneous development as professions ... pushing towards divergence and distinction’.¹¹ Against this, however, we can see the growing policy of signature as giving litterateurs like George Moore and W.B. Yeats a degree of fame they would arguably have found harder to achieve otherwise. As Kelly Mays has argued, in relation to the self-consciousness of periodicals about the ‘task of producing readers’:

while the arguments that underwrote the new orthodoxy were multiple, the overarching ideological rationale and effect was to transfer authority from the corporate text to the individual contributor and thus to understand authority as properly the outgrowth of individual personality and competence, or – as George Lewes put it – individual “sensibility and culture”.¹²

The New Review, in this way, epitomised the late nineteenth-century break with anonymity while at the same time asserting the power of new forms of journalism. For Irish writers, this heterogeneity of content and discourse made it a particularly appealing platform.

There were many discernible links and underlying approaches common to the *Review*’s Irish contributions. Most of the writers discussed here explore a nascent sense of opportunity in their pieces, whether it was the possibility of passing a Home Rule bill for Ireland or a renewed idea of gender relations. Indeed, the various authors’ struggles with

¹¹ Laurel Brake, ‘Culture Wars? Arnold’s *Essays in Criticism* and the Rise of Journalism 1865-1895’ in Dinah Birch and Mark Llewellyn (eds.), *Conflict and Difference in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 202.

¹² Kelly J. Mays, ‘The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, in John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (eds.), *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 168.

the idea of the ‘new’ is integral to their articles. For a political era, especially, that was seen by many as stagnant in the wake of the fall of Parnell, pieces such as ‘The New Irish Movement’ and ‘The New Departure in Ireland’ seemed to offer a way forward for the country and its political representatives. Culturally, too, pieces by Moore, O’Connor and George Bernard Shaw reflected the mood of the 1890s – and indeed the thrust of the review – in their discussions of the New Censorship, New Theatre, New Journalism and New Realism. There were not always wholly positive connotations to the new, however: the Irish writer Grand may have been a firm champion and embodiment of the New Woman, but the presence of Shaw in the same journal would have reminded readers of broader attacks against such feminist rhetoric in the press.¹³

Fiction and non-fiction form two quite separate yet overlapping considerations in this analysis. Each of the authors examined here represent significant literary and cultural trends of the 1890s that enable us to read their contributions within a richer context of the time and, indeed, place. The stories of Yeats and Standish O’Grady can most easily be aligned with orthodox conceptions of ‘Irish writing’, given their engagement with Celtic Revival tropes and forms of cultural nationalism. Their legends of Irish history (on the part of O’Grady) and folk tales of the supernatural (on the part of Yeats) were in different ways tapping into a mythologising discourse of the late nineteenth century, and represent attempts to ‘create a unifying myth for “a deeply divided country”’.¹⁴ Moreover, Yeats’s folklore and O’Grady’s tales of Gaelic Ireland also exemplify the various efforts of turn-of-the-century Irish writers to legitimise a cultural legacy for Irish fiction – though this cannot be isolated from their periodical publishing content, as the following chapter shows. In striking a claim for a new form of Irish representation in London journals, the Ulster-born writer Sarah Grand adopted a different approach to Yeats and O’Grady. Gender, rather than national identity, is to the fore in her New Woman stories, and is reflective of her involvement in a cosmopolitan literary culture that saw her become one of the most esteemed feminist authors of her day. In *The New Review* her writing is a forceful voice for female agency in artistic endeavour, highlighting a sense of untapped potential that straddles the divide between personal and political. Throughout their fiction, then, each

¹³ One critic has remarked how the New Woman created an ‘intellectual panic’ for Shaw and others, who viewed her as a dangerous threat to men’s autonomy. Shaw himself once said of Sarah Grand that “for my part, I am a man; and Madame Grand’s solution [moral purity of the man as well as the woman] fills me with dismay”. As quoted in Kerry Powell, ‘New Women, New Plays, and Shaw in the 1890s’, in Christopher Innes (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 76, 95.

¹⁴ R.F. Foster, *Paddy and Mr Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* (London: Allen Lane, 1993), p. 143

author is articulating a version of the ‘new’ that they saw as essential to cultural life in the 1890s. Even if Yeats & O’Grady rooted their ‘new’ Ireland in a reimagining of old stories while Sarah Grand looked to the future for her ‘new’ system of gender relations, they were each anchored by a wish to shape the present, to forge a ‘new’ now.

This pursuit of novelty was a concept that chimed with many of the non-fiction articles in the same review. George Moore, George Bernard Shaw, T.P. O’Connor and Standish O’Grady contributed a number of articles that addressed contemporary issues in theatre, journalism, art and politics. Taken together, the pieces chart the reactions of an elite cohort of cultural commentators to developments that threatened their established status in intellectual life. As suggested above, this again comes in the form of the ‘new’ – O’Connor’s exposition of New Journalism, for instance, is essentially a blueprint for a radically novel form of press discourse, and one echoed in Tighe Hopkins’s piece on ‘Anonymity’, where some of the many authoritative figures consulted include the Irish writers Moore, Shaw and O’Connor. In their own contributions, Moore and Shaw shift their focus from the workings of the press towards debates surrounding the London stage and wider cultural arena. Censorship, drama and the new art criticism all come under the scrutiny of two of Ireland’s most influential literary expatriates, who, indeed, helped to define and shape many of the ‘new’ forms that they discuss in their articles. In this way *The New Review* bears witness to the import and impact of Irish litterateurs on the cultural developments of the 1890s.

But they were also visible on the political front. Many of the same authors used the review as a vehicle for asserting the Irish presence on the British political scene, approaching the issues from a variety of angles. The MP Justin McCarthy features as a mouthpiece for the Home Rule movement, while Shaw turns to politics to delineate ‘The Socialist Ideal’. O’Grady also recurs in a political guise, articulating a vision for the new Irish co-operative movement based on an ideology of aristocratic leadership – the same ideology that informed his fictional works in the periodical. He is, therefore, illustrative of the heterodoxy that characterised much of the Irish writing within *The New Review*. Helping to collapse the distance between the traditional distinctions of art and polemic, politics and fiction, O’Grady shows that they often existed in a symbiotic relationship in the periodical press. Similarly, Grand, Yeats, Shaw and others did not adhere to the often pejorative definition of ‘journalist’, but sought to elevate all their periodical contributions to the status of literature, in the most influential sense.¹⁵ In this way, the Irish contributions

¹⁵ Brake, ‘Culture Wars?’, p. 203.

to Grove and Henley's new review (and *New Review*), in all their diversity of outlook and format, showcase some of the numerous means in which visions and versions of the 'new' were debuted, debated and denounced in the late-nineteenth century periodical press.

The Old and the New: Fiction in *The New Review*

In various ways, Standish O'Grady's fiction published in the journal represents an important juncture in the development of his – and indeed broader Irish cultural – ideas surrounding the place of history, myth and legend. Critics have long recognised how myth was central to Irish intellectual discourse throughout the nineteenth century, particularly in the pages of the *Dublin Review* and *Dublin University Magazine* during the mid-century.¹⁶ O'Grady, however, was arguably the first in a new generation of litterateurs to imaginatively (re)construct Irish myth and history in the form of a new national saga. His 1878 and 1880 *Histories of Ireland* – subtitled 'The Heroic Period' and 'Cuchulain and his Contemporaries' – were important vehicles for legitimising his vision of a renewed appreciation of the bardic culture of ancient Ireland. In his 1897 article for *The New Review* he expanded on this, asserting the centrality of imagination to the historian as a 'prophet' and 'bard'.¹⁷ Responding to Carlyle's writings, the author frames this approach as a rigorous intellectual pursuit, proclaiming 'it is very easy to write history with rhetorical embellishments; it is an arduous and hazardous task to dramatise it, or in any way hale it within the dominion of art'.¹⁸ In R.F. Foster's view, O'Grady's theory of history was itself a type of fiction – 'the imaginative and psychological record of a nation, its wished-for history made magically coherent'.¹⁹

But this blueprint of his literary ideology can help us understand some of the motivations behind his periodical stories. In the years 1896 and '97, alongside the non-fiction article, O'Grady published the three-part series 'In the Gates of the North'. These tales of ancient Ireland recount the feats of Queen Maeve in her attempts to take back the North from the Ulster men of the Red Branch. They also incorporate aspects of the Cuchulain myth, which O'Grady had been instrumental in popularising throughout the

¹⁶ Edward A. Hagan, 'The Aryan Myth: A Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Irish Will to Power' in Tadhg Foley and Seán Ryder (eds.), *Ideology and Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998), p. 197.

¹⁷ Standish O'Grady, 'Imagination in History', *The New Review* 17 (Dec 1897), p. 658.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 660.

¹⁹ R.F. Foster, *The Irish Story: Telling Tales and Making it up in Ireland* (London: Allen Lane, 2001), p. 11.

1880s and 90s.²⁰ The stories here are lengthy, replete with Gaelic titles and place names, and related in a highly-wrought hiberno-Elizabethan speech. O’Grady’s repetition of – indeed almost ritualistic acts of – naming are significant in drawing out a clear sense of worship of nobility and heroism. We can see this in the figure of Cuchulain, but also in his chosen adversary Fardia:

That night it was resolved by Queen Meave that Fardia of the Firbolgs should go out against Cuculain. Those who knew Fardia, the son of Daman, marvelled with one another how the Queen would fare in that undertaking, for he was a dear friend of Cuculain. Now, Fardia was not of the blood of the Milesius, nor was his race equal in rank with that which now ruled over Erin ... Then Fardia felt sick at heart, and ... he said “Not if the saba of the kings should give to me the whole of the level plains of Ai, which is the public land of the Olnemacta; not if to this were added all the treasures laid up in the two Moy Turas, both of the Fomorians, ... or all that are contained in Tlatga, Usna, and Tailteen, nor all that the sacred precincts of Tara hold within its borders at the Feis Tara.”²¹

The defamiliarising effect that this would have had on an English readership is striking, and, we can assume, O’Grady’s intended result. It acts as both a reminder of the linguistic richness of Gaelic heritage and an assertion of his claims that history, properly written, belongs to the sphere of the artistic and aesthetic.

As many of his later critics have attested, however, the militaristic basis of feudal society was also a vitally important touchstone for O’Grady, not only in his fiction but throughout the spectrum of his political convictions. Aligned with this, the influence of the early nineteenth-century social criticism of Ruskin and Carlyle can be traced from his time as a student at Trinity College. As Patrick Maume has noted, in his writings O’Grady repeatedly evinces an ‘inclination to see society on a military model, with Elizabethan warrior-adventurers as Carlylean heroes.’²² The growing capitalist and commercial interests in Ireland that, for O’Grady (and others such as Horace Plunkett) threatened to efface a

²⁰ O’Grady’s letters bear witness to his continued (and almost obsessive) interest in publication of ‘The Coming of Cuchulain’ during 1893, at times lauding its ‘very curious heroic incidents’, and at other times justifying it as ‘probably too unique, too much out of the ordinary’. Letter to Unknown, 9 March 1893, Standish O’Grady Collection, Trinity College Library, TCD MS 3548/2.

²¹ Standish O’Grady, ‘In the Gates of the North (Part II): At the Ford’, *The New Review* (Feb 1896), p. 205.

²² Patrick Maume, ‘Standish James O’Grady: Between Imperial Romance and Irish Revival’, *Éire-Ireland* 39.1 (Spring 2004), p. 14.

noble Celtic heritage are embodied in the character of Caelshanig, the Crithneean in the third part of the series. He is a newly wealthy and materialistic landowner who refuses to grant hospitality and entertainment to the hero Laeg, and in doing so represents a corruption of the bardic and heroic virtues that form the moral basis of O'Grady's imagined system. The figure of Cucualain, on the other hand, embodies martial leadership at a time when the men of Ulster in the Táin are affected by a fatal (and fateful) paralysis. This 'Great Enchantment' recurs as a leitmotif in O'Grady's Gaelic stories and has been read as the writer's criticism of what he sees as the paralysis emanating from Westminster, and indeed from the Irish aristocracy. The social order of Queen Meave's Ireland, then, acts as a 'symbolic rebuke ... to the sectarian and democratic doctrines of a growing Irish political nationalism'.²³

Even while O'Grady was using these tales to develop his heroic Gaelic world, the mid-late 1890s was a time when Michael McAteer has located 'a vacillation between O'Grady's affirmation of the centrality of the imagination in comprehending history, and his anxiety over the empirical historical validity of his work'.²⁴ In other words, his concern for history in his literary work was being surpassed by his concern for fictional narrative. The stories here are certainly concerned with a kind of historical veracity. Elements of *dinnseanchas* appear in the carefully detailed descriptions of place names, and there is an accurate grasp of the legalities of land ownership in Gaelic Ireland. Compared to his earlier published work on history (such as articles in the *Dublin University Magazine* in the 1870s), however, these tales incline more towards the tastes of a new reading public. In their imaginative renderings and highly stylised acts of heroism, they echo a realisation apparently informed by an incident in the University Club in Dublin. According to his 'Imagination in History' article in *The New Review*, upon discovering that the pages of George Petrie's innovative study of round towers had remained uncut, O'Grady concluded that only romantic fiction now appealed to the public.²⁵ In the future, therefore, he determined that all his versions of Irish heroes had to appear in the guise of novels – or, in this case, easily digestible short stories. Whether or not this is accurate, we can certainly see an emerging belief in the centrality of imagination to his historical writing. According to Roy Foster, the lifelong ambition of O'Grady was 'to restore to the Irish their mythological

²³ Jerry C.M. Nolan, 'Standish James O'Grady's Cultural Nationalism', *Irish Studies Review* 7.3 (Dec 1999), p. 350.

²⁴ Michael McAteer, *Standish O'Grady, AE and Yeats: History, Politics, Culture* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2002), p. 74.

²⁵ O'Grady, 'Imagination in History', p. 663.

pedigree’.²⁶ While this may hold true for his larger published work, it is somewhat disingenuous when applied to his short stories. In this case, and indeed for much of his career, his attempt at rewriting myth was mediated through the pages of an English periodical. It therefore becomes a complex, nuanced, and far more fluid enterprise than is perhaps commonly recognised.

Of course, like so many marginal figures of the Gaelic Revival, O’Grady’s legacy has also been refracted through the magisterial pronouncements of W.B. Yeats; or, in Jerry Nolan’s words, ‘shrouded in Yeatsian rhetoric’.²⁷ Despite an early influence on the young Irish poet, Yeats famously described O’Grady’s fiction as nothing more than ‘high nonsensical words’.²⁸ But their ideological and material proximity in this journal suggest a common readership and some closely aligned concerns. Both writers possessed firm ideas about the cultural validity and proper use of Gaelic scholarship, for instance, despite neither having extensive knowledge of the Irish language. In the same way that O’Grady’s dependence on existing translations of middle-Irish texts didn’t affect his claims to authorship, Yeats’s interest in folk and oral traditions silently co-opted the work of earlier transcribers such as Lady Wilde and Thomas Crofton Croker.²⁹ The stories published by Yeats in *The New Review* are themselves the first iterations of pieces that were to be later revised for collections. O’Sullivan the Red, from the 1896 contributions, was to become Eoin Hanrahan in his 1897 collection *The Secret Rose*, and eventually developed into the *Stories of Red Hanrahan* published in 1904. This figure of the bard, or Celtic visionary, under the process of constant revision, was an important one for Yeats. In his writings on reclaiming this tradition of Gaelic literature he highlights the ‘imaginative possession’ so integral to the work of the author, and claimed later that ‘I myself created Hanrahan’.³⁰ This of course was blatantly untrue – his earliest version of Hanrahan was a close rendering of the eighteenth-century bard Eoghan Rua O’Suilleabhain. But like O’Grady’s construction of his mythic heroes, the historical rootedness of the Gael becomes less important for Yeats as the 1890s proceeded and Ireland became a place of almost unlimited imaginative inspiration.

²⁶ Foster, *The Irish Story*, p. 12.

²⁷ Nolan, ‘Standish James O’Grady’s Cultural Nationalism’, p. 349.

²⁸ W.B. Yeats, ‘Beautiful Lofty Things’ in *The Collected Poems of W.B. Yeats* (London: Macmillan, 1965), p. 348.

²⁹ Sinéad Garrigan Mattar, ‘Folklore’, in David Holdeman and Ben Levitas (eds.), *W.B. Yeats in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 249.

³⁰ W.B. Yeats, ‘The Tower’, as quoted in Edward Hirsch, “‘And I Myself Created Hanrahan’: Yeats, Folklore and Fiction”, *ELH* 48.4 (Jan 1981), p. 883.

What Yeats's contributions here demonstrate most strongly, however, is the creative impetus that Irish folklore granted the young writer in looking to a British readership. Fairies, ghosts, magic and oral superstition underpin these tales, as indeed they did to a lesser extent the stories of Standish O'Grady. During their years of composition Yeats was an ardent believer in and commentator on Irish folklore, and was intent on reawakening its ancient forms (this was the time, as one critic has put it, before his 'prophetic zeal was translated into a disappointed esotericism').³¹ Folklore's generative energy found expression in his two main fictional collections of the 1890s: *The Celtic Twilight*, published in 1893, and *The Secret Rose* of 1897. These stories fall between the two collections, and illustrate some of the formal developments in his prose style. 'Wisdom' and the two stories of 'O'Sullivan the Red' are written in the mode of folk tales, and create the illusion of belonging to a larger narrative:

O'Sullivan, after wandering from place to place, sleeping, now in a barn, now under a hayrick, set out to cross Copes Mountain, with the thought of pushing on into North Leitrim, where, perhaps, his love songs might be known and his satires unknown, and the little square harp that hung from his shoulders a new delight.³²

This opening passage of 'The Vision of O'Sullivan the Red' seems almost to establish itself as a new chapter of an already continuing saga. Indeed for Yeats its natural, unstudied tone was at the core of folkloric story-telling, where the tales themselves needed little embellishment or explanation. In this case, their further revision and republication over many years of Yeats's career highlight their role as 'a continually revivifying source' for the poet, but also for the tradition of folklore itself: O'Sullivan may die at the close of these stories, but as a character he represents a presence outside and above such material renderings.³³

'The Tribes of the Danu', on the other hand, is a longer article and based on extensive material collected by Lady Gregory around Co Galway about the fairy tribes of the area. It deploys the techniques and practices of a 'scientific' mode of folklore, including narratives of personal experience by the local peasantry, and with an emphasis on place and circumstance. Long descriptive passages give the story a strikingly different style to the

³¹ Garrigan Mattar, 'Folklore', p. 248.

³² W.B. Yeats, 'The Vision of O'Sullivan the Red', *The New Review* 14 (April 1896), p. 404.

³³ Sineád Garrigan Mattar, 'Yeats, Fairies, and the New Animism', *New Literary History* 43.1 (Winter 2012), p. 144.

O'Sullivan tales. A typical passage opens with: 'there was an old Martin Roland, who lived near a bog a little out of Gort, who saw [the fairies] often from his young days, and always towards the end of his life'.³⁴ Gesturing towards a more lifelike vein of storytelling, the piece could be read as Yeats's attempt at embedding folklore within a more modern context. In fact what it represents most clearly is the patronage – both creative and material – given to Yeats by Lady Gregory. During his stay at Coole Park in 1897 she supposedly handed him 200,000 words of typescripts to use as he wished in his periodical publishing ventures. We can see here the beginnings of the construction of the imaginative authority of the poet – despite the article being subject to what James Pethica has called the 'dual burden of debt' to Lady Gregory (she was supporting Yeats financially at this time), he was to remain the principal author and authority on Irish fairy lore.³⁵

But 'The Tribes of the Danu', despite being a significant boost to his reputation as a folk collector, also reveals much about the publishing strategies of Yeats, and the importance of periodical literature at the time. The story was conceived as the first in a series of six major articles on aspects of the Irish supernatural experience, which were published across the *Nineteenth Century*, the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Contemporary Review* over the next five years. They marked the beginning of the collaborative partnership between Yeats and Lady Gregory, and the funds they provided were (ironically enough) intended to allow Yeats to 'give up journalism'.³⁶ In addition to providing the textual substance of the articles, however, Lady Gregory acted as a kind of publication agent for Yeats. According to her diaries, *The New Review* had in fact been engaged to take the entire series, but following its closure in December 1897 she arranged for the 'Prisoner of the Gods' to be printed in the *Nineteenth Century*. Lady Gregory was satisfied, she writes, at having introduced Yeats 'to another circle', and records how 'he is pleased, and has been told there is no use in approaching the *Nineteenth Century* unless you have a title yourself or are introduced by someone with a title'.³⁷ Gregory was thus implicated in the formation, writing, and publication of the article, or as Sinead Garrigan Mattar has put it, 'willingly sacrificed the material she collected on the altar of Yeats's genius'.³⁸

³⁴ W.B. Yeats, 'The Tribes of the Danu', *The New Review* 17 (Nov 1897), p. 556.

³⁵ James Pethica, 'Patronage and Creative Exchange: Yeats, Lady Gregory and the Economy of Indebtedness', in Deirdre Toomey (ed.), *Yeats and Women: Yeats Annual* 9 (London: Macmillan, 1997), p. 170.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

³⁷ As quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 70.

³⁸ Garrigan Mattar, 'Folklore', p. 252. Pethica also includes an illuminating insight into the financial rewards (or otherwise) of periodical publication, in quoting a conversation Lady Gregory had with John Quinn in 1913: '[She] told me that the article in the *Nineteenth Century* on Folk-Lore under Yeats's name, was written by her. Yeats was dreadfully hard-up, practically penniless, and so she let him take her collected folk-lore

Moreover, to illustrate the importance of access to literary networks at the time, the publication of this article is illuminating. It places Yeats very much back in his context as a London writer of the mid-1890s – his early interest in folklore was of course fostered and produced in the expatriate community of Bedford Park. It also underlines the urban genesis of early Irish Revivalist literature. Similar to O’Grady, Yeats’s fashioning of a Celtic mythological tradition within the pages of London’s society journals moves to complicate the prescribed spatial parameters of the literary revival. The provenance of these articles and stories are important, because as Adrian Paterson asserts, ‘the material conditions of a text’s production, are themselves profoundly affected by precise geography’.³⁹ While this holds true for many writers in the transitional years of the late nineteenth century, it is heightened in the case of Yeats and the carefully constructed divisions in his prose writings. The dichotomies of ‘ancient’ and ‘modern’ that underpin his folk tales are, as various studies of the Revival have shown, locations in space as much as time. In stories such as ‘The Tribes of the Danu’, Yeats, in the words of one critic, ‘images himself out in the field’.⁴⁰ In doing so he effaces the English metropolis as successfully as he does the attributed collaboration of Lady Gregory. But London – and indeed *The New Review* – is, as Garrigan Mattar has established, ‘the field for Yeats’s collections as much as Ireland’.⁴¹

We can also see this as calling into question the notion of a ‘residency requirement’ in Irish literature of the 1890s. As mentioned above, John Wilson Foster’s diagnosis of the ‘ambitious provincial’ writer was one who looked to London for cultural advancement, effectively sealing their fate by violating the tacit requirement of the Revival project to reside in Ireland.⁴² Foster may have been ignoring Yeats’s negotiations with a certain type of Irish identity in London at the time, but this quote holds true for another Irish writer who found success within *The New Review*. Sarah Grand represents the other end of the spectrum from Yeats’s carefully constructed vision of Ireland and Irish literature. Indeed she is only infrequently described as an Irish writer, and suffers from that canonical neglect so often afforded to women writers – Foster’s ‘ambitious provincials’ – who defied easy categorisation. Grand is mostly included, if at all, in the bracket of English New Woman

things and put them into shape. He sold it to the *Nineteenth Century* for fifteen pounds. This explains why Yeats has never republished that article under his own name ...’, p. 71.

³⁹ Adrian Paterson, ‘On the Pavements Grey’: The Suburban Paradises of W.B. Yeats and William Morris’, in Tom Herron (ed.), *Irish Writing London Volume I: Revival to the Second World War* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), p. 34.

⁴⁰ Garrigan Matter, ‘Folklore’, p. 251.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² John Wilson Foster, *Irish Novels 1890-1940: New Bearings in Culture and Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 35.

writers of the late Victorian era, and published almost exclusively in Britain. Yet Frances Bellenden Clarke, to give her her full name – she adopted the pseudonym after her marriage broke down – was born in County Down, and her childhood in the Irish countryside provided imaginative material for her later novels such as the 1897 *The Beth Book*. As an author she reflects the tradition of the transnational Irish woman, an upwardly-mobile, aspirational middle class figure who looked to the London periodical press for opportunities for career advancement. Like others such as Emily Lawless, Hannah Lynch and Frances Power Cobbe, her ambiguous (and often unacknowledged) relation to Ireland has largely meant literary effacement. But recent works from JW Foster and Tina O'Toole have sought to restore her into a broader conception of Irish writing before the turn of the century. O'Toole places her within a 'rhetorical construction of expanded horizons for women' at the end of the nineteenth century, her 'implicitly contradictory self-positioning' making her an ideal candidate for critical re-evaluation in light of the feminist, imperialist and, occasionally, nationalist impulses within her writing.⁴³

In *The New Review* issues of September and October 1894, Grand published a two-part series entitled 'The Undefinable', which was heavily informed by the New Woman sentiment of the decade. It was later republished in her 1908 short story collection *Emotional Moments*, and remains one of her most-anthologised tales. Grand herself is acknowledged as one of the most prominent New Woman writers, and indeed is credited with having invented the term in an interview some months previous to these publications.⁴⁴ In 1894 she was at the height of her literary fame as a pioneer for the reform of relations between men and women,⁴⁵ and was involved in many of the lively debates of the day – including membership of the Rational Dress Society, founded 'to warn women of the dangers of tight lacing and other constrictive clothing'.⁴⁶ *The New Review* story revolves around the figure of a male artist who is visited by a young woman insistent on transforming his attitude towards painting. In the vein of the new feminist movement, it seeks to challenge the aesthetic criteria imposed by a masculine artistic establishment.⁴⁷ The unnamed woman presents herself as both muse and instructor:

⁴³ Tina O'Toole, *The Irish New Woman* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 17.

⁴⁴ Sally Ledger, *The New Woman: Fiction and Feminism at the Fin de Siecle* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), p. 3.

⁴⁵ K.A. Atkins, 'Towards a Critical Edition of the Short Fiction of Sarah Grand' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of the West of England, 2014), p. 45.

⁴⁶ As quoted in Lauren Simek, 'Feminist 'Cant' and Narrative Selflessness in Sarah Grand's New Woman Trilogy', *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 67.3 (Jan 2012), p. 340.

⁴⁷ Marilyn Bonnell, 'Sarah Grand and the Critical Establishment: Art for [Wo]man's Sake', *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 14.1 (Jan 1995), p. 124.

I commanded you. I am a woman with all the latest improvements; the creature the world wants. Nothing can now be done without me ... But I am altogether an outcome of the age, you will perceive, an impossible mixture of incongruous qualities.⁴⁸

Grand's ideal of the radical potential of the New Woman, however, was tempered by the moral impetus of much of her writing. 'It is shameful', she wrote, 'to think how man was neglected and allowed to act on his own worst impulses until the new woman came to correct him'.⁴⁹ This interpretation is certainly applicable to 'The Undefinable'. The unnamed muse may wield fascination and a mysterious power over the male artist, but it is with a view to improving his (and the narrative's) artistic integrity. As she explains to him, "'if I could paint myself I should not be here. I should be doing what I want for myself instead of using my peculiar power to raise you to the necessary altitude'".⁵⁰ Yet Elaine Showalter has defended the feminist elements of the story, seeing in it 'the rebellion of the muse, the exploration of a New Woman's language, and the protest against the appropriation, even theft, of women's stories by men'.⁵¹

We can also see this story within the context of the literary trends of the *fin-de-siècle*. Elke D'hoker and Stephanie Eggermont have shown how women's short stories were coming to prominence at the time, offering a new mode of expression suitable to the demands of the market and a growing female readership. The feminist potential of the short story as a 'new' literary form, 'unhampered by generic and masculine conventions', was compelling to both women writers and their readership among women's magazines and the general literary public.⁵² It was also an attractive prospect for editors such as Archibald Grove at *The New Review*, who could commission experimental work without committing to lengthy and expensive series. Stories such as 'The Undefinable' were self-conscious responses to fashionable literary trends like aestheticism and the new realism, gesturing towards the fictional innovation of the era with a firm eye on the commercial marketplace. Grand undoubtedly was ideologically closer to forms of realism and the objective

⁴⁸ Sarah Grand, 'The Undefinable: A Fantasia (Part II)', *The New Review* 11 (Oct 1894), p. 435-6.

⁴⁹ As quoted in Angelique Richardson, 'The Eugenization of Love: Sarah Grand and the Morality of Genealogy', *Victorian Studies* 42.2 (Jan 1999), p. 238.

⁵⁰ Grand, 'The Undefinable (Part II)', p. 439.

⁵¹ Elaine Showalter (ed. and intro.), *Daughters of Decadence: Women Writers of the "Fin de Siècle"* (London: Virago, 1993), xxxi.

⁵² Elke D'hoker and Stephanie Eggermont, 'Fin-de-Siècle Women Writers and the Modern Short Story', *English Literature in Transition* 58.3 (2015), p. 294.

representation of contemporary reality – especially gendered reality and lived experience. But this story also echoes the aestheticist mode of the ‘slice of life’ fiction, and in its unreliable first-person narrator creates a tone of irony and ambiguity.⁵³ In this sense it is emblematic of the kind of hybridity that characterises Grand herself. The story was in fact published simultaneously in *The New Review* and the American magazine *Cosmopolitan*, which points to the deeply transnational nature of the literary networks within which she partook (cultural connectivity, indeed, which was a hallmark of most Irish writers within the English periodical press). ‘The Undefinable’, for example, opens with a quote from the writer John Ruskin who, as mentioned previously, was to exert a powerful influence on the writings of the young Standish O’Grady. In this way, it contains possibilities for new modes of reading across discourses, while moving to complicate (and indeed collapse) what one critic has termed the ‘conventional dichotomies between literary and political writing’.⁵⁴

Grand, like many other New Woman figures, was writing at the intersection of cultural politics and political activism, where new fiction ‘opened up a largely gynocentric space for discussion and dissemination of feminist thought’.⁵⁵ This was played out in *The New Review* issue of June 1894, where Grand featured as one of the authors in a colloquium entitled ‘The Tree of Knowledge’. Informed, we can presume, by the culture of New Woman fiction circulating in the press at the time, the article invoked the periodical model of an ‘open platform’ to debate the question of teenage girls’ sex education. Contributors included some of the most high-profile literary names of the day, from Thomas Hardy to Eliza Lynn Linton, with opinions ranging from a firm belief in the dangers of ignorance to the bitter assertion by Israel Zangwill that ‘owing to the circulation of the woman-novel (much greater than mine, alas!), and of the modern newspaper, nine girls out of ten must know as much as their parents, and the tenth a great deal more’.⁵⁶ The ‘woman-novel’ was indeed the largely unacknowledged backdrop to the article’s discussion of morals and knowledge, and Grand’s input follows the ideological position laid out in her fiction of the same journal. A certain conservatism regarding radical political change is tempered with a deep suspicion of femininity as a constricting identity, and her piece argues that ‘innocence is always liable to be unsafe for a girl, whatever her position’. Urging a sensitive approach, Grand writes that a girl ‘after the age of twenty ... should certainly not,

⁵³ Ibid., p. 302.

⁵⁴ Ann Heilmann, *New Woman Strategies: Sarah Grand, Olive Schreiner, Mona Caird* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 1.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ I. Zangwill, ‘The Tree of Knowledge’, *The New Review* 10 (June 1894), p. 690.

under any circumstances, be allowed to marry without full knowledge of all that is expected of her in marriage, and she should also be fully informed of the past life of the man whom she may be inclined to accept'.⁵⁷ As various critics have shown, however, this discussion took place within a wider climate of mild hysteria surrounding the issue of women's sexual education during the latter years of the century. Henry Maudsley, writing in the *Fortnightly Review* in 1874, agonised that the educated female, 'if she is subsequently married ... is unfit for the best discharge of maternal functions'.⁵⁸ Some years later Gustave Boucherau warned of the threats to the health of women and the population, attributing female sexual dysfunction to experiences of early childhood education.⁵⁹ Grand's involvement in such a debate points to the various textual manoeuvres in her periodical writings, where, as Heilmann has noted, she carefully modulates the tone of her articles 'addressed to an advanced readership interested in intellectual debate'.⁶⁰

This shifting vision was also commented upon by another Irish writer, Katharine Tynan, who had 'thought of [Grand] as something militant', but on meeting her was surprised to find her 'soft-voiced, gentle, delicately feminine, and most lovable'.⁶¹ Tynan herself was a contributor to *The New Review*, and like Grand had established herself on the London journalistic scene where she wrote prolifically for a living. She is known mainly for her friendship with Yeats and her poetry about Ireland but, as Whitney Standlee notes, Tynan had more in common with other Irish women novelists who settled in England than with the majority of the Revivalists.⁶² She is perhaps more notable for what she didn't contribute than what she did – avoiding New Woman discourse and turned down by Henley for a story with nationalist overtones, her marginal position in the *Review* reflects her own economic and cultural displacement; a natural ambivalence about both Revival and New Woman culture that left her, in the words of one critic, on ever 'shifting ground'.⁶³ It is a term that could be extended, in various ways, to her other Irish compatriots within the journal. Grand, despite her apparently firm stance on women's emancipation, was involved in various complex negotiations around gender relations and roles in the press. The New Woman was by no means a stable enterprise and it was largely to fall off the cultural radar

⁵⁷ Grand, 'The Tree of Knowledge', p. 680.

⁵⁸ Henry Maudsley, 'Sex in Mind and in Education', *Fortnightly Review* 21 (April 1874), p. 475.

⁵⁹ Kristin C. Ross, 'Preparing the Girl for 'The Fight of Life': Female Education and the New Woman in Ella Hepworth Dixon's *The Story of a Modern Woman*', *Women's Writing* 19.1 (Feb 2012), p. 79.

⁶⁰ Heilmann, *New Woman Strategies*, p. 24.

⁶¹ Katharine Tynan, *The Middle Years* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), p. 380.

⁶² Whitney Standlee, 'Power to Observe': *Irish Women Novelists in Britain, 1890-1916* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 195.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

by the later years of the decade. Similarly, in their efforts to construct a new mode of Celtic literary discourse, Yeats and O'Grady were undoubtedly aware of the fluctuating market for Irish subject matter in literary London. These contributions, therefore, are notable, if not for overt thematic connections, then for the opportunities they represented for a distinguished selection of Irish authors in the periodical press.

Literary Journalism or Literature versus Journalism?

Among the varieties of literary styles and debates that were endorsed by *The New Review* in the 1890s, Irish writers contributed more that could be regarded in the vein of 'intellectual prose' than any other form (including fiction). Shaping their creations around the decade's major intellectual and political questions, George Moore, T.P. O'Connor, George Bernard Shaw and others reflected an enthusiasm for critical inquiry that stood alongside an anxiety about the proper place and function of such criticism. As successful and established authors, Shaw and Moore were joined in the critical arena by a range of other Irish voices that included Standish O'Grady, Tighe Hopkins and Justin Huntly McCarthy. *The New Review* provided a suitable forum for these expressions, in its adherence to the open platform of press debate modelled on that of the *Nineteenth Century* and the *Fortnightly Review* – titles in which, incidentally, O'Connor, Shaw, Moore, O'Grady and McCarthy were also to publish. Despite, however, the relatively 'fledgling' nature of the younger periodical, its pages bore witness to strands of some of the most significant discussions in cultural matters of the 1890s. Foremost among these, and perhaps closest to the concerns of the *Review's* proprietors, were debates over the nature of literature and journalism and the frictions inherent in their relationship. Indeed the contested nature of literary endeavour itself – and its place within an uneasy triumvirate of public, private and authorial interests – forms the backbone to many of these articles. Contemporary culture, many of these writers claimed, constituted a minefield for any intellectual seeking to inscribe the legitimacy of their respective literary or artistic pursuit. Emerging debates over censorship, for example, provide the material for Shaw and Moore's invectives about the London stage, while O'Connor's defence of the New Journalism similarly picks apart the propriety of an earlier, high-Victorian press culture. These writings, some of the most high-profile of their day, sought variously to ask and answer who the arbiters of public taste were, and where morality could fit into an era that saw the *fin-de-siècle* movements of decadence and aestheticism wipe away previously-held notions of conventional respectability and realism. This was, of course, allied to developing conceptions of the public and the public sphere.

Playing on the Arnoldian theme of artistic circumscription, these Irish writers, in their various efforts to define a culture, implicitly record some of the many views on what ought to be known, read or seen during the late-nineteenth century.

The culture of reviews encouraged and gave shape to these debates. One of the flagship articles in the early years of *The New Review* was a two-part colloquium addressing the question of anonymity in press discourse, in the issues of November 1889 and March 1890. Written by Tighe Hopkins, it brought together the views of ‘persons whose right to be heard all journalists would acknowledge’.⁶⁴ This stated authority, the ‘right to be heard’, is both implicit and explicit in the article’s curation of literary stars such as John Morley and Eliza Lynn Linton, discussing a subject liable to allow ‘a modest quill-driver to bawl his opinions from the housetops in the ears of newspaper editors and proprietors’.⁶⁵ Anonymity, indeed, was a defining example of the multifaceted press culture of the late nineteenth century. Recalling debates that had hounded the monthly reviews from their outset in the 1860s and 70s, the article outlines the extent of current opinion both for and against signed journalism. Its gesture towards the history of the periodical press is made clear in quoting both John Morley and George Henry Lewes, pioneers of the abolishment of anonymity during their tenures at the *Fortnightly Review*. Morley, later to become Chief Secretary for Ireland, had announced in 1882 that ‘the childish imposture of the editorial ‘we’ is already thoroughly exploded’.⁶⁶ Hopkins’s article, however, is less convinced of such finality, with editors L.F. Austin and Edward Russell weighing in on the side of impersonal, and therefore collectively powerful, journalism. As one critic has noted, ‘all participants in the ‘Anonymity’ colloquium agreed that anonymity creates an identifiable, autonomous authority with operative power’.⁶⁷ What was at stake, instead, was the question of whether the press ought to wield what James Runciman calls the ‘mysterious power’ which the anonymous article granted.⁶⁸

But the debate also points towards the heart of what it meant to be a journalist and author at the time. Irish writers, as well as partaking publicly in various influential spheres of discourse in the periodical press, were given a prominent voice in Hopkins’s piece. Moore and Shaw, both at formative stages in their careers as London litterateurs, appear as sharp-tongued authorities on the matter (Moore wittily describes the English public as ‘a

⁶⁴ Tighe Hopkins, ‘Anonymity?’, *The New Review* 1 (Nov 1889), p. 513.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ John Morley, ‘Valediction’, *Fortnightly Review* (Oct 1882), p. 516.

⁶⁷ Brian Artese, *Testimony on Trial: Conrad, James, and the Contest for Modernism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), p. 16.

⁶⁸ Hopkins, ‘Anonymity?’, p. 528,

docile brute that will walk where it has walked before, however arduous the way may have become'.⁶⁹) T.P. O'Connor and Justin McCarthy, meanwhile, are acknowledged as newspaper men; Irish journalists who have worked their way to prominence through a more traditional route on Fleet Street. In this way the article functions as an insight into the self-perception of various kinds of periodical contributors. Hopkins notes that 'nowhere, save in connection with the newspaper Press, do we hear this remarkable talk about the tremendous power and dignity of anonymous writing', and admits that 'a very sharp distinction must be drawn between the fame of the man of letters and the fame of the journalist'.⁷⁰ Yet on closer examination the Irish writers polled do not divide so neatly into such distinctions: O'Connor announces himself 'strongly in favour of signed articles in newspapers', while Moore's preference is 'to leave the political leader unsigned'.⁷¹ Indeed in the broader world of periodical literature these dichotomies do not hold up as starkly as traditional narratives of the 1890s would suggest. Laurel Brake has provided important commentary on the multifarious development of journalistic practices, suggesting that

while the periodical press was moving, with reservations, towards signature and fragmented authority, the newspaper press came to occupy the middle ground between blanket anonymity and vulgarity to named contributors: a kind of acknowledged collectivity that indicated the individuality of journalists by generic bylines ... regular columns, and occasionally outright signature.⁷²

Perhaps the most lauded example of such a contributor was Shaw himself, who had worked himself up from anonymous reviewing at the *Pall Mall Gazette* to his celebrated theatre columns at Frank Harris's *Saturday Review*, signing himself G.B.S. (and in the process bringing Harris's paper for the first time into the era of signature). His pronouncements in *The New Review* article centre on the idea of 'responsibility', and in doing so underline his implicit adherence to the higher forms of literary journalism such as reviews and criticism. Not for him is the thankless drudge of daily journalism, 'since a man who writes without conviction in the third person is generally a pest and a bore, and seldom now gets really important work to do, his signature is uncalled for, and his sphere is that of

⁶⁹ Hopkins, 'Anonymity? II', *The New Review* 2 (Mar 1890), p. 276.

⁷⁰ Hopkins, 'Anonymity?', p. 523; Hopkins, 'Anonymity? II', p.272.

⁷¹ Hopkins, 'Anonymity?', p. 529, 519.

⁷² Laurel Brake, 'The Old Journalism and the New: Forms of Cultural Production in London in the 1880s' in Brake, *Subjugated Knowledge: Journalism, Gender and Literature in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), p. 91.

pure news'.⁷³ If the public, then, is best served by the authority of signature, as the article seems to conclude, 'it is a question, therefore, of the true worth of the name – that is to say, of the writer'.⁷⁴

This overarching project of maintaining a journalistic responsibility had been taken up in a previous article by T.P. O'Connor some months earlier. 'The New Journalism' – laying out a blueprint for an innovative form of press writing that was to have ramifications across the industry – was an important reflection on the state of British journalism at a pivotal moment in its history. It was also an issue closely linked to the debates on anonymity. New Journalism, as described by O'Connor, advocated the practice of signature in introducing 'personality' to the modern newspaper.⁷⁵ It was, he argued, a more realistic reflection of modern existence: 'no one's life is now private; the private dinner party, the intimate conversation, all are told'.⁷⁶ This was the 'sound principle' of journalism, hinting at the desire to bridge the gap between the public and private sphere as well as the social hierarchy that sustained it. As its moniker would suggest, it was an entirely new approach predicated not only upon the needs of a growing class of readers, but upon the potential for social change. O'Connor himself was sympathetic to the Radical cause in 1880s Britain, and stood as a successful MP – indeed the only one with an English seat – for the Irish Parliamentary Party. Throughout the last two decades of the century he retained a popularity among both his Irish peers in Britain and the English political establishment, often acting as an intermediary between the two. His articles in newspapers such as the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Freeman's Journal* served, moreover, to establish a link between popular journalism and politics, and were to influence the development of his own press organ, the highly successful *Star* paper, that was launched in 1887.

The term 'New Journalism', however, was not without its pejorative associations by the time O'Connor was writing. As a term it is generally attributed to W.T. Stead in an 1887 article for the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and was famously criticised by Matthew Arnold in an essay for the *Nineteenth Century* later that same year. Drawing again on the moral distinction between literature and journalism, Arnold relegated this new sector of the press to the bottom of the literary hierarchy by contrasting it with older (and therefore

⁷³ Hopkins, II, p. 275.

⁷⁴ Hopkins, I, p. 524.

⁷⁵ As Richard Salmon argues, however, care should be taken in conflating the two phenomena, since the practice of signature 'was not necessarily a corollary to the wholesale personalisation of journalistic discourse'. Richard Salmon, 'A Simulacrum of Power': Intimacy and Abstraction in the Rhetoric of the New Journalism', in Laurel Brake, B. Bell and D. Finkelstein (eds.), *Nineteenth-Century Media and the Construction of Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 29.

⁷⁶ T.P. O'Connor, 'The New Journalism', *The New Review* 1 (Oct 1889), p. 429.

trustworthy) cultural forms. ‘We have had’, Arnold wrote, ‘opportunities of observing a new journalism which a clever and energetic man has lately invented. It has much to recommend it; it is full of ability, novelty, variety, sensation, sympathy, generous instincts; its one great fault is that it is *feather-brained*’.⁷⁷ O’Connor’s article, appearing two years later, avoids mention of either Arnold or Stead but implicitly references this clash of cultural viewpoints in its explication of the *raison d’être* of New Journalism. It stands as a defence of the ‘personal touch’ as a new direction in British journalism, but also frames it in the context of a historical imperative. Drawing a comparison with the writings of Macaulay and Carlyle, O’Connor links New Journalism’s disdain for solemnity with the older historians’ scorn of what they called the ‘dignity of history’.⁷⁸ In claiming that ‘a true understanding and appreciation of the character of her public men is part of the history and wisdom of a nation’, O’Connor was establishing a direct challenge to Arnold’s conception of history and tradition in contemporary culture. O’Connor casts this new character of journalism in terms of its usefulness, not only to news reporting, but to politics, gossip and, significantly, the changing material forms of the newspaper:

A journal, whatever its views, should express them with the greatest lucidity and in the strongest and most striking manner it can command ... The newspaper is not read in the secrecy and silence of the closet as is the book. It is picked up at a railway station, hurried over in a railway carriage, dropped incontinently when read.⁷⁹

In paying tribute to what Kelly Mays has termed the rapidly altering ‘dimension and character of the reading public and the ever-greater productivity of the publishing industry’, the article – one of Arnold’s esteemed ‘review essays’ – would have been an asset for a title such as *The New Review*.⁸⁰ O’Connor, of course, was the product of that sector of the press more used to rapid change, and arguably more adaptable. Having founded the influential *Star* paper in 1887, he was already seeing the success and popularity of the new approach in his weekly gossip column, ‘Mainly About People’. As his wife confirmed in a letter to George Bernard Shaw, ‘Tom ... really revels in people. His mind is very personal, he does

⁷⁷ Matthew Arnold, ‘Up to Easter’, *Nineteenth Century* (May 1887), p. 638.

⁷⁸ O’Connor, ‘The New Journalism’, p. 424; Gary Weber, ‘Henry Labouchere, "Truth" and the New Journalism of Late Victorian Britain’, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 26.1 (Spring, 1993), p. 43.

⁷⁹ O’Connor, ‘The New Journalism’, p. 434.

⁸⁰ Mays, ‘The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, p. 165.

not care for pictures, ... or houses ... only people'.⁸¹ Yet there is also an informed self-consciousness to the article, an awareness of the precariousness of his position in the 'changing cultural formations' that were to fundamentally affect the shape and direction of the press.⁸² These forces, beyond the control of any journalistic innovations, were manifested in changing readership, professionalisation, and increasing systems of corporate ownership of large swathes of the late Victorian press. In the words of one commentator, 'it is surely not coincidental that at the very moment when the material basis of the press made it harder to locate an individuated source of material value, the discourse of journalism should so insistently declare its personalised character'.⁸³

Beyond its significance in the reflexive discourse of the press industry, however, the rhetoric and history of New Journalism had important links to Ireland. O'Connor, one of its best-known practitioners as well as commentators, was Irish by birth and retained a strong national identity in much of his writing. In the public eye he was 'an ambassador for the cause of Irish nationalism', and through efforts such as *The New Review* article had asserted his status as a powerful wielder of journalistic authority at the heart of the British political and intellectual establishment.⁸⁴ For readers of the periodical, the associations between New Journalism and Ireland would have been further strengthened by O'Connor's discussions of Parnell as a leading example of his argument. Referring to the Irish politician's 'oratorical fire', O'Connor emphasises the importance of a reporter who could convey accurately the atmosphere of the parliamentary chamber: 'Three lines in the letter of a good London correspondent would give to ... a historian a better idea of the scene than columns of reporting in Hansard'.⁸⁵ Alongside O'Connor, of course, the other major figure in the propagation of New Journalism was W.T. Stead, a 'towering presence in the cultural life of late Victorian and Edwardian society'.⁸⁶ Though Stead had no national connections to Ireland, as one of the first journalists to truly understand the value of a publicly-mediated persona he attached himself to the cause of Home Rule, carefully following (and often critiquing) the political career of Parnell. A recent study by Karen Steele and Michael de

⁸¹ Elizabeth O'Connor to George Bernard Shaw, Shaw Papers, British Library, ADD MS 50, 512, fol.50 (28 Aug 1888). Quoted in Ian Sheehy, 'Irish Journalists and Litterateurs in Late Victorian London, c.1870-1910' (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Oxford, 2003), p. 138.

⁸² See Brake, 'The Old Journalism and the New', p. 83.

⁸³ Salmon, 'A Simulacrum of Power', p. 29.

⁸⁴ M. Macdonagh, 'O'Connor, Thomas Power (1848-1929)', rev. Marie-Louise Legg, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn., Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35286>, accessed 13 April 2017]

⁸⁵ O'Connor, 'The New Journalism', p. 429.

⁸⁶ Laurel Brake and James Mussell, 'Introduction W. T. Stead: Newspaper Revolutionary', 19: *Interdisciplinary Studies In The Long Nineteenth Century* 16 (2013), p. 1.

Nie has also pointed out how deeply influential Stead's style of journalism was to Ireland.⁸⁷ The significant transformation wrought by the changing media practices of New Journalism, they write, had considerable implications on the 'cultural landscape' of late nineteenth century Ireland, and arguably helped to bring the commercial presses of the two countries closer together.⁸⁸

Yet beyond such direct lines of influence, the interconnectedness of Ireland and New Journalism also occurs in some rather more surprising forms. Arnold's 1887 pronouncement – inadvertently coining the term to dismiss claims made by Stead – comes at the end of an essay given over to the Irish situation. Specifically, the piece is an invective against Gladstone's policy of Home Rule, which Arnold was passionately against and Stead passionately for.⁸⁹ Arnold's use of the press to undermine Gladstone and the Liberals was not new, but his urgent rhetoric was a distinctive marker of the increased power of the press in realms beyond the cultural – in particular the political arena. As Kate Campbell has noted, 'both Arnold's and Stead's discussion of contemporary newspaper journalism proceeded in the overriding context of Gladstonian liberalism and the project of Irish Home Rule'.⁹⁰ The ideological and material proximity of the two issues, then, was an unmistakable feature of periodical culture as represented by *The New Review*. Taking place within the contextual framework of the Irish question of the 1880s and 90s, these writings highlight how debates around the New Journalism were played out (ironically) in the pages of elite journals. To a contemporary readership, this intertextuality would come to define a medium that increasingly looked to contributors who could interpret both the political and cultural upheavals of the late Victorian world of letters.

It was therefore established that by the early 1890s, the traditional status and scope of 'literature' was coming under fire from the rising tide of a journalism attuned to a new mass readership. But there were other frontiers of attack: namely, censorship, which in all its forms was to provide perhaps greater cause for worry in the writings of the Irish coterie of *The New Review*. The issue at stake was, once again, who ought to be the arbiters of cultural taste. Much like Matthew Arnold 'characteristically unselfconsciously' denouncing the New Journalism 'in the discourse of a journalism article located clearly in a

⁸⁷ Karen Steele and Michael de Nie, *Ireland and the New Journalism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁹ John Stokes and Mark W. Turner, 'Oscar Wilde, New Journalist', in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 372.

⁹⁰ Kate Campbell, 'W. E. Gladstone, W. T. Stead, Matthew Arnold and a New Journalism: Cultural Politics in the 1880s', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 36.1 (April 2003), p. 21.

journalism space', the vigorous debates over censorship in the press reflected significantly upon the role of periodical critics themselves.⁹¹ In particular the role of the essayist as a spokesperson for the educated class, with an imbued authority on cultural matters, was becoming fractured in the face of moral and public judgements on their art. Censorship was not only a matter of principle, but for a great many of the contributors whose artistic endeavours spanned the genres of drama, novel-writing and poetry, a question of pressing economic significance. This was certainly the case with two of Ireland's best-known cultural exports whose articles in *The New Review* grappled with these debates. Both George Moore and George Bernard Shaw had vested interests in the issue of London's stage censorship, and their pieces reflect its importance as a basis of artistic and critical controversy in the 1890s.

The issue attracted commentary from all quarters of the press, but especially from those Irish writers – Moore and Shaw are the best examples – who had forged careers as theatre critics on the London dramatic scene. In 1890, the proposed abolition of the Chief Examiner for Plays (essentially the national theatre censor) prompted Moore to launch a defence of the office, and publish it in the October issue of *The New Review*. It was perhaps a surprising move in light of his earlier campaigns against Mudie's travelling libraries (Moore, famously, took great insult when the library refused to stock his 'unsuitable' books) but his rationale was made clear in the alternative presented to the English public:

I ... challenge all who are interested in the preservation of Art and Letters to the consideration of the question, and to decide if it would be wise to hand over an important branch of literature, a large industry in which hundreds of thousands gain their livelihood, to be made the pretty game of those ... faddists of every scent and hue.⁹²

The matter at hand was not the inherent problem of censorship itself, but that the means of exercising it was to be given over to a panel of twelve jurymen ('mostly greengrocers', according to Moore). The Irish writer contrasted the 'opinion of an intelligent and unbiased individual' with the fickle nature of English public opinion: 'doubt and mistrust' he saw, were 'the characteristics of the national mind'.⁹³ This reference to the unreliability of public taste was also echoed in broader currents of cultural discourse around late-nineteenth

⁹¹ Brake, 'Culture Wars?', p. 208.

⁹² George Moore, 'The Dramatic Censorship', *The New Review* 3 (Oct 1890), p. 355.

⁹³ Ibid.

century drama. As the critic Renata Miller has noted, theatre criticism at this time developed a strong emphasis on elevating ‘not only the theatre but also the drama critic above mass culture’.⁹⁴ This creation and self-justification of a platform was, at least in the case of Moore, closely tied to the perceived status endowed by the periodical press. Considering the wider practice of censorship, the writer remarked that ‘I would willingly establish a Censorship of literature; and were that censor a man of letters – for instance, were he chosen from among the editors of the leading Reviews, I cannot for a moment entertain the thought that any case of flagrant injustice done would ever come before the public’.⁹⁵ This kind of cultural elitism was not untypical for Moore, a writer who had personally taken on the responsibility of converting the English reading public to the naturalism of Zola and the French avant-garde school. But it was also an attitude that resonated with the cultural behemoths of 1890s theatre criticism. Alongside Moore, figures such as William Archer, Shaw, J.T. Grein and Frank Harris shared a set of overarching ideals, such as the need for attacking the moral and structural conventionality of middlebrow drama.⁹⁶

There were differences, naturally; in particular Shaw’s opposing view of the office of the public censor.⁹⁷ But what Moore and Shaw could agree on, at least in their respective *New Review* articles, was the belief that popularity was not a good index of cultural importance.⁹⁸ Shaw’s most important contribution to this debate was an 1894 article entitled ‘A Dramatic Realist to his Critics’, which remains one of the most anthologised and oft-quoted of his essays. Demonstrating the playwright’s distinctive reactionary style, the piece was written in response to criticisms of his 1894 production *Arms and the Man*. The play, essentially a romantic comedy set against the backdrop of an English soldier’s experiences in the Balkans, had premiered in April at the Avenue Theatre to a mostly ‘favourably disposed’ audience.⁹⁹ Newspaper critics, echoing what they saw as the popular reaction to this new style of theatre, gave conclusions ranging from ‘perplexing’ to ‘a

⁹⁴ Renata Kobetts Miller, ‘The Cultural Work of Drama Criticism in the Early 1890s’, http://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_articles=renata-kobetts-miller-the-cultural-work-of-drama-criticism-in-the-early-1890s [Accessed 18/4/2017], p. 1.

⁹⁵ Moore, ‘The Dramatic Censorship’, p. 358.

⁹⁶ Jean Chothia, *English Drama of the Early Modern Period, 1890-1940* (London: Longman, 1996), p.28.

⁹⁷ See Shaw’s 1895 obituary of the late Examiner for Plays EF Smyth Pigott for the playwright’s criticisms of the office: [George Bernard Shaw], ‘Down with the Censorship’, *Saturday Review* 79, 2 March 1895, p. 14.

⁹⁸ Miller, ‘The Cultural Work of Drama Criticism’, p. 5.

⁹⁹ *Daily Telegraph*, 23 April 1894. As quoted in J.P. Wearing, ‘Introduction’, *Arms and the Man* <http://www.dramaonlinelibrary.com/books/arms-and-the-man-iid-115637/do-9781408183205-div-00000006> [Accessed March 19, 2017].

Gilbertian ... extravaganza'.¹⁰⁰ It was the latter view, as articulated by Archer in *World*, which provoked Shaw to launch a defence of his experiments in realism. In what was to become characteristic, Shaw's delineation of his own dramatic philosophy involved a vehement rejection of contemporary critical fashions. 'No class', he writes, 'is more idiotically confident of the reality of its own unreal knowledge than the literary class in general and dramatic critics in particular'.¹⁰¹ His convictions about the place of realism in art clashed with those of reviewers, whom he believed were blinkered by conventional ideas of reality and expectation.¹⁰² Appearing on the coattails of 'The Quintessence of Ibsenism' (Shaw's esteemed essay on ideals in literature and politics) and just prior to his fame as a critic for the *Saturday Review*, this *New Review* article helped to position Shaw at the centre of the decade's many debates around literary realism. It also points to a battlefield of conflicting and overlapping Victorian ideologies, where Shaw stakes his claim that 'the dramatic effect produced by the shock which these realities give to the notion of romantic young ladies and fierce civilians is not burlesque, but legitimate comedy'.¹⁰³ It is worth perhaps highlighting the similarity with Wilde here, another disenchanted Irish émigré who utilised the conventions of popular drama to wryly undercut the public's notions of theatrical realism. Thus Shaw was able to defend his play's protagonist, captain Bluntschli, a stage hero who, after death, had 'the supreme consolation of being able to get up and go home when the curtain falls'.¹⁰⁴

In arguing for a wholly new kind of theatre, Shaw, like Moore, O'Connor and indeed many other Irish contributors, was involved in a semantic struggle over ideas of the 'new'. This term (ascribed to a multitude of movements in the 1890s, from New Woman to New Journalism), threw up challenges and threatened the established cultural norms and encoded worldview of large sectors of the periodical press. New censorship and what it meant, for example, was almost as unthinkable as the new readers hinted at by O'Connor, and by extension unknown or untested public taste. As an offshoot of this, anxiety around changing professional and institutional standards of public discourse found its way into the pages of *The New Review*. George Moore's 1893 article 'Our Academicians and their Associates' took a critical view of the Royal Academy of Art and its declining fortunes in the latter years of the century. He points to the questionable management, quality and ethos of the institution as a factor in its loss of reputation to competitors such as the New Gallery

¹⁰⁰ William Archer, 'Theatrical Note, *World*, 25 April 1894, p. 63; Unsigned notice, *Star*, 23 April 1894, p.1.

¹⁰¹ George Bernard Shaw, 'A Dramatic Realist to his Critics', *The New Review* 11 (July 1894), p. 57.

¹⁰² E.B. Adams, *Bernard Shaw and the Aesthetes* (Cleveland: Ohio State University Press, 1971), p. 75.

¹⁰³ Shaw, 'A Dramatic Realist to his Critics', p. 68.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

and the New English Art Club. For Moore, the authority of the Academy coming under pressure meant that its role as guardian and keeper of artistic standards was being threatened – ‘the preservation of art in England’, he writes, ‘is what I am pleading for’.¹⁰⁵ The presiding danger in this case was the influence of what he calls ‘the new art criticism’, whose power was refracted through the press:

The newspapers lament it, and, strangely enough, it is the Radical journals that are most firmly ranged on the side of the Academy, though the mission of the new criticism is to break through a monopoly and restore free trade to art. Calamity follows calamity...¹⁰⁶

As one critic has pointed out, however, Moore’s attack on the Royal Academy borrowed Matthew Arnold’s terms to criticise it for its difference from the French model.¹⁰⁷ Arnold was a lifelong champion of academies, whether literary or artistic, and saw the French Academy as serving ‘a sort of centre and rallying point’ for excellence, an ‘intellectual metropolis’ that contrasted with the degraded and commercial enterprise of its English counterpart.¹⁰⁸ Moore echoed the sentiment in his conclusion, defending the traditional status of academies by stating his belief ‘that the attempt of our nineteenth century to nationalise art has merely ended in a horrible vulgarisation of art.’¹⁰⁹

If Moore was unequivocal in his defence of the ‘professional’ and the institutions that upheld such cultural authority, he was certainly in line with the currents of intellectual development at the time. Elizabeth Prettejohn has discussed the shifting meanings of ‘academic’, alongside various connotations of conservatism, and their ossification at the end of the nineteenth century.¹¹⁰ This narrative of the general move towards institutional and university-led cultural discussion has been complicated elsewhere (see Chapters Two and Three), but it was doubtless the case that, in Kelly Mays’ words, ‘the periodicals began to operate less as sociocultural authorities in their own right than as forums for the exercise of a sociocultural authority derived elsewhere – chiefly from the universities.’¹¹¹ Moore and

¹⁰⁵ George Moore, ‘Our Academicians and their Associates’, *The New Review* 8 (June 1893), p. 665.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Elizabeth Prettejohn, ‘Leighton: The Aesthete as Academic’, in Rafael Cardoso Denis and Colin Trodd (eds.), *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 49.

¹⁰⁸ Matthew Arnold, ‘The Literary Influence of Academies’, *Cornhill Magazine* 10 (Aug 1864), p. 163.

¹⁰⁹ Moore, ‘Our Academicians and their Associates’, p. 674.

¹¹⁰ Prettejohn, ‘Leighton: The Aesthete as Academic’, p. 41.

¹¹¹ Mays, ‘Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, p. 169.

Arnold were writing at the juncture of a shift in authorised spheres of learning, siding with the elite *belles-lettres* tradition in an age of encroaching professionalisation of knowledge. Like Shaw and many other non-Irish contributors, they saw the qualities of responsibility, literary ethics and dignity as ones protected by an elite culture, which itself must be constantly policed. As cultural critics, then, both Shaw and Moore appear as ‘moral and intellectual leaders in the community’ of *The New Review*, demonstrating an ability to perceive and shape the currents of intellectual culture as directly as their peers in the areas of Irish literature.¹¹²

A ‘New’ Political Voice?

If many of the Irish cohort writing for *The New Review* reflected, to varying degrees, establishment values regarding the proper place and use of literature, their counterparts in the political arena could be seen as a more outspoken and radical element in the periodical’s pages. This is not to claim, however, that they weren’t writing from within the political and intellectual establishment of the day – indeed, Justin Huntly McCarthy’s father, Justin McCarthy, was well known as a novelist, newspaper man and Irish Party MP. His wide range of connections spanned British and Irish political circles, and meant that he wrote frequently for the *Nineteenth Century*, *Fortnightly Review* and the *Westminster Review* during the 1880s and 90s. He was joined by George Bernard Shaw and Standish O’Grady, who were for different reasons both familiar to the British reading public by the end of the century. Significantly they all appear in other capacities within *The New Review* itself, displaying a diversity of range that includes McCarthy’s pronouncements on anonymity, Shaw’s invectives against critics and O’Grady’s historical fiction. Their political articles, however, are all written from a convicted standpoint as members of political movements, respectively Home Rule, Fabian socialism and Irish co-operation. This use of high-brow journals to advance a cause was not uncommon in the periodical press, where the ‘heightened role and interrelationship of symbolic forms in journalism and politics’ was a noted feature by the 1890s.¹¹³ As a form of polemical journalism, it owed much to the Liberal campaigns of Gladstone in the preceding decade, as well as the extension of the franchise outside the traditional elite in the 1870s. Each writer’s vehemence in attempting to effect social change also displays the influence of the Liberal statesman. McCarthy’s

¹¹² James L. Machor, ‘Historical Hermeneutics and Antebellum Fiction: Gender, Response Theory, and Interpretive Contexts’, in James L. Machor (ed.), *Readers in History: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Contexts of Response* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993), p. 64.

¹¹³ Campbell, ‘W. E. Gladstone, W. T. Stead, Matthew Arnold and a New Journalism’, p. 21.

articles outlining Home Rule politics, O'Grady's advocacy of a new social movement and Shaw's hopes for a class transformation all convey a nascent sense of opportunity, a belief that the 1890s was the right moment for change both in Britain and Ireland.

McCarthy was one of *The New Review's* (and indeed the broader periodical press's) most prominent spokesmen for the Irish interest at Westminster in the years after the fall of Parnell. Throughout his career he occupied an important position in the Irish Parliamentary Party due to his English connections, and he proved invaluable as a conduit between British politicians and Parnell during the 1880s.¹¹⁴ R.F. Foster has likened his ascent to that of Trollope's Phineas Finn, migrating from Cork journalism into the world of Fleet Street, literary salons and Westminster with equal ease.¹¹⁵ To that list one could include the elite spheres of literary reviews, where publication signalled a visible social status in literary London. Writing in his autobiography, he refutes the idea that his (avowedly nationalist) politics 'ever interfered in the slightest degree with my way in journalism or in literature here in England'.¹¹⁶ This sense of fluidity between politician and writer, and indeed as an intermediary in terms of national identity, is mapped onto his articles in *The New Review*.

McCarthy was a lifelong advocate of Home Rule, and was to a large degree responsible for keeping the Irish perspective to the forefront of the press during the last two decades of the century. He contributed his considerable skill as an essayist to the campaign, including three *New Review* articles in 1892, 1893 and 1894. Taken together, these can be seen as gestures towards unity and conciliation in the years following the post-Parnell fallout in the Irish Party. He records his optimism for the Home Rule project in August 1892, believing 'that the recent split in the Irish Party will [not] make the slightest difference in the division lobby'.¹¹⁷ But he was not only a partisan lobbyist – widely regarded as a voice of reason, he also provides perceptive commentary on John Morley's tenure as Chief Secretary in Ireland some months later.¹¹⁸ Even after the defeat of the second Home Rule bill in 1893, his articles retain a measured tone and stand by the Liberal alliance. In pushing in this way for a transparent and unified mode of nationalist politics, McCarthy emblematised the Irish constitutional political outlook in Westminster of the

¹¹⁴ Alan O'Day, 'Justin McCarthy', *Dictionary of Irish Biography* [<http://dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a5579&searchClicked=clicked&quickadvsearch=yes>], Accessed 25 April 2017.

¹¹⁵ R.F. Foster, *Paddy and Mr Punch*, p. 290.

¹¹⁶ Justin McCarthy, *Reminiscences*, vol. 1 (London: Chatto and Windus, 1899), p. 15.

¹¹⁷ Justin McCarthy, 'Parties and Programmes in the New Parliament: I. – The Nationalists', *The New Review* 7 (Aug 1892), p. 130.

¹¹⁸ Justin McCarthy, 'The New Departure in Ireland: Success or Failure?', *The New Review* 7 (Nov 1892), pp. 522-528.

1890s. His pieces are written out of a need for mutual understanding, a belief that ‘it may be of some advantage, of some guidance, to Liberal Ministers to know how the people of Ireland are feeling about this question just at present’.¹¹⁹ Like his *Fortnightly Review* contributions, these articles insightfully chart the fortunes of the nationalist interest in England, while remaining firmly convinced of a ‘right way’ for Ireland.

Standish O’Grady was for his part equally convinced of the validity of his cause, and his political articles act here as a rallying cry for a new kind of national project. Writing in support of the co-operation movement in Irish agricultural affairs, O’Grady – like Shaw, O’Connor and McCarthy – again conceives his project in terms of the ‘new’. His 1896 article entitled ‘The New Irish Movement’ and its counterpart some months later, ‘The New United Ireland’, demonstrate the rhetorical force of both O’Grady’s prose and the concept of an innovative, wholly fresh initiative. This may, however, have been little more than a publicity strategy as the movement itself was some way from being entirely new. In 1889 Horace Plunkett had founded the first co-operative society in Doneraile, and in 1895 the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society had been formally set up.¹²⁰ In the years between, the question of combining classes in the national interest had been widely debated. Foremost among this had been the ideological battles fought in the press, particularly in the pages of *The All-Ireland Review*, *The Irish Homestead* and *The Freeman’s Journal*, over Plunkett’s vision of constructive unionism.¹²¹ In the 1890s O’Grady moved this campaign to a British platform and audience, and through these *New Review* articles essentially wrote himself into a periodical review culture. He explicitly addresses the views of his intended audience, opening one of his articles:

I, writing from an Irish point of view, shall have to say many severe things concerning the British Statesman, and shall beg my English readers to believe that, no more than Carlyle, do I regard the British Statesman as in any degree the type and representative of the English people, but rather as the transitory product of an ephemeral phase in the national evolution.¹²²

The reference to Carlyle here provides a link back to his fictional concerns, and one which is echoed in the broader structural themes of his political thought. These articles also

¹¹⁹ Justin McCarthy, ‘Ireland and the Government’, *The New Review* 11 (Oct 1894), p. 337.

¹²⁰ For further details see Chapter Five on the *Fortnightly Review* and Plunkett.

¹²¹ See McAteer, *Standish O’Grady, AE and Yeats*, pp. 104-114.

¹²² Standish O’Grady, ‘The New United Ireland’, *The New Review* 16 (Feb 1897), p. 129.

articulate the interests of the landed gentry and their importance to a combined society, as, O’Grady believes, ‘they will be the most powerful and illustrious aristocracy in Europe, and endure for generations’.¹²³ The co-operative system, as envisaged by Plunkett, aimed at harmonising all classes in Ireland on an economic and agricultural basis. This organic concept of society was interpreted by O’Grady as foregrounding the historical and cultural supremacy of the landed class, as natural leaders whose authority revealed itself in contemporary discontent with political leadership. It also paid important homage to O’Grady’s ideological concerns with imagination and history that permeated all his work. Here, the basis of landed leadership is due to the particular Irish constitution: ‘The past has an immense hold upon their affections and imaginations’, O’Grady explains, since “‘the old families that were there always” still exert a great power over the minds of the peasantry’.¹²⁴

In this way O’Grady brought considerable imaginative and persuasive powers to bear on a movement that could often have been described as somewhat sterile and uninteresting. The sense of potential that his political articles evoke meant harnessing an energy (imaginative or otherwise) among Irish people and British sympathisers that was seemingly lacking on the political front. In *The New Review* at least, there is a sense of not so much speaking *out* of an intellectual bastion as speaking *to* an audience. Much the same could be said of George Bernard Shaw in his political writings, most notably his contribution to a series on ‘The Socialist Ideal’ in January 1891. Shaw’s involvement in politics was patchy, apart from his well-publicised alignment with the Fabian society throughout the 1880s and ‘90s. Critics have noted that he was possibly influenced in this way by Henrik Ibsen, who had ‘always declared himself as outside politics’.¹²⁵ Indeed Shaw acknowledges his disdain for much mainstream political ambition in *The New Review* article, declaring ‘to me the Gentleman is a disgraceful sponging creature, the Tory my natural enemy, the Liberal a treacherous ally who will desert me when the hour of battle comes ... Politics, then, are based on the pocket’.¹²⁶ Like the other Irish writers at the journal, however, there is a self-consciousness of his place in the cohort of elite opinion-formers at the time. His glib awareness of the irony of a socialist pleading with the readership of such reviews is revealing:

¹²³ Ibid, p. 133.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Annette T. Rubinstein, *The Great Tradition in English Literature: From Shakespeare to Shaw* (New York: Citadel Press, 1953), p. 892.

¹²⁶ George Bernard Shaw, ‘The Socialist Ideal II: Politics’, *The New Review* (Jan 1891), pp. 10-11.

I cannot for the life of me escape from the influence of my audience. In addressing the rich members of the review-reading classes, I am addressing an inorganic part of society; and when, out of mere good nature, I pretend to take them for real people, my acting lacks conviction: they smell brimstone, somehow, no matter how respectably my cloven hoof is booted.¹²⁷

In arguing for a social transformation, then, Shaw is careful to appeal to the self-interest of the masses. Their material well-being, he notes, is inextricably linked to the collective good of society – an argument designed ‘for highly principled England, where coercion must have moral force behind it’.¹²⁸ The success of such an approach, however, was questionable. Shaw’s wry sarcasm in the article frequently works against the earnestness of his subject, and indeed contemporary commentators were quick to point out that he ‘is so overcome by the absurdity of the situation, that he can only give way to uproarious merriment, and drown all sense and meaning in his boisterous laughter.’¹²⁹ But Shaw himself was aware of his conflicting tone, and at the opening of the piece acknowledges that ‘my sense of humour gets the better of me: the truths [my audience] ignore assume flippant and fantastic disguises in spite of me: the deportment of the truth-teller sinks to the occasion and becomes egotistical and shameless’.¹³⁰

Shaw, in this article, may have been addressing a matter almost wholly unconnected to other Irish writings within *The New Review*, but in his interlinking of the ideological and the imaginative he puts forward a formative and largely optimistic vision for society. In this way, his impulse is not so dissimilar to that of O’Grady or McCarthy, or indeed in a broader sense, of Yeats, Grand or Moore. If we can see Shaw within the context of J.W. Foster’s ‘hyphenated writers’ – those authors who worked within the liminalities of a British/Irish literary nexus – we can perhaps begin to make sense of the cultural hybridity that such figures embodied.¹³¹ Foster may have been referring to marginalised women writers of the 1890s, but the term ‘hyphenated’ could equally be applied to those whose larger-than-life, carefully constructed public personas within London journals foreclosed an often-ambiguous relationship with national identity. Shaw, indeed, is a famous (and frustrating) example of the difficulties entailed in trying to impose a national context to literary output. His periodical writing in the journal reveals in what he calls ‘delightful

¹²⁷ Shaw, ‘The Socialist Ideal’, p. 9.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 6.

¹²⁹ *Spectator*, 10 Jan 1891, p. 7.

¹³⁰ Shaw, ‘The Socialist Ideal’, p. 9.

¹³¹ Foster, *Irish Novels*, p. 9.

eccentricities, probably due to the accident of birth, which occurred to me in Ireland'.¹³² His contemporaries in *The New Review*, however, were not always such 'accidental' Irish writers. The 'hyphenated' writings of McCarthy, Mahaffy and O'Connor, for instance, demonstrate an engagement with a transnational tradition of journalistic and political discourse. Other contributors such as Moore and Grand epitomised a cosmopolitanism sustained by the context of 1890s *fin-de-siècle* culture. In literary and artistic terms, both took advantage of the new forms of expression circulating, as they themselves did, between Ireland, England and the continent.

There were other benefits to this fluidity in the context of the literary marketplace in 1890s London. *The New Review* may have modelled itself on publications like the *Fortnightly Review*, prioritising stability, gravitas and longevity, but the rebranding of 1894 showed that it too was vulnerable to market forces. Alongside its commitment to literary excellence, it was a commercial venture where straitened financial considerations no doubt impacted upon editorial decisions. The Irish contributions should therefore be viewed in the context of their publicity value as well as aesthetic merit – especially under William Henley, who stabilised the deteriorating finances of the journal post-1895.¹³³ The New Woman could be counted on to attract readers, as could Yeats's and O'Grady's fashioning of a new Celtic mythology as the Irish Revival began to come into focus in London literary circles. Irish subject matter may sometimes have worked against publishing success, such as when Henley declined a poem by Katharine Tynan on The Wild Geese in 1891 because of its nationalist subtext.¹³⁴ In general, however, he was a fair editor who mostly subordinated personal taste to professional standards.¹³⁵ The broad range of Irish material stands testament to this editorial openness, a stance that was all but essential in maintaining and attracting readership to a non-partisan publication. In many ways, *The New Review* reflected late nineteenth-century London as a cultural, intellectual and political locus and Irish writers, in turn, reflected this diversity of outlook in their writings.

In many ways, the consistent recourse to the values and challenges of the 'new', discernible among nearly all of the *Review's* Irish writers, provides a rich interpretative thread in assessing their collected material. In their efforts to define and shape a culture,

¹³² Shaw, 'The Socialist Ideal', p. 11.

¹³³ Houghton, 'Introduction' to *The New Review*, *The Wellesley Index*, no pagination.
<http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk/toc/toc.do?id=JID-NEWR&divLevel=1&action=new&queryId=#scroll>
 [Accessed 26 April 2018].

¹³⁴ Bubb, *Meeting Without Knowing It*, p. 145.

¹³⁵ Bubb provides some examples of what Henley's personal feeling on Irish matters could have been, such as the tirades against Parnell and heavy-handed satires of the New Woman in his paper *The Observer*. These biases, however, were absent from *The New Review*. Bubb, *Meeting Without Knowing It*, pp. 145, 147.

contributors such as Shaw, Standish O'Grady and Sarah Grand also demonstrated a generic fluidity, where the literary often took on a political slant and vice versa (McCarthy's eloquent rhetoric in his political tracts, for instance, bears testament to the literary background that endeared him to the intellectual press). But alongside this optimism for the future was a tangible sense of anxiety about the state of literary and cultural production. Moore's none-to-happy analysis of the artistic and dramatic institutions in London at the time indicates the challenges facing an educated elite of how to moderate practices of cultural and textual consumption. The social changes in readership and audience that prompted O'Connor's plea for a new journalism had rather more worrying ramifications for writers like Shaw, Yeats and Moore, and the public reception of their works. In this way we can see a continued strain of Arnoldian thought in the contribution of those writers who saw themselves as voices of authority, and believed in the need for cultural arbiters who could defend the bastion of intellectual periodical culture.

Ultimately, however, *The New Review* was not to provide any sustainable platform for these kinds of aspirations. It published its last issue in December 1897, echoing the fate of the *New Woman* which was to largely lose its momentum by the end of the 1890s. In many ways, then, it is easy to see both as symptomatic of a sort of *fin-de-siècle* decline; a failure to fulfil potential in any kind of long-term way. Critics, indeed, have tended to view the fate of *The New Review* as inevitable, struggling from birth to gain a foothold in an already overcrowded market. Yet its overall calibre and editorial estimation speaks against this kind of assumption. It was, in many senses, an initiative in an embryonic period full of nascent artistic, cultural and intellectual movements. Just as Yeats's vision of a Celtic renaissance was, at this time, merely a hope of an anticipated transformation, so too was O'Grady's ideal of an Ireland united by a heroic aristocracy, or Sarah Grand's conviction in the rise of an emancipated and cosmopolitan *New Woman* literature. Instead, then, of a teleological judgement on the relative success or failure of these ventures, what *The New Review* offers us is a compelling portrait of the diversity of Irish literary production in a formative era, where the glimmerings of a new Irish cultural validity took shape in the cosmopolitan surrounds of London's periodical press.

Chapter Two

The Periodical Writings of W.E.H. Lecky

On August 23rd 1898, the *Freeman's Journal* carried an article on W.E.H. Lecky, stating that “[a]ll Irish men are very proud of Mr Lecky. He and Mr Ruskin are the last surviving men of genius of the great Victorian age, an age so prolific in men of genius writing in the English tongue. He is the greatest historian of our time.” The piece was just one of many articles that drew on Lecky in the year commemorating the centenary of the 1798 rebellion. In featuring the historian’s views, the paper was deliberately playing on the double-edged reputation that characterised Lecky in Irish nationalist circles. It may have admired his public standing, but continued by describing ‘with great sadness ... [the] astounding abuse of the English language and of historical truth’ which it saw in his assessment of the rebels (Lecky had been critical of the uprising in his historical writings).¹ An article in the *Kerry Sentinel* some months later similarly quoted his analysis of the uprising, while various newspapers and magazines in England ran reports on his interactions in parliament (he stood as MP for Dublin University from 1895 to 1903) as well as his contributions to historical debates.² These publications followed a trend that had steadily increased over Lecky’s career: the scrutiny of a figure who, perhaps despite his inclinations, had become the figurehead for a certain elite view of British political and intellectual output by the close of the nineteenth century.

There were many reasons why the late Victorian press – from the intellectual periodicals to daily newspapers – kept close watch on this prolific historian. William Edward Hartpole Lecky was born into a landed Dublin family in 1838, and after rising through the ranks of Trinity College Dublin (which left an enduring influence on his work, as did the College Historical Society), quickly became known as an articulate and informed voice on Irish and English history. His first major publication, the 1861 book *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, was an influential treatise on the personalities that shaped the narrative of Ireland’s recent political past. Its reception essentially confirmed Lecky’s

¹ ‘Mr Lecky and Ninety-Eight’, *Freeman's Journal*, 23 Aug 1898, p. 4.

² Thomas S. O’Sullivan, ‘The Story of ’98’, *Kerry Sentinel*, 23 November 1898, p. 4.

position as a critical authority on historical representation. Bringing together sympathetic portraits of O'Connell, Swift, Grattan and Flood, it was broadly admired within Irish nationalist circles, and was consistently cited throughout the following decades of Lecky's career. John Morley, writing as editor of the *Fortnightly Review* after the publication of the 1871 edition, noted the author's 'admiration for the Irish parliament' but praised the even-handed judgement which came to characterise much of Lecky's output.³ *Leaders* was followed by two historiographical texts, on the *Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe* (1865), and *History of European Morals* (1869). Between 1878 and 1890 he released the multi-volume *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, parts of which were subsequently expanded into a separate *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*. The all-encompassing reach of these works gave Lecky a prominence both within and outside the academy, and marked an important juncture in the nineteenth-century expansion of historical thought.

What this chapter is concerned with, however, are those essays, articles and press interventions that complemented Lecky's published output during the span of his career. Critical attention thus far has focused mainly on his books and their perceived political leanings, as well as their contributions to the development of Home Rule discussions. Donal McCartney's thorough biography of the writer is a helpful starting point, and includes reference to most of Lecky's important journal articles. Like other surveys by Ann Wyatt and Norman Pilling, though, it uses these largely as illustrations of wider issues in Lecky's writing.⁴ What this ignores is the significance of certain types of press discourse, not only in Lecky's conception of his work as an essayist, but on matters of tone and audience that move to distinguish various phases of his career. His correspondence and papers show a continued dialogue with editors, reviewers and fellow contributors on matters of periodical publication. His friendship with the writer W.J. O'Neill Daunt, for instance, ranged from discussion on contemporary politics to urgent requests from Daunt to influence the publishers of the *Fortnightly Review*.⁵ Although his reputation today tends to place him firmly within the ranks of highbrow intellectual historians, Lecky was very much involved in the business of press publicity. In recalibrating attention towards this aspect of his work then, we can begin to chart the symbiotic relationship that existed between author

³ John Morley, 'Irish Policy in the Eighteenth Century', *Fortnightly Review* 11 (Feb 1872), p. 199.

⁴ Ann Wyatt, 'Froude, Lecky, and the 'Humblest Irishman'', *Irish Historical Studies* 19.75 (Jan 1975), pp. 261-285; and Norman Pilling, 'Lecky and Dicey: English and Irish Histories', *Eire-Ireland* 16.3 (Autumn 1981), pp. 43-56.

⁵ W.J. O'Neill Daunt to Lecky, 1882, TCD MS 262.

and publication process, and furthermore to evaluate conceptions of public opinion, popular history and readership that became increasingly contested in the late Victorian years.

Lecky, Irish History and the Press

Lecky's contributions to the *Nineteenth Century*, *Macmillan's*, the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Contemporary Review* drew upon a range of subjects, but they all contained a strong sense of the authority that history carried. The latter decades of the nineteenth century, indeed, reflected this idea of history (and history-writing) as a major cultural and moral resource.⁶ As W.E. Gladstone wrote in 1875, "I am convinced that the thorough ... study of history is a noble, invigorating, manly study, essentially political and judicial, fitted for and indispensable to a free country".⁷ In demonstrating his belief in the value of historical research, Gladstone was prefiguring his later political manoeuvres over the Irish question where the influence of the past on contemporary attitudes was to have a defining effect. As a practice, history too was seeing an emergent presence within British universities. Oxford and Cambridge had the longest-established departments, but Edinburgh, London and, latterly, the University of Dublin increasingly invested in professorships, specialised research journals and scholarly associations.⁸ This drive towards professionalisation during the 1880s and 1890s in particular had some interesting corollaries. What Stefan Collini has called the 'historicisation of knowledge' in the humanities led to more defined terms of reference, and the repositioning of certain intellectual areas as the preserve of academically qualified scholars.⁹ It also largely meant the death of antiquarianism as a serious pursuit, as the tide of scientific enquiry was to (albeit slowly and unevenly) erode the traditional standing of 'softer' modes of historical research.

Yet recent scholarship has shown this long-accepted narrative – of the growing predominance of a new breed of specialist over the mid-Victorian generalist – to be somewhat more complex. The quest for scientific status, in Peter Novick's analysis, didn't preclude 'the leakage of moral opinion into the objective recovery of the past'; among the variations of thought on Victorian history, there were still those who saw lessons to be

⁶ Phillippa Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 37.

⁷ W.E. Gladstone to William Stubbs, 27 December 1875, in W.H. Hutton, *Letters of William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 1825-1901* (London: Archibald Constable, 1904), p. 147.

⁸ Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 207.

⁹ Stefan Collini, *English Pasts: Essays in Culture and History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 308.

gleaned from history.¹⁰ In his inaugural lecture as Cambridge Regius Professor of Modern History in 1895, Lord John Acton urged historians ‘never to debase the moral currency or to lower the standard of rectitude ... [and] to suffer no man and no cause to escape the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict on wrong’.¹¹ In viewing history as a means to build character and inform modern ideas of progress, Lecky stood alongside Acton and the scholar Charles Kingsley as a deliberately *moral* historian. Lecky’s construction of an ethical interpretive framework, however, was only one approach in the nineteenth-century tendency to narrativise the past. Hayden White, in his seminal work on the Victorian historical imagination, has put it that ‘the demand for the scientisation of history represents only the statement of a preference for a specific modality of historical conceptualisation, the grounds of which are either moral or aesthetic’.¹² In other words, each school of history was implicit in creating out of its rhetorical structures competing ‘realisms’ that took the form of narrative tropes. In his own case, Lecky saw history as an informing discipline, an educational ideal to be brought before the public eye even within the advances of professionalization. He believed that there was an important relationship between

the process which physical science is now undergoing ... [and] what may be termed the morphological conception of opinions – that is to say, the belief that there is a law of orderly and progressive transformation to which our speculative opinions are subject.¹³

This belief that the past had meaning, and that it therefore had serious implications for the future, was a continuous strain of thought in Lecky’s output throughout his career. Particularly in the latter years of the century, when the struggle to interpret Ireland’s history became inextricable from the political struggles at Westminster, this construction of a

¹⁰ Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: the “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Robert J. Richards, *The Tragic Sense of Life: Ernst Haeckel and the Struggle over Evolutionary Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), p. 490.

¹¹ John Acton, *Lectures on Modern History* (London: Macmillan, 1906), p. 23.

¹² Hayden White, ‘Preface’, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2014), xxxii.

¹³ W.E.H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, vol. I (London: Longmans, 1865), p. 296.

‘usable past’ provided the narrative terrain for a certain view of contemporary national identity.¹⁴

In the Irish context, this period saw a renewed interest in popular forms of history. A large variety of works in local and ecclesiastical history were published in the three decades before 1900, as amateur historians exploited archives collected by their mid-Victorian predecessors.¹⁵ Buoyed perhaps by the political climate, a new generation of professional historians also deployed archival knowledge in reinterpreting the country’s recent past. A.M. Sullivan, Thomas Dunbar Ingram, J.G. Swift MacNeill and G.H. Orpen all produced volumes contemporaneous with Lecky’s published works. Many of these were notable only for their marked unionist or nationalist slant, such as Sullivan’s *The Story of Ireland* (1867) which, though highly partisan in its nationalist viewpoint, can arguably be seen ‘to co-opt and control the more unruly and refractory narratives of vernacular history’.¹⁶ The use of ‘Story’ as a title was also a significant choice, and one that was co-opted by later Revivalist writers and, indeed, Lecky’s friend Emily Lawless. On the opposing side, Unionists such as G. H. Orpen were active in restructuring narratives from medieval Irish history to current political debate. Orpen penned numerous pieces for the *English Historical Review* between 1890 and 1920, many of them attacking Irish historical works written from a nationalist perspective.¹⁷ These fractious debates over historiography had a significant effect on constructions of Irish identity both at home and in Britain, and would not have been lost on Lecky. His monumental work on 18th-century Ireland was in part an attempt to rectify the distortions of previous portrayals, and give an objective account of the sources from the period. Writing to Charles Bowen in 1878, he describes his Irish chapters

as the first serious attempt to analyse the political and social state of Ireland somewhat philosophically; and if they are disproportionally long and detailed, you must remember, first, that a great part of them is quite new; and, secondly, that I had

¹⁴ Richard A. Cosgrove, ‘A Usable Past: History and the Politics of Identity in Late Victorian England’, *Parliamentary History* 27.1 (Mar 2008), p. 30.

¹⁵ R.V. Comerford, ‘Introduction: Ireland, 1870-1921’ to W.E. Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland Volume VI: Ireland under the Union II, 1870-1921* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), liv.

¹⁶ Luke Gibbons, *Transformations in Irish Culture* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996), p. 15.

¹⁷ Nadia Claire Smith, *A “Manly Study”? Irish Women Historians, 1868 – 1949* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 10.

to prove, often from very recondite sources, positions which are in direct opposition to the best English authorities.¹⁸

The rigorously objective methodology espoused by Lecky here is indicative of a more general move in British historiography at the time. Allied to the university-led disciplinisation, historical knowledge in the late Victorian years became increasingly fragmented and specialised. The development of particular techniques and methodologies was a marked feature of much history writing, especially within the so-called ‘Oxford school’ of academics. Writers such as William Stubbs and E.A. Freeman were acknowledged authorities in their areas, and in turn regarded themselves as the ‘custodians of the new scholarly standard’.¹⁹ The intellectual (and his perceived scientific robustness) became more visible in many areas of public life, and especially in the periodical press where he gradually displaced the high-Victorian ‘man of letters’.²⁰ This shift – from the dominance of the polymath to reliance on the specialist – will be discussed in more detail in the later sections of this chapter.

Lecky, certainly, was one of the first and most prominent of this new school of professional historians. Although he was not officially affiliated to a university, the reputation of his early works won him an offer of the Oxford Regius Professorship of Modern History in 1892, as well as multiple honorary degrees and the prestigious Order of Merit in 1902. His articles and essays, as well as the longer published works, stand testament to a distinct, methodological and exacting approach towards his historical subjects. Reflecting on his own techniques, he cited the influence of Comte, Hegel and Herder, commenting that ‘what characterises these writers is that they try to look at history, not as a series of biographies, or accidents, or pictures, but as a great organic whole’.²¹ The wide-lens focus of such an approach is evident in the scope of many of Lecky’s most celebrated works. *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century* was released in eight volumes, while the offshoot *History of Ireland* eventually reached four complete volumes. But even his stand-alone books display the ability to assimilate extensive material in a cohesive fashion. His view of history was that it was essentially one of morals and ideas,

¹⁸ Lecky to Bowen, January 9, 1878, as quoted in Elizabeth van Dedem Lecky, *A Memoir of the Right Hon. William Edward Hartpole Lecky: Member of the French Institute and of the British Academy, by his wife* (London: Longman’s, 1909), pp. 120-122.

¹⁹ Doris S. Goldstein, ‘The Professionalization of History in Britain in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries’, *Storia della Storiografia* 3 (1983), p. 14.

²⁰ See John Gross, *The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life since 1800* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973) for the most important survey of this term.

²¹ E. Lecky, *Memoir*, p. 69.

encapsulated in works such as *The Political Value of History* and *Democracy and Liberty* of the 1890s. As a historian of opinions, then, Lecky is generally regarded as unparalleled for his time. In W.J. McCormack's reading, the historical sociology and other novel forms of intellectual history that Lecky pioneered made possible the study of *mentalités* and micro-communities for further generations of Irish readers.²² He was, therefore, a historian of true European and transnational significance.

And the influences that can be traced throughout his writing serve to emphasise this. Along with the great German and French philosophers mentioned above, he had read Voltaire, Coleridge, Locke and J.S. Mill. But perhaps his most important influences were geographically closer to Ireland. Ann Wyatt has noted that eighteenth-century Dublin was his 'spiritual home', and indeed Lecky has largely been forgotten as a historian with firm intellectual roots in the capital.²³ As an undergraduate at Trinity College, Lecky's earliest forays into historical debating concerned themselves with the legacy of Grattan and the eighteenth-century patriots (as he saw them), that were to become the foundation of his later scholarship. Many of his contributions to British journals draw upon the period of Grattan's parliament as an illustration of Ireland's past glory and peace. His 1874 article for *Macmillan's*, for instance, strongly defended the legislative independence of the parliament and the principle of constitutional self-government in the face of another historian's reductive analysis.²⁴ The Scottish historian Thomas Carlyle, too, exercised a major influence on Lecky's thought throughout his career. In October 1891 the *Contemporary Review* featured a piece Lecky entitled 'Carlyle's Message to his Age', where he details the literary and historical significance of one of the nineteenth century's greatest writers. 'His own special talent', Lecky states, 'was the gift of insight, the power of looking into the heart of things; piercing to essential facts'.²⁵ It was a reflection of Lecky's personal convictions about historiography; that Carlyle's 'standard of truthfulness was extremely high' made him a moral as well as intellectual torch-bearer – one of the 'teachers of mankind'.²⁶

The article also points up some other facets of Lecky's quality as a historian. He was certainly aware of the importance of publication context, and the piece opens with a discussion on Carlyle's difficulty in his early ventures into publishing on first arriving in

²² W.J. McCormack, 'Lecky, Mark Twain and Literary History', Appendix to Donal McCartney, *W. E. H. Lecky: Historian and Politician, 1838-1903* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1994), p. 205.

²³ Wyatt, 'Froude, Lecky, and the 'Humblest Irishman'', p. 273.

²⁴ Lecky, 'Mr Froude's English in Ireland', *Macmillan's Magazine* 30 (June 1874), pp. 166-184.

²⁵ Lecky, 'Carlyle's Message to his Age', *Contemporary Review* 60 (Oct 1891), p. 526.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 525.

London. The Scottish writer's rejection from *Fraser's Magazine* may well have struck a chord with Lecky, who had experienced a similar rebuff from Macmillan's publishers in 1861. Following his submission of the first draft of *Leaders*, Lecky received a letter stipulating that 'the difficulty of reading the manuscript is considerable, and must form a hindrance to any speedy decision on the part of the publisher'.²⁷ Concerns over writing and authenticity, moreover, were to shape and direct much of Lecky's output. Just as Carlyle 'took his literary vocation most seriously', the literary affiliations that occur throughout Lecky's essays afford an insight into his aspirations as a writer. Despite his conscientious use of manuscript sources for the establishment of facts, his anxiety that the development of scientific methods of investigation could drive a wedge between history and literature emerges very clearly.²⁸ As one critic has observed, his concern was 'almost exclusively with written evidence, with literature in its broadest definition'.²⁹ That Lecky was a generalist, who wrote for the broad, educated reading public, is an accepted fact that helped earn him a continued place within the periodical press. Pieces such as 'The History of the Evangelical Movement' in an 1879 issue of the *Nineteenth Century* were not just intellectual but educational. As a journalist, Lecky attempted to contribute to the improvement and visibility of high culture, a kind of canon formation for the historical process. For him, 'history is never more valuable than when it enables us, standing on a height, to look beyond the smoke and turmoil of our petty quarrels, and to detect in the slow developments of our past, the great permanent forces that are steadily bearing nations onwards to improvement or decay'.³⁰

Somewhat surprisingly, then, only a number of Lecky's periodical contributions concern themselves directly with history. He is featured variously as a reviewer, a political commentator and obituary writer, though a historical lens is a recurring element throughout the pieces. More interestingly, perhaps, is the authority which lends weight to his evaluations on such subjects. Editors such Archibald Grove at *The New Review* and James Knowles of the *Nineteenth Century* were shrewd commercial operators, who understood the cultural value of such prestigious names. Lecky's articles appeared, for example, in the same issues as E.A. Freeman (writing on developments in Roman archaeology), as well as discussions on classical history by J.P. Mahaffy and the Oxford scholar Richard

²⁷ Macmillan & Co to Lecky, 16 May, 1861, TCD MS no. 19.

²⁸ Pilling, 'Lecky and Dicey', p. 51.

²⁹ McCormack, 'Lecky, Mark Twain and Literary History', p. 205.

³⁰ W.E.H. Lecky, *Historical and Political Essays* (London: Longmans, 1910), p. 41.

Cleaverhouse Jebb.³¹ We can discern here the growing popularisation of history, especially within journals like *The New Review* that maintained a strong literary bent. Readers would have been expected to have at least some grasp on historical trends that were both of general interest and geared towards the current political climate (as Lecky's essays on Home Rule in the 1890s exemplified). Underpinning this visibility, furthermore, was a concurrent awareness of the tensions surrounding historiography. Lecky had built his reputation as an Irish historian redressing many of the inaccuracies of earlier works, and his press interventions mirrored this reflexivity. 'Mr Froude's English in Ireland', published in two instalments in *Macmillan's* between 1873 and 1874, was a scathing review of the historian James Anthony Froude's one-sided account of eighteenth-century Ireland. It handed Lecky the opportunity not only to assert his own reading of the period but, in its counter-balancing stance, to reflect the moral ideology that was implicit in much of his other historical narratives.³²

Lecky's interactions with historians in his press articles, however, went further than one-way commentary. The uniquely generative space of the intellectual journals encouraged sustained engagement between contributors, a technique epitomised by the *Nineteenth Century's* 'open platform' symposia. It meant that matters were open to debate and opposing or corrective opinions were given a platform. More than once, Lecky found himself the subject of such debate. In 1887 Gladstone dedicated an entire essay in the *Nineteenth Century* to Lecky's renowned *History of England*. It centres on Lecky's portrayal of William Pitt, to whom Gladstone ascribes more positive features than were allowed in Lecky's history. The criticism extends to the type of history Lecky wrote, that of 'gathering conspicuous persons and events around the centres of most commanding interest'.³³ But in acknowledgement of the status of Lecky within historiography as well as journalism, the piece opens with a (somewhat qualified) admission:

³¹ E.A. Freeman, 'Recent Works on the Buildings of Rome', *Macmillan's Magazine* 30 (June 1874), pp. 89-103; John Pentland Mahaffy, 'Further Gleanings from the Papyri', *The New Review* 9 (Nov 1893), pp. 526-535; Richard Cleaverhouse Jebb, 'In Defence of Classical Study', *The New Review* 9 (Nov 1893), pp. 495-501.

³² Ciaran Brady, 'Arrested Development: Competing Histories and the Formation of the Irish Historical profession, 1801 – 1938' in Tibor Frank and Frank Hadler (eds.), *Disputed Territories and Shared Pasts: Overlapping National Histories in Modern Europe* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011) includes an interesting discussion on how the reaction to Froude's work influenced the development of Anglo-Irish historiography, where he notes how 'Lecky, whose historical work had previously been little affected by manuscript sources, carefully followed Froude through the archives, revisiting his sources and silently refuting his interpretations, often in point by point rebuttals, but without overt reference' (p. 294).

³³ W.E. Gladstone, 'Lecky's History of England in the Eighteenth Century', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (June 1887), p. 924.

Mr Lecky has long ago reached so high a position in the honourable company of contemporary historians as to place him beyond the action of any fears and hopes, in connection with possible criticism, as may ruffle or perturb the minds of authors who have not yet obtained their certificate. To treat him with less than freedom would be a bad compliment to such a man ...³⁴

The matter was not, however, his only terse exchange with Gladstone in periodical surroundings. In Lecky's case, one of his most substantial articles – on 'The History of the Evangelical Movement' in the August 1879 number of the *Nineteenth Century* – arose as a response to criticism from Gladstone. The politician had taken issue with a passage in Lecky's *History of England* about the nature of the eighteenth-century English church, points which Lecky claims in the article 'have much more than a mere personal or literary interest'.³⁵ It is an example once again of the significance Lecky placed upon his own written authority. Gladstone's critique, however technical it may have been, was taken up as a direct challenge. Lecky concludes by asserting that 'I have endeavoured to defend the position which he has impugned'.³⁶ A letter to a friend around this time confirms that Lecky was 'a good deal occupied' with the matter, and that Gladstone had written to him personally about it. Interestingly, we are also told that it was James Knowles, editor of the *Nineteenth Century*, who persuaded Lecky to make a public response in his journal.³⁷

These incidences point to an aspect of Lecky's writing that earlier commentators had picked up on – that the historian was much more suited to a journalistic, or short-form, medium than a novelistic one. The writer and public intellectual A.V. Dicey reviewed Lecky's six-volume edition for the American journal *The Nation*, concluding that the writer was essentially a historical essayist rather than a historian. Lecky could, Dicey stated, 'describe the men of the past if he saw them, but he has not the gift, granted alike to Carlyle, to Froude, and to Macaulay, of seeing the dead as they appeared when alive'.³⁸ This accusation – his failure of imagination (and therefore his inadequacy as a literary artist) – one can imagine struck a nerve with Lecky, who revered what he called 'complete, elaborate, and well-digested works of enduring value'.³⁹ Writing to his friend Alice Stopford Green some years later he was deeply critical of the tendency to distance literature

³⁴ Ibid., p. 919

³⁵ W.E.H. Lecky, 'The History of the Evangelical Movement', *Nineteenth Century* 6 (Aug 1879), p. 280.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 285.

³⁷ Lecky to Mr. Booth, 13 July, 1879, as quoted in E. Lecky, *Memoir*, p. 154.

³⁸ *The Nation*, 3 Aug 1882, p. 96.

³⁹ E. Lecky, *Memoir*, p. 103.

from history, complaining that ‘it seems as if a certain school of historians almost looked on beauty of language as something ... unbecoming in history!’⁴⁰ Later critics have since adhered to the dichotomy that Dicey set up, between essayist and historian, reviewer rather than *litterateur*. Norman Pilling, in his article on relations between the two writers, largely sides with Dicey, pointing to the success Lecky achieved with his shorter periodical pieces and political tracts.⁴¹ Lecky’s biographer Donal McCartney, meanwhile, is more sympathetic to the historian’s own conviction that he ‘needed the wide canvas and the free range of several volumes to exhibit his historiographical talents to the full ... he was more the long distance man than the sprinter in his approach to history’.⁴²

It is perhaps difficult to avoid the sense that however respected Lecky may have been as an author of Victorian multi-volumed monographs, contemporary interest in his works was due largely to complementary articles, essays and reviews. Keeping to the forefront of public discourse meant retaining a presence in the periodical press, often by whatever means possible. And one overlooked side to Lecky as public intellectual was his role as literary reviewer within journals. Like Hannah Lynch, Stephen Gwynn and other Irish writers in London’s press industry, Lecky was frequently asked to provide educated opinion on new publications relating to Ireland. In August 1890, for instance, he contributed a review of Emily Lawless’s book *With Essex in Ireland* for the *Nineteenth Century*. Lawless’s work was significant for its time, examining as it did the intricacies of Ireland’s colonial past under the Earl of Essex during the Elizabethan era. The narrative emerges from a first-person perspective of Essex’s secretary during the suppression of a Tyrone uprising, and was reported to have duped Gladstone into believing it to be a true account. Lecky, however, praises this authorial dexterity in an overwhelmingly positive piece (perhaps unsurprising, as the two were good friends and correspondents), remarking on Lawless’s ability to incorporate historical ‘fidelity’ into a compelling narrative. There is a strong feeling here of empathy with Lawless’s attempts; that both writers are involved in different ways with the problems of historical representation. In a telling line near the end of the review Lecky hints that Lawless may well be the writer ‘who could do for Irish history what Scott did for the history of his own country’.⁴³ The implicit recognition of a need for a more nuanced connection between literature and history illustrates, once again, the more progressive elements of Lecky’s conception of culture.

⁴⁰ W.E.H Lecky to Alice Stopford Green, 12 April 1894, National Library of Ireland, MS 15,085.

⁴¹ Pilling, ‘Lecky and Dicey’, pp. 43-56.

⁴² McCartney, *W. E. H. Lecky*, p. 155.

⁴³ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘Noticeable Books I: With Essex in Ireland’, *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Aug 1890), p. 238.

But as a reviewer, Lecky was no doubt best known for his early brush with James Anthony Froude in the pages of *Macmillan's*. The two extended reviews that appeared in 1873 and 1874 cemented Lecky's reputation in the public eye as the putative advocate of modern liberal ideology. In attacking not only Froude's representation of historical events but his broader credence regarding the ethical use of history, Lecky sets himself apart as the authoritative voice of rational expertise. He takes care, however, to distinguish between the character of the author and the opinions expressed within his work. The thoroughgoing style of the review directs its criticism at the factual inaccuracies, interpretative inconsistencies and various contradictions that comprised the bulk of Froude's work. In Brady's view, Lecky's main censure of the book was that it 'amounted to little more than a polemic against liberalism and reform, and a panegyric to unyielding authority and brute force'.⁴⁴ But Froude's work also represented an attack on Lecky's personal historical methodology. In dissecting both the formal and ideological flaws in Froude's thought, Lecky warns that 'the power of a dramatic historian in this manner to falsify history without any distinct misstatement of facts can hardly be overrated'.⁴⁵ The significance of these reviews, moreover, can be measured by their resonance throughout the periodical press. Some sixteen years later the Irish MP Justin McCarthy, writing in the *Contemporary Review*, recalls the 'purport and force' of Lecky's comments on Froude, 'in which Lecky denounced the sort of historian who thought it his duty to stand beside the victims of tyranny as they went on their way to the scaffold and curse them as they pass'.⁴⁶

This cultural afterlife of essays and reviews was a defining aspect of the elite press during the later decades of the nineteenth century. For an intellectual of high standing such as Lecky, public pronouncements, even from an overtly historical perspective, flagged up political and ideological affiliations in the eyes of readers. The historical articles and reviews that marked the early period of Lecky's career in London were to retain an immediacy for many commentators in the more politically divisive debates of the 1880s and '90s. Taken together, however, these contributions reveal more about contemporary circumstances for Lecky than any future political leanings. No more than Lawless or O'Neill Daunt, the historian's archive reveals that his periodical publications were a kind of professional scaffolding to supplement and indeed enhance his earnings as a public historian. The range of interests displayed also goes some way towards explaining how the discipline of history was perceived at the time. Lecky's claim to posterity may have rested

⁴⁴ Brady, *James Anthony Froude*, p. 266.

⁴⁵ Lecky, 'Mr Froude's English in Ireland (II)', p. 179.

⁴⁶ Justin McCarthy, 'Mr Lecky's Last Volumes', *Contemporary Review* 58 (Nov 1890), p. 674.

upon his breaking ground in a single field – in this case eighteenth-century Irish parliamentary history – but, in his press interventions at least, he clearly saw this as no hindrance to dabbling elsewhere.⁴⁷ Like E.A. Freeman and other prolific scholars, press visibility offered a chance to demonstrate his intellectual authority on various matters of the day. Rooted in contemporary political discourse, then, Lecky created out of his historical journalism a topical and interrogative style of writing that registered broader trends within the general landscape of historiography.

Lecky as ‘Man of Letters’

If history today remembers Lecky as merely a specialist, dedicated to his long and research-intensive works on historical thought, readers of late Victorian journals would have had quite a different perception of him. The fifteen high-profile articles he contributed between 1879 and 1900 to various publications reveal a diverse range of enquiry, spanning history, ethics and political journalism. In this sense, we can measure Lecky’s influence as a man of letters, redolent of the mid-century polymath committed to intellectual endeavour in its broadest sense. Three articles in particular reflect this heterogeneity of interests. A short piece in *The New Review* in 1893 condemns the ubiquity of modern advertising, railing against the ‘placards [that] are fast vulgarising and defacing English towns and English scenery’.⁴⁸ His concern here is with the diminishing of national character, a sentiment that is echoed in a *Pall Mall Magazine* article of some years later. ‘Queen Victoria as a Moral Force’ was written months after the monarch’s death, and is a sympathetic account of the queen’s life and achievements. He reserves high praise for her role in state matters, describing her as ‘a perfect model of a constitutional sovereign’.⁴⁹ Thirdly, an underlying moral impetus can be seen once again in his 1895 article on the Canadian Copyright act, where he rejects as ‘unjust’ the proposal that Canada be allowed to abolish the British laws on copyright protection.⁵⁰ Writing as one of the ‘Queen’s subjects’, and on behalf of English literature, Lecky’s views in these pieces represent to some extent the anxiety of the nineteenth-century literary establishment about the erosion of high culture. In the mid-century sense of the ‘intellectual’, he saw his role in the press in many ways as that of a moral gatekeeper, speaking with an authority beyond simply his area of specialism. Much

⁴⁷ Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional*, p. 26.

⁴⁸ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘The Advertisement Nuisance’, *New Review* 9 (Nov 1893), p. 466.

⁴⁹ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘Queen Victoria as a Moral Force’, *The Pall Mall Magazine* 23 (Apr 1901), p. 466.

⁵⁰ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘The Canadian Copyright Act’, *Contemporary Review* 67 (April 1895), pp. 481-82.

like his Trinity College peer J.P. Mahaffy, Lecky balanced the demands of disciplinary expertise with a belief in a rounded conception of culture outside the academy.

These contributions, as well as demonstrating the scope of Lecky's interests, underline the importance of reaching what Collini has termed a 'non-specialist public' in nineteenth-century cultural discourse.⁵¹ The very *raison d'être* of prestigious journals was to present a variety of informed opinion for the educated middle and professional classes. As the founding prospectus of *The New Review* put it:

[we aim] to place within the reach of all a critical periodical of the first order, which, as the subjoined list shows, will yield to none in the eminence of its contributors. Politics, Science, and Art will be treated, in signed articles, by writers of acknowledged repute, and literature, both critical and creative, sober and fanciful, will be associated with names that carry their own commendation.⁵²

The disjunction here, between the 'reach of all' and the exclusive 'commendation' of renowned names signals some of the contemporary attitudes towards public opinion. The idea that opinions were *weighed* rather than *counted*, that reasonable and reputable views should be privileged in the identification of a true public opinion, emerges forcefully from these reviews.⁵³ Editors and contributors were attentive to the views of a more enlightened public, from the earliest days of the *Edinburgh Review* (in particular Francis Jeffrey's influential writings on polity and society) to discussions around the power of a widened electoral base in the later years of the century. This issue of franchise reform, moreover, was one that troubled Lecky. In his 1896 volume on *Democracy and Liberty* he articulates a classically liberal position on the rights of the public under conditions of emerging democracy.⁵⁴ His reservations, that 'the strength of public opinion ... needed to carry a great organic change in Britain can never be simultaneously evoked on two totally different opinions' was a view echoed in many corners of both the Liberal and Conservative establishments.⁵⁵ Lecky was convinced that public opinion should be confined to 'the characters and motives of public men'.⁵⁶ He looked favourably, however, on the growth of

⁵¹ Collini, *English Pasts*, p. 308.

⁵² *Saturday Review*, 25 May 1889, p. 652.

⁵³ James Thompson, *British Political Culture and the Idea of 'Public Opinion', 1867-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 23.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁵⁵ W.E.H. Lecky, *Democracy and Liberty* (London: Longmans, 1896), p. 14.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

literacy and the impact of the press on public morality, noting that ‘in our day, the press is becoming far more than the House of Commons the representative of the real public opinion of the nation’.⁵⁷

His influential role at the heart of these debates in British intellectual and political circles mark Lecky out as a distinctly cosmopolitan thinker. This was reflected in his network of acquaintances that spanned various levels of London society, establishing the Irish writer as an important literary and transnational nexus. Socially, Lecky was a conscientious correspondent who remained in contact with a large number of significant figures throughout his career. His advice, both personal and professional, was highly valued, with his friend and fellow writer W.J. O’Neill Daunt assuring him in 1883 ‘that you should deem my paper on Swift interesting gratifies me very much’.⁵⁸ His associates in London included Alfred Tennyson, Robert Browning, Anthony Trollope and Lady Gregory, indicating some of the complex social interrelationships that existed between Ireland and England in the mid- to late Victorian period.⁵⁹ They were facilitated by a thriving salon culture in 1890s London, where gatherings including Lecky, Gregory, Edward Carson and Mark Twain would not have been uncommon.⁶⁰ Lecky, however, often deliberately kept himself at a remove from these elite networks of contact, preferring, as with much of his intellectual work, to proceed alone. Nevertheless, his correspondence suggests a keen awareness of the workings of periodical publication in a social context. Editors, especially Knowles at the *Nineteenth Century* and Frank Harris of the *Fortnightly Review*, were frequent correspondents, requesting Lecky’s contributions on a range of matters. This was not always a one-way dialogue either, as demonstrated in 1890 when Lecky wrote specifically to ask to review ‘With Essex in Ireland’.⁶¹ In cultivating respect on both personal and professional levels, Lecky can be seen as an exemplar of the *belle-lettrist* tradition of these years. Like predecessors Carlyle and Macaulay, he was part of a wider historical community but found associates and friends in literary and political circles of a more general kind.⁶²

These admirers, especially the political type, sometimes came from unexpected areas. Lecky’s status as an established man of letters and his important social standing in the intellectual press became a defining aspect in both the public and private reception of

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 210.

⁵⁸ W.J. O’Neill Daunt to Lecky, November 1883, TCD MS 291.

⁵⁹ McCormack, ‘Lecky, Mark Twain and Literary History’, p. 196.

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 202.

⁶¹ Lecky to James Knowles, Jun 1890, TCD MS 604.

⁶² Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional*, p. 3.

his writings. During the debates over Home Rule in the 1880s and '90s he often found himself facing the ire of the nationalist press in Ireland for his pronouncements in favour of a unionist government. Many public figures, including Richard Barry O'Brien, Justin McCarthy and Thomas Dunbar Ingram were also quick to chastise him for his professed 'anti-Irish' stance. But in private he drew the sincere respect of many who may have disagreed with his overtly unionist attitude. In 1903 Stephen Gwynn wrote to assure him that 'it is the barest statement of facts to say that we never speak or think of your work without respect and gratitude'.⁶³ In the same letter he asks Lecky to subscribe to the early activities of the Gaelic League, which Lecky would later agree to back financially. It was this same sympathy towards cultural nationalism that led Lecky to champion Douglas Hyde, and invite Lady Gregory to his house in London (despite, by the 1890s, a growing difference of opinion over visions of Irish national identity).⁶⁴ These intertwined political and social connections had meaning within the context of late Victorian literary society. Assuming the role of the professional expert in his periodical writings did not exclude Lecky from the traditional respectability allowed to the 'gentleman class' – in one analysis, 'doors were open to the successful Victorian intellectual as much as on account of the social standing of the roles he and his peers characteristically occupied as for his individual achievement in some department of 'serious work''.⁶⁵

In this way, although he was firmly outside the academy for most of his career, Lecky remained associated with the university culture of his alma mater through social and professional connections. Most obvious perhaps was his election to parliament as a representative of Dublin University in 1895. As a means of asserting influence, increasing social standing and drawing political attention, the appeal of 'that great stage' must have been clear to Lecky.⁶⁶ Yet it took the Trinity don J.P. Mahaffy a considerable amount of time to persuade his friend of the value of the move.⁶⁷ Even in this political process the influence of his peers played a pivotal role in Lecky's determination; as he explained to Alice Stopford Green 'certainly nothing except a most pressing request from a number of distinguished men who seem to think that my candidature would be a real advantage for Trinity College Dublin would have induced me to be a candidate for the House of

⁶³ Stephen Gwynn to Lecky, 1903, TCD MS 2317.

⁶⁴ McCormack, 'Lecky, Mark Twain and Literary History', p. 202.

⁶⁵ Collini, *Public Moralists*, p. 33.

⁶⁶ Lecky is quoted as referring to Parliament in 1871 as 'that great stage, a stage upon which, I fear, it will never be my lot to mount', in Jeffrey von Arx, *Progress and Pessimism: Religion, Politics and History in Late Nineteenth Century Britain* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1985), p. 103.

⁶⁷ See the correspondence between Mahaffy and Lecky, TCD MS 965, 2512-2522.

Commons'.⁶⁸ Lecky's association with the intellectual environs of Trinity, however, stemmed from his earliest days as an undergraduate and formed a significant part of his broader scholarly identity. He returned a number of times to speak at the College Historical Society, and in a *Fortnightly Review* article of 1870 on Trinity College, is named as one of the outstanding alumni of the university.⁶⁹ The scholars John Kells Ingram and Edward Dowden, as well as Mahaffy, remained friends with Lecky as his career progressed outside strictly academic lines, and during the altercations over the cultural significance of the Irish language in 1899, Lecky spoke out in defence of the Professors Mahaffy and Atkinson.⁷⁰ The intellectual life of the college was therefore one that sustained the image of the professional gentleman of letters, and both within and without the culture of academic scholarship, Lecky continued to rely on the transnational networks of contact that the university provided.

The complex web of relations that sustained much of his professional career can also be seen within the context of the periodical press. Lecky's contributions to the elite journals were reflective of his social standing, setting up a dialogue that could be traced throughout both public and private correspondence. The interaction between Lecky, Froude and Carlyle is one such significant group of influential voices. Soon after his review of Froude's *English in Ireland*, Lecky wrote to the English historian somewhat ashamedly, 'someone told me that I would never speak to you again after reading your Irish book. I am afraid that you will never speak to me again after reading my review of it in *Macmillan's*. I am very sorry for this as I hate quarrels...'⁷¹ Froude's reply is not recorded, but was most probably not so sympathetic in tone, as Lecky was later to pen a rather more acidic rebuke:

No-one else in Ireland could do anything very considerable to supply an antidote, for I happen to have the ear of the English public ... I have always hoped to get through my literary life without a quarrel, but I believe that in putting on record my views about Mr Froude's book and the grounds on which those views are based, I am doing some real service to history, to the cause of truth and to the reputation of Ireland.⁷²

⁶⁸ Lecky to Alice Stopford Green, NLI MS 15085.

⁶⁹ Max Cullinan, 'Trinity College Dublin', *Fortnightly Review* 14 (Oct 1870), p. 436.

⁷⁰ See Chapter Three for discussion of Mahaffy's role in this controversy, as played out within his *Nineteenth Century* articles.

⁷¹ Lecky to J.A. Froude, June 1874, TCD MS 97.

⁷² As quoted in James Johnston Auchmuty, *Lecky: A Biographical and Critical Essay* (New York: Longmans, Green & co, 1945), pp. 29-30.

To ‘have the ear of the English public’ was a key consideration for both writers. It points to the cultural capital of historical representation, where competition for the public part of spokesperson reinforced an ‘active warfare of opinion’.⁷³ Yet it wasn’t the only connection between the two writers. Thomas Carlyle, as discussed above, was a formative influence on the development of Lecky’s political and social thought, and a writer whose literary ethics he rated highly. Lecky was therefore quick to perceive strands of Carlyle’s ‘peculiar antipathies’ in Froude’s work, but of a kind outdated and misinterpreted by the English historian. Carlyle’s forms of ideal government remain morally unimpeachable, Lecky writes, whereas ‘Mr Froude’s views on the subject are shadowed out with all the obscure majesty of prophetic diction’.⁷⁴ It was a review designed deliberately to place Froude on an inferior intellectual footing, while suggesting the critical weight that denouncements from Lecky could carry in the public sphere.

These shifting social relations illustrate much about the discourse of the late-nineteenth century periodical press. Allied to the professionalisation of English studies within universities, reviews had become a prestigious commodity for writers who sought to gain serious critical authority amongst the general reading public. This institutionalisation of criticism, as Kelly Mays observes, ‘make[s] visible the historical emergence of interpretation as the definitive process and product of professional reading’.⁷⁵ The Irish historian Thomas Dunbar Ingram, a frequent attacker of Lecky, illustrated this preoccupation with critical authenticity in the elite journals. Taking to the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* in 1887, he positioned himself as at once reviewer and subject, dismissing Lecky’s *Leaders* in favour of his own recently published work on the *History of the Irish Union*. The bulk of the article, however, is concerned with refuting Gladstone’s critique of his book (itself published as a scathing review in the October 1887 number), and the ‘system of literary warfare’ which Ingram sees as growing stain on the harmony of the literary establishment. ‘As a citizen of the republic of letters’, Ingram writes, ‘where all stand on equal footing ... I protest against invective, and the use of such flowers of rhetoric as Mr Gladstone has allowed himself.’⁷⁶ This cosmopolitan view of literature (significantly, within a periodical context) recalls many of Lecky’s own convictions on the place of

⁷³ Collini, *Public Moralists*, p. 55.

⁷⁴ Lecky, ‘Mr Froude’s English in Ireland’ (II), p. 167.

⁷⁵ Kelly Mays, ‘The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, in John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (eds.), *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 194.

⁷⁶ Thomas Dunbar Ingram, ‘Mr Gladstone and the Irish Union: A Reply’, *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Dec 1887), p. 766.

historical writing in contemporary culture. In measuring itself against the output of two authorities in the area, it also functions as an example of self-publicity through the practice of literary reviewing.

This awareness – of how to consolidate public authority and esteem – echoes Lecky's status as a nineteenth-century man of letters. His success in a range of publishing ventures, as well as his wide network of acquaintances within the public sphere of London intelligentsia, marked him out as perhaps Ireland's most visible cultural export (and expert) on both historical and topical matters. It is not surprising, therefore, that other aspiring writers and historians often turned to him for advice. Indeed Lecky seemed to adopt almost a pastoral role for many Irish writers, especially women, for whom the professional world of letters was still a largely hostile place. The influence that Lecky wielded with editors and publishers established him as a fruitful point of contact for writers such as Emily Lawless and W.J. O'Neill Daunt. Daunt, especially, seems to have relied heavily upon his friend for help in his periodical contributions. Writing to Lecky in 1883, he displays a marked sense of pessimism both about the current state of Irish politics and his chances of being published within the *Fortnightly Review*. Regarding the 'demoralisation of Irish people' under the Union, he declares

I should deem it most desirable to put these truths before the English public; but they are, I fear, unlikely to find admission into an English periodical ... If you know the editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, would you have any objection to say a word to him that might obviate his reluctance to circulate my statements? You have worked nobly in the cause in your historical writings.⁷⁷

The entreaty seemed not to have worked: Frank Harris's *Fortnightly* featured no article by Daunt in the succeeding issues. But Lecky's interventions for and on behalf of other writers met with more success. His correspondence with Emily Lawless, for instance, is peppered with advice and suggestions on drafts of her books that she would regularly send. Her gratitude, and admiration for his own historical writings, is echoed by the reaction to Lecky's review of *With Essex in Ireland*, where she felt it 'was such miles and miles beyond what the little book deserved, and could only be accounted for on the ground of friendship'.⁷⁸ Alice Stopford Green similarly benefited from such gestures of friendship. In congratulating her on finishing her latest book, Lecky writes 'I think I know better than

⁷⁷ W.J. Daunt to Lecky, November 1883, TCD MS 291.

⁷⁸ Emily Lawless to W.E.H. Lecky, no date, TCD MS 639.

most persons how much labour – and I feel unappreciated labour – to finish a book implies and I heartily congratulate you on having brought it to a successful conclusion'.⁷⁹ It is a mark of Lecky's professional maturity that such interactions were not tainted by political biases: Lawless may have shared Lecky's outlook on Home Rule ('that old boggy', as she called it) but Green, of course, was a nationalist historian whose views on the Irish situation would have diverged significantly from the elder historian's by 1894. As one critic has suggested the fact that both Green and Lecky were elite Irish Protestants may have enhanced their credibility in legitimising parts of an Irish nationalist narrative.⁸⁰

Lecky's political views, certainly, were rarely an impediment to public admiration for his work and widespread influence on Irish cultural production. Stephen Gwynn, writing in 1903, summed up this feeling when he stated

as you know, I do not hold with many of your inferences. But I have been studying Irish history for some time ... [and] I think you have the finest and most uncommon of rewards, in that violent partisans, often half-educated, never fail to recognise the thoroughness and perfect honesty of your exposition.⁸¹

Another enthusiast of Lecky's anti-sectarianism was the politician Horace Plunkett, also a veteran of the English periodical press, who dedicated his book *Ireland in the New Century* to Lecky 'in gratitude to the friendship and counsel which he gave me for my guidance in Irish public life' [sic].⁸² Even Standish O'Grady, godfather of cultural revival nationalism, acknowledged Lecky's role in shaping his own approach towards eighteenth-century Irish history.⁸³ The sum of these relationships and networks of influence constitute, in W.J. McCormack's words, Lecky's 'complex placing in literary history'.⁸⁴ His importance, not only in public opinion but as an authority and mentor to opinion-formers on both sides of the Irish Sea, was widely accepted. Drawing on the esteem of highbrow periodical publication, his articles mirror the intellectual integrity that underpinned his reputation as historian. Perhaps the ultimate man of letters of the latter years of the nineteenth century, Lecky sought to combine the scholarly and social elements of life in the public eye, at once recalling the heyday of the mid-Victorian generalist while gesturing forward to the growing

⁷⁹ Lecky to Alice Stopford Green, 12 April 1894, NLI MS 15085.

⁸⁰ Smith, *A "Manly Study"?*, p. 48.

⁸¹ Stephen Gwynn to Lecky, 1903, TCD MS 2317.

⁸² As quoted in McCartney, *W.E.H. Lecky*, p. 166.

⁸³ Standish O'Grady to Lecky, no date, TCD MS 2541.

⁸⁴ McCormack, 'Lecky, Mark Twain and Literary History', p. 203.

importance of the professional (both in terms of networking and vocation) from the turn of the century onwards.

Lecky's Political Writings

Yet however progressive Lecky may have been in his historical writings, and however bound up he was in contemporary networks of nineteenth-century London, what defines him most often in modern histories are his political affiliations. Contextualising Lecky in this respect is important, and not overly difficult: his collected writings from the earliest published article bear witness to a developing political consciousness, shaped both by policies of various English administrations and the conditions he perceived in Ireland. His most prolific period as a journalist and historian coincided with the era of Parnellite politics, Gladstone's conversion to the cause of Home Rule and a hardening of Irish Unionist sentiment, particularly in Ulster. This section will consider those articles, published between 1886 and 1900, which deal directly with political issues, specifically his interaction with public debates over Home Rule. They reveal the extent to which Lecky belonged to an influential class of public experts, whose appearances in the *Nineteenth Century*, *Contemporary Review* and *Fortnightly Review* provoked responses from across the political spectrum. Much like his views on history, Lecky's tied his understanding of politics to more general notions of progress.⁸⁵ In this respect the eighteenth-century parliament under Henry Grattan assumes an importance for the writer, who regarded its Protestant and loyal nature as setting a standard nineteenth-century politics had failed to reach. Operating within the constantly shifting climates of public and political opinion in Britain at the time, then, Lecky carved out for himself the role of political pamphleteer *par excellence*, a highly esteemed intellectual whose voice could not afford to be ignored by parties on either side of the political divide.

This climate was characterised, perhaps more than any other, by debates around the two significant Home Rule bills of 1886 and 1893. Gladstone's announcement, in early 1886, that he would support the Irish party in Westminster in their aims for Irish self-government sent ripples through the political establishment. One of the most charismatic and articulate English politicians of the nineteenth century, the Liberal leader became synonymous with an era of rhetorical battles and brought a more partisan shade to British politics. Notwithstanding the defeat of both bills, first in the House of Commons and later

⁸⁵ Stefan Collini, Donald Winch and John Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 8.

by the House of Lords, the spectre of Home Rule carried much force in political discourse in the years following. For nationalist sympathisers, it promised constructive legislation on the land issue and an end to Irish representation at Westminster. For Tories and unionists (not necessarily the same but in broadly similar opposition), it sounded a death-knell for ideals of Empire and heralded the encroachment of Catholic agrarian anarchists into high politics. Gladstone had ambitious aims for his elite project: to preserve the integrity of the United Kingdom 'by marshalling the new mass democracy, persuading the English that Irish self-government would reconcile Ireland to the Union'.⁸⁶ The extent to which he succeeded remains open for analysis, but undoubtedly, for almost a decade, the 'Irish Question' became the most pressing issue of British politics.

For Gladstone and the Irish party, as for those on the opposing side, the campaign for Home Rule was essentially an appeal to the hearts and minds of the public. The press played a crucial role in the dissemination of political opinion through local party newspapers and editorial lines, as well as through the elevated platform of periodical essays. Gladstone was not only the spokesperson for home rule within the Westminster parliament, but, as shown above, was its public champion, engaging with writers such as Lecky in the pages of numerous journals. In advancing the historical case for Irish self-government, with particularly renewed vigour following his 1886 election defeat, he conducted what Richard Shannon has termed the 'most sublime example in constitutional democracy of a history lesson applied to politics'.⁸⁷ Alongside Parnell, the sheer force of personality and aura of moral imperative made Gladstone's drive towards Home Rule one of the defining aspects of public relations in the nineteenth century. But unionists, too, were adept at combining 'sentiment and opportunism' in opposing Home Rule.⁸⁸ Randolph Churchill and Joseph Chamberlain, in particular, were vocal antagonists to the Liberal party line, and both canvassed support in Ireland as well as England for the pro-Union movement. Each side relied heavily on support from spheres outside politics, however, and in this respect some of the most important writings against Home Rule came from Lecky himself.

Almost simultaneous with Gladstone's conversion in 1885, Lecky became one of the most eminent champions of the Unionist cause across Britain and Ireland. In the collection of journal articles dating from 1886 to 1893, he speaks to the various dangers he

⁸⁶ N.C. Fleming, 'Gladstone and the Ulster Question', in D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day (eds.), *Gladstone and Ireland: Politics, Religion and Nationality in the Victorian Age* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 141.

⁸⁷ Richard Shannon, *Gladstone: Heroic Minister, 1865-98* (London: Penguin, 1999), p. 515.

⁸⁸ R.V. Comerford, 'The Parnell Era, 1883-91', in Vaughan, *A New History of Ireland*, vol. VI, p. 64

sees inherent in the two bills, threatening equally the social conditions of Ireland and the unity of the British Empire. Opposing Gladstone on a number of platforms, he presents himself as a representative of ‘educated opinion’ and as a scholar familiar with the historical context of the debates.⁸⁹ His biographer has argued that the antipathy between the two men sprang from the fact that they were both moralists, with a deep-seated conviction of their duty to the polity and readership of the press – and indeed Lecky frequently targeted the morality of Gladstone’s different appeals to varied sections of the electorate.⁹⁰ Whether or not Gladstone was an idealist in his political vision has been hotly contested, but it is undoubtedly the case that his strength of conviction mirrored Lecky’s in his periodical interventions. Like the elder statesman, what Lecky brought to the Unionist side was a ‘mind richly versed in the masters of political controversy, and an awareness of what constituted effective political writing’.⁹¹

Lecky’s various interactions with the politician in the *Nineteenth Century*, and their resonance throughout other publications, highlight again the significance of scholarly disputes in the space of periodicals. Involvement in controversy, such as that between the two writers over the tax policies of Gladstone in 1887, worked to attract attention from many different quarters. In this case, the issue arose when Gladstone contested an assertion of Lecky’s concerning the promised abolition of direct taxation during Gladstone’s re-election campaign. Explaining that he finds this charge utterly false, Gladstone declares that ‘the historian of the past, before comparing his morality with the present, should well consider what he is about’.⁹² In the next issue Lecky shot back, with a pithy article that challenged Gladstone’s arguments and cast doubt on the ‘usually very accurate memory’ of the politician.⁹³ But the personal nature of the argument was clearly an irritant for Gladstone, who responded once again in the August number of the journal. ‘Mr Lecky and Political Morality’ paints his adversary as ill-suited to the business of political reporting, a historian who had ‘wandered out of a province which he knows into one which he does not know’.⁹⁴ The dispute was watched with close interest by other periodicals, including the *Saturday Review*, which in June of 1887 gave its readers a detailed description of Gladstone’s criticism. Notwithstanding the continued replies of both writers, the article

⁸⁹ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘The Political Outlook’, *Fortnightly Review* 58 (Aug 1892), p. 243.

⁹⁰ McCartney, *W.E.H. Lecky*, p. 127.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

⁹² W.E. Gladstone, ‘Lecky’s History of England in the Eighteenth Century’, *Nineteenth Century* 22 (June 1887), p. 932.

⁹³ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘Mr Gladstone and the Income Tax’, *Nineteenth Century* 22 (July 1887), p. 52.

⁹⁴ W.E. Gladstone, ‘Mr Lecky and Political Morality’, *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Aug 1887), p. 279.

concluded that ‘the whole controversy has now only a historical interest’.⁹⁵ Set against Gladstone’s magisterial remarks, these interventions highlight Lecky’s preoccupation with his reputation across intellectual circles and the press.

They also illustrate the thoroughness and clarity that came to be associated with Lecky’s mature style. In a historiographical sense, he was no stranger to influencing the currents of popular opinion. His books *Rationalism* and *Morals* charted these ‘climates of opinion’ over centuries, and even *England in the Eighteenth Century* was alive to the importance of organs of the press and public discourse.⁹⁶ In the periodical articles he combined the Carlyle-ian principles of political progress with immediate problems of representative government. The subjects of these pieces address the present through juxtaposition with the past (as in ‘Some Aspects of Home Rule’), with a firm eye to future prospects (see ‘The Political Outlook’).⁹⁷ It was an approach calculated to strike a chord with the British reading public and to mould national sentiment. By 1893, then, the resonance of Lecky’s arguments was a significant factor in the propaganda surrounding Home Rule. Having been asked to contribute articles to both the *Contemporary* and *Fortnightly Review*, in July he appeared alongside the Marquis of Salisbury, Arthur Balfour and Goldwin Smith in a fifteen-part series in the *Pall Mall Gazette*.⁹⁸ Both this and a piece in the *National Observer* some months previously were republished in pamphlet form. This productive phase of activity and political agitating was clearly something that energised Lecky, despite earlier claims of reluctance about making what he called ‘amateur excursions into politics’.⁹⁹ It also brought him to the attention of observers across the Irish Sea. The *Freeman’s Journal* carefully followed his contributions to the highbrow British journals, reporting on his ‘powerful’ article in the April 1886 issue of the *Nineteenth Century*, while Justin McCarthy analysed his political influences in the November 1890 number of the *Contemporary Review*.¹⁰⁰ And Lecky was cognisant of this reception, as he wrote to a friend in 1888:

I have had a good many reviews, and almost all very favourable; more so, I think, than on the occasion of my last volumes. The *Freeman’s Journal* especially had a

⁹⁵ ‘Mr Gladstone on Mr Lecky’, *The Saturday Review*, 4 June 1887, p. 786.

⁹⁶ McCartney, *W.E.H. Lecky*, p. 133.

⁹⁷ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘Some Aspects of Home Rule’, *Contemporary Review* 63 (May 1893); Lecky, ‘The Political Outlook’.

⁹⁸ W.E.H. Lecky, ‘The Case against Home Rule: From an Historical Point of View’, *Pall Mall Gazette*, 24 July 1893, p. 1.

⁹⁹ E. Lecky, *Memoir*, p. 220.

¹⁰⁰ *Freeman’s Journal*, 26 April 1886; McCarthy, ‘Mr Lecky’s Last Volumes’, p. 678.

very amiable (considering my politics) and also very able review, which I should guess to be written by Gavan Duffy.¹⁰¹

These forays into the business of political journalism marked Lecky as a shrewd and perceptive operator. He was highly aware of context, frequently quoting Gladstone, Harcourt and Trevelyan against themselves in his articles, and his correspondence displays an abiding concern with publication and reception. But what precisely was the thrust of these deeply felt political tracts? Perhaps most striking is his preoccupation with the treatment of history in the rhetorical battles over Home Rule. In particular, the treatment of *his* histories takes on a particularly charged quality. Using Lecky's own writings against him had become a gleeful pursuit for many Home Rule activists, as epitomised by Richard Barry O'Brien's articles for the *Nineteenth Century* in 1886. In the same issue that Lecky presented his arguments against a nationalist parliament, O'Brien laid out the ways in which Ireland had been misgoverned under the Union.¹⁰² In quoting liberally from Lecky's *Leaders*, the piece illustrates not only Lecky's supposed shift in political affiliations, but the value of a hostile witness. It was a feeling summed up some years later by the *Evening Herald*, reporting on Lecky's article for the *Pall Mall Gazette*. 'That such an eminent litterateur', the piece stated, 'whose versions of Irish history have made almost all who have read them in England Home Rulers from conviction, should put forward such shallow arguments to confute the lessons to be inevitably learned from his own book is really astonishing'.¹⁰³ These interactions placed Lecky at the centre of a potent mixture of press, politics and history, where the representative worth of his Irish histories became a currency in the ongoing battles for the votes and hearts of the British public.

In this sense we can view Lecky as one of the late-nineteenth century's 'politicised historians', a group who relished participation in public controversies. As the critic L.P. Curtis has remarked, many of the MPs who voted on the Home Rule bills of 1886 and 1893 owed much of what history they knew to the work of such writers as Lecky, Froude and Freeman.¹⁰⁴ John Morley, Gladstone and Justin Huntly McCarthy were some of the many politicians who publicly acknowledged the influence of the Irish historian on the development of their political ideologies. The contemporary T.W. Russell certainly held

¹⁰¹ Lecky to Booth, May 1888, as quoted in E. Lecky, *Memoir*, p. 229.

¹⁰² Richard Barry O'Brien, 'Three Attempts to Rule Ireland Justly', *Nineteenth Century* 19 (April 1886). See also the *Freeman's Journal*, 26 April 1886, pp. 5-6 for O'Brien's response to Lecky's article.

¹⁰³ 'Mr Lecky on Home Rule', *Evening Herald*, 25 July 1893, p. 1.

¹⁰⁴ L.P. Curtis, *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England* (New York: New York University Press, 1968), p. 74.

that Lecky's position 'alike as historian and politician entitles his words to the greatest weight.'¹⁰⁵ It is therefore little surprise that in his own political interventions, Lecky was at pains to assert and correct views on the history of the Irish question. Many of the arguments that were played out between Gladstone and Lecky in the *Nineteenth Century* revolved around competing interpretations of Irish history. Writing some years after their first dispute, during the Liberals' 1892 election campaign, Lecky was seemingly unable to resist revisiting earlier criticism and claimed that '[Gladstone's] very recently acquired knowledge of Irish history is neither accurate nor profound'.¹⁰⁶ The article argues that not only does the politician misunderstand large sections of Irish history, but that he has deliberately manufactured a version of events to attract popular support. If we overlook here Lecky's own subtle manoeuvring of his critical standpoints post-1886, the argument – that Irish history is being whitewashed and abused for the purposes of political point-scoring – is a powerful one.

There were, however, other major themes that linked Lecky's political journalism with the ideology of the elite periodicals. The question of Ireland's threat to the empire had powerful resonance within the press, and Lecky's views on Home Rule were an important nexus in this context. In many ways he had always been a British imperialist: his earliest published work stands testament to the considerable emotive force that empire carried for him, going beyond political unity and encompassing the moral and rational strength of the British (and therefore Irish) people.¹⁰⁷ His issue with Home Rule, he stresses in all the articles, was not with the idea itself of limited independence for Ireland, but with the careless disregard with which its main advocates seemed to view the question of imperial unity. Nationalist leaders, whom he refers to as 'anarchists', did not respect the seven-hundred year history of the imperial programme, something to which Lecky attaches considerable importance. A separate legislature for Ireland would not only 'plant ... an element of weakness' in the heart of Empire but would critically threaten its defences at a time of war.¹⁰⁸ In Lecky's mind, however, it was not only Britain that stood to lose from the move towards Home Rule, but Ireland as well. The 'sense of security that Ireland needs above all things' remained inextricably linked to the financial and social underpinnings of the British economy, where the leveraging influence of an elite ruling class could work to

¹⁰⁵ T.W. Russell, *Ireland and the Empire: A Review 1800-1900* (London: G. Richards, 1901), p. 9.

¹⁰⁶ Lecky, 'Some Aspects of Home Rule', p. 632.

¹⁰⁷ See Preface in Lecky, *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* (New York: Charles Braziller, 1955), xi-xvi.

¹⁰⁸ Lecky, 'Some Aspects of Home Rule', p. 635.

check those ‘elements of disorder’ threatening the ‘dismemberment’ of empire.¹⁰⁹ Of course, Lecky’s political consciousness transcended the often narrow English-Irish dichotomy, and his understanding of empire in these periodical pieces reflects this wider perspective. References to India, Egypt and Canada are common, particularly when equating Irish self-government with the ‘revival of very dangerous questions relating to Egypt and Eastern Europe’.¹¹⁰ The awareness of an international context to British politics is also made clear through examples of European unifications projects of the nineteenth century: Germany under Bismarck and Cavour’s Italy displaying ‘the best tendencies of the time’.¹¹¹

In using these emotive and patriotic arguments against Gladstone’s Home Rule policies, Lecky was deliberately playing on English fears at the end of the century. The cultural impact of *fin-de-siècle* anxiety over the decline of empire had seeped into public and political discourse by the 1890s – despite, as various studies have shown, Gladstone’s government annexing more territory in South Africa and Egypt than even the ‘great imperialist’ Disraeli.¹¹² The periodical press paid particular attention to these concerns, reflecting to a considerable degree its transnational perspective on British affairs. Almost every issue of the *Nineteenth Century* during these years, for example, contained matter relating to the colonies. Lecky’s July 1887 article on ‘Mr Gladstone and the Income Tax’ (referring to the Liberal leader) appeared alongside Herbert Gladstone’s ‘First Visit to India’ and the colonial administrator M.E. Grant Duff’s view on his six years spent away from England.¹¹³ Duff, incidentally, was also to feature with Lecky in the *Pall Mall Gazette*’s essay series opposing Home Rule in 1893, contributing, somewhat unsurprisingly, the ‘Imperial Point of View’.¹¹⁴ The combined impact of this material was presumably to keep the imperial question, and its attendant political and economic anxieties, to the forefront of British minds during the Home Rule debates. The unionist side had in its arsenal a particularly effective ammunition, and by juxtaposing the principles of nationalism and imperialism, Lecky’s brand of historical propaganda became a touchstone

¹⁰⁹ Lecky, ‘The Political Outlook’, p. 246.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Lecky, ‘A ‘Nationalist’ Parliament’, p. 644.

¹¹² K. Theodore Hoppen, ‘Introduction’ to Mary E. Daly and K. Theodore Hoppen (eds.) *Gladstone: Ireland and Beyond* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), p. 22.

¹¹³ Herbert John Gladstone, ‘A First Visit to India’, *Nineteenth Century* 22 (July 1887), pp. 133–48; M.E. Grant Duff, ‘After Six Years’, *Nineteenth Century* 22 (July 1887), pp. 1–30.

¹¹⁴ M.E. Grant Duff, ‘The Case Against Home Rule (VI): From an Imperial Point of View’, *Pall Mall Gazette*, 21 July 1893, p. 1.

in the competing ideologies at play between the parties.¹¹⁵ It is perhaps a striking irony, therefore, that by the 1890s Lecky was supporting a stance on imperialism that he had so firmly denounced in Froude's work some twenty years previously.

Central to Lecky's conception of Britishness and imperial sentiment, of course, was the idea of loyalty. This became a recurring theme throughout his political writings on Ireland, and shaped his judgement of almost all the historical figures he deals with. Lecky was not unilaterally opposed to nationalism in all its forms – he gave quite generously to Gwynn's appeal for funding the Gaelic League, for example – but he showed a particular distaste for the 'disloyal' class, as he called them, who were spearheading the Home Rule campaign in Ireland. The articles from both 1886 and 1893 contain perhaps the historian's strongest condemnation of the 'anti-English' nature of Irish contemporary politics, emphasising in part the complexity of his own national affiliations. His *Pall Mall Gazette* piece essentially differentiates between the concept of *loyalty* as embodied in the eighteenth-century parliament of Henry Grattan, and *disloyalty* as threatened by the proposed Home Rule scheme.¹¹⁶ It was a stance echoed in his other public attacks on Home Rule, as well as his replies to William Harcourt in the *Times*. In laying out the historical nuances that separated the two centuries, the article acts as Lecky's ultimate retort to the critics who levelled claims of hypocrisy at his earlier interpretations of the period. But there is a tangible hardening to his rhetoric in the late 1880s and 1890s. In contrast to his admiration for the press as expressed in *Democracy and Liberty*, his *Nineteenth Century* article 'A 'Nationalist' Parliament' is scathing in its critique of the 'newspapers and popular literature which ... have for years been educating the Irish people in the most inveterate hatred of the British Empire'.¹¹⁷ Gladstone, too, does not escape his charge of disloyalty to the imperial project; it being clear, Lecky asserts, 'how completely he is alienated from all sympathy with the greatness of the Empire, and there are signs that his feelings towards England in particular have developed into something not far removed from positive hatred'.¹¹⁸ For Lecky, patriotism meant loyalty, and for the forces aligned against stability and moral rectitude of Britain it was most clearly the patriotism of the growing polity (under the influence of a dangerous Liberal party) that was at stake.

¹¹⁵ See James Anderson and Liam O'Dowd, 'Imperialism and Nationalism: The Home Rule Struggle and Border Creation in Ireland, 1885–1925', *Political Geography* 28.8 (Nov 2007), pp. 934–950 for an insightful discussion of the historiographical usages of both terms, particularly their relations to one another in the cultural rhetoric of Irish nationalism post-1900.

¹¹⁶ Lecky, 'The Case against Home Rule', p. 1

¹¹⁷ Lecky, 'A 'Nationalist' Parliament', p. 638.

¹¹⁸ Lecky, 'Some Aspects of Home Rule', p. 636.

Conclusion

In the broader context of Irish writing within elite London journals, Lecky was an extraordinarily rich contributor. He was not only concerned with representations of Irish history in the press, but with the forms all kinds of political thought should take. The articles considered here display an engagement with everyday context and yet are rooted in history; they capture the contemporary mood by reflecting on both the past and future of the imperial British state. Lecky can be viewed as a kind of bulwark, shoring up ideas of Empire and its cultural and social mores. His appeal to shared values among a liberal readership rested upon the emotive force of a cohesive, imperial-minded society and the integrity of the Anglo-Irish connection. His convictions, in this sense, made him one of the most heeded Irish voices in the periodical press. The sense of history under threat and a growing tension within historiographical consensus which emerges from these pieces, may be one reason why he engages so personally in the journals. The writing and (re)interpretation of the Irish past had serious intellectual currency during the latter years of the century, as can be clearly seen in his interaction with Froude in *Macmillan's*.¹¹⁹ It may also be why he espouses such deeply-felt moral framework throughout his work, in seeking to reinforce the strained connections between empire, culture and an ethical view of history.

This moral philosophy is central to Lecky's understanding of politics and the historical process. His clashes with Gladstone in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* were essentially a conflict of values, pivoting on notions of loyalty and idealism. In his writings Lecky was largely a positivist, adhering to the external reality of empire and a belief in the progressive teachings of history. Gladstone, at least in his dealings with the Irish historian, was as steadfast in his beliefs – but was also a politician who saw the general need for a more flexible approach to political principles. Lecky's moral standpoint can be once again contrasted with his opponents in the nationalist camp, whose constructivist ideals of a new Irish state sounded alarm bells for the bastion of Anglo-Irish historiography. From their perspective, his vehement defence of the Union was both baffling and admirable: 'it seems to come as natural to him', Justin McCarthy writes, 'as it is to a man of honour to disclose all the truth in a witness box.'¹²⁰ Moreover, the high-political narrative of his histories, in periodical format, had the effect of turning various periods of the past into self-contained

¹¹⁹ Lecky's lengthy, strongly argued and quite personal article can be contrasted with a review of Froude by Oscar Wilde some years later: 'Mr Froude's Blue Book', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 13 April 1889, p. 3.

¹²⁰ McCarthy, 'Mr Lecky's Last Volumes', p. 677.

demonstrations of his moral principles.¹²¹ The disputes with Gladstone, his 1879 article ‘The History of the Evangelical Movement’, and reviews of other historians all encapsulate this firmly-held conviction, what has been termed an ‘innate intellectual conservatism’ in one critic’s reading.¹²²

It is certainly true that Lecky, despite some affiliations to Irish historical and intellectual circles, became (in these journals at least) the literary exponent for a British elite class and values. In the context of the periodical essay, we can usefully deploy Collini’s argument that ‘full intelligibility depends upon a fairly intimate acquaintance with the larger cultural conversation from which it’s taken’.¹²³ This public conversation was one that Lecky helped to shape in the pages of the most prestigious journals. Christopher Morash has noted that in the context of *fin-de-siècle* production, if literary culture was primarily a print culture, it was even more true that political culture was newspaper culture – and by the 1890s a culture driven by all sectors of the press.¹²⁴ Indeed the forms of public debate in the last two decades of the century, although changing, were predominantly structured around the expertise of leading minds. For Lecky, as indeed for many other leading intellectuals at the time, the periodical press was where his political ideas were formulated and where they found their most memorable expression. His contributions – comprising not only politics but history, ethics and contemporary liberal ideology – mark him out as a kind of ‘intellectual hermaphrodite’, the polymath who, by the late nineteenth century, still wielded a considerable influence on public opinion.¹²⁵ Because of the often-complex historical and constitutional issues at play, editors continued to seek out his input into important political debates, where an ability to combine logical argument with powerful and compelling rhetoric made him into one of unionism’s most valuable literary agents. Every public pronouncement during the 1880s and 90s, from letter replies in the *Times* to long-form essays in the *Contemporary Review*, was met with the kind of scrutiny that reflected, in J.G. Swift Mac Neill’s words, his ‘European reputation as an historian’ of high esteem.¹²⁶

¹²¹ John P. Farrell, review of A. Dwight Culler, *The Victorian Mirror of History* (1985), *Victorian Studies* 30.3 (Spring 1987), p. 430.

¹²² Brady, ‘Arrested Development’, p. 294.

¹²³ Collini, *Public Moralists*, p. 56.

¹²⁴ Christopher Morash, *A History of the Media in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 116.

¹²⁵ McCartney, *W.E.H. Lecky*, p. 193.

¹²⁶ J.G. Swift MacNeill, ‘Hibernia Irredenta (I): Mr Lecky and Irish Affairs’, *Fortnightly Review* 65 (Jan 1896), p. 18.

Yet there is a duality to Lecky's role as the successful Victorian political and historical essayist. He was undoubtedly, as his biographer concludes, an intellectual by vocation, remembered not only for his histories but his contributions as a sort of high-class journalist, populariser and educator in the development of nineteenth-century civilisation.¹²⁷ But there is a trace of the reluctant periodicalist to his writings, as he once remarked: 'it was my early aim in literature to turn away from the fragmentary and ephemeral and to the limit of my capacity to embody my best thoughts in complete, elaborate and well-digested works of enduring value'.¹²⁸ It was an ironic stance for a figure who exerted an influence not only over his contemporaries but on the very development of the intellectual press (Lecky and Gladstone's interactions were a favourite feature of W.T. Stead's *Review of Reviews*, for example). Furthermore, he complicates the accepted narrative of exclusive disciplinisation at the end of the nineteenth century. An academically trained and rigorous historian, yet unaffiliated and diverse in breadth of interests: Lecky remained a singularly influential man of letters in an era associated with the rise of the specialist. In periodical terms, the intellectual currency that his historical interpretation carried can be seen in the prominent placing of his articles within journals. Presenting a cosmopolitan face of historical scholarship – as both literary and political in nature – enabled Lecky to manoeuvre between various discourses in late-nineteenth century publishing. As a public historian, political pamphleteer, mentor and scholarly expert, he brought to the pages of major periodicals an informed, measured voice of moral argument that shaped discussions of Ireland and political thought throughout the educated readership of late Victorian Britain.

¹²⁷ McCartney, *W.E.H. Lecky*, p. 187.

¹²⁸ As quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 151.

Chapter Three

Nineteenth Century: Irish Writing and its International Context

The founding of the *Nineteenth Century* in March 1877 was something of a watershed in the history of the periodical press in Britain. Its editor, James Knowles, had left his post at the *Contemporary Review* to form his own journal, a publication that would reflect his dedication to the Metaphysical Society and its ethos of open, impartial debate on issues of the day. It was a move that was not without rancour – the *Contemporary*, less than happy with his move, published a number of defamatory articles over which Knowles later sued for damages – but the leap of faith was to prove successful. From its inception the young journal was to build on and consolidate what the *Cornhill*, *Fortnightly Review* and others had started in the 1860s, namely the repudiation of anonymity and the pursuit of liberal discourse in its widest and most sophisticated sense. Knowles's experience as an editor meant that the *Nineteenth Century* commanded an impressive reputation from the outset, with T.H. Huxley, Alfred Tennyson and Frederick Harrison among early contributors. Its defining feature was the symposium which Knowles inaugurated as a 'framework within which eminent men could argue their views on serious subjects ... adapting the Socratic dialogue to the conditions of journalism'.¹ This kind of structured controversy, exemplified by the series 'Is Central Africa Worth Having?' in September 1890, allowed the journal to weigh in on matters of serious political import without committing to one editorial standpoint. Perhaps because of this the *Nineteenth Century* remained, materially, in a relatively strong position throughout the 1880s and 1890s. By all accounts its contributors were well paid, and Frederick Harrison reports that in 1884 its circulation was some 20,000 – though this, as with most of the periodicals at the time, can be hard to verify.² Certainly, its relatively high price of 2s 6d would have been prohibitive for the majority of readers in

¹ Walter Houghton, 'Introduction to *Nineteenth Century*', *The Wellesley Introduction to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900* <http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk/toc/toc.do?id=JID-NC&divLevel=1&action=new&queryId=#scroll>
[Accessed 24th May 2018]

² Priscilla Metcalf, *James Knowles: Victorian Editor and Architect* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), p. 285.

Britain, but it never suffered the same financial struggles as either the *Fortnightly* or *The New Review*.

There is little doubt that the personality and strong editorial guidance of Knowles was fundamental to the smooth course of the review in these years. As T.H.S. Escott, editor of the *Fortnightly*, wrote in 1884, ‘Mr Knowles ... has the same craze for social omniscience which I have repeatedly observed among the private sees of ministers ... the world is his oyster, society his happy hunting-ground’.³ Despite this ‘omniscience’, it was clear that he exercised conscious choices about material, discriminating between what was worth including and what was not. His biographer has noted how he positioned himself at the heart of the press establishment with this authoritative persona, an editor with a firm hand in guiding the contents of his review. As letters to W.E.H. Lecky and Emily Lawless (as detailed in other chapters) show, he would often commission articles directly, and displayed continued scepticism about the various ‘new’ movements of the 1890s – in particular the pernicious influence of New Journalism.⁴ But eminent names that could draw an audience counted for much. The Liberal leader W.E. Gladstone, a personal friend of Knowles, was afforded substantial space in which to inscribe and defend his views on (among other things) the ‘Irish question’ during the late 1880s and 1890s. In terms of Ireland and its growing political and cultural resonance in London, then, Knowles was cautiously welcoming. Like most other highbrow monthlies, the *Nineteenth Century* contained ample material on the Home Rule crises of 1886 and 1893, directing and reflecting public opinion through the publication of various political opinion on both sides of the question (although the literary interest in Celtic Revival poetry, ‘a young man’s trend’, passed the journal by).⁵

For the most part, however, this political material is not covered in the following chapter. The *Nineteenth Century*’s most prolific writers on the subject, including Justin McCarthy, Horace Plunkett and Richard Barry O’Brien, published across multiple monthly journals, often rehearsing similar themes and ideological standpoints. Their arguments are discussed in depth in the chapters on the *Fortnightly Review* and *The New Review*, as well as that on W.E.H. Lecky where a detailed analysis of many of Gladstone’s press skirmishes

³ As quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 354.

⁴ Knowles despised the innovator of New Journalism, W.T. Stead, whom he described as ‘that filthy ex-convict ... indiscriminate pirate ... unconscionable cad [with] his stolen-goods truck the *Review of Reviews*’. *Ibid.*, p. 346.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 320. For a detailed and comparative discussion of periodicals’ content on Home Rule, see Ann Parry, ‘The Home Rule Crisis and the ‘Liberal’ Periodicals, 1886-1895: Three Case Studies’, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 22.1 (1989), p. 18-30.

with the Irish historian can be found. To replicate that material here would be largely redundant (although with the caveat that articles on the Irish political situation did appear in almost every issue in the *Nineteenth Century* over these years, and have been the subject of many other studies). Instead, this chapter takes as its focus those writers who established themselves as journalists, commentators and authorities outside the confines of the nationalist-unionist binary of contemporary politics. In doing so it points up the interconnectedness of Irish writing with broader currents of thought in the public sphere, where the *Nineteenth Century's* structured diversity of debate offered the chance to display an intellectual rigour on a platform beyond that of the often-insular nature of Westminster politics and Irish cultural nationalism.

The internationalist ideology of the *Nineteenth Century* provided a firm ground for the kind of reporting in which Irish writers discovered a small but lucrative niche during the later decades of the century. While the editors at the *Fortnightly Review* and *The New Review*, for example, patronised a large portion of the literary and political commentary of the Irish cohort in London, the *Nineteenth Century* showcased a lesser-known branch of Irish cultural production located beyond the shores of Ireland (and indeed Britain). While this kind of 'Irish' writing is frequently afforded only a cursory glance in the critical literature (there is yet to be a full-length biography published of any of the writers considered in this chapter, for instance), its centrality to the pages of Knowles's review points towards an alternative understanding of how Irish writers, journalists, politicians and bureaucrats sought to establish themselves within the literary and intellectual culture of the time. These writers, therefore, were *transnational* in the broadest sense of the word. Edwin Lawrence Godkin, the Belfast-born editor of New York's *Nation* newspaper, wrote for the *Nineteenth Century* on the American view of the Irish question as shaped by his sympathy for British liberalism. His view of contemporary issues from one side of the Atlantic helped to cast light on the ramifications of British expansionist government at a crucial stage in its history. These different points of contact can be seen, albeit in different form, in the career of John Pope Hennessy, who became one of Britain's most outspoken colonial governors throughout the late nineteenth century, and whose mobile lifestyle was mapped onto his writings for the journal. Both figures reflected the broad geographical scope of the periodical as embedded in the increasing trends towards international material in its pages – trends which were heightened in the years leading up to the Boer War of 1899 – and the variety, if not diversity, of voices featured in its pages.

Almost every issue in 1898, for example, contained material on British colonies, expansionist ambitions and the imperial anxieties that were beginning to take hold of informed public consciousness by the closing years of the century. This type of outward-looking perspective was embodied in the writings of two Irish women, Alice Stopford Green and Charlotte Grace O'Brien, during the 1880s and 1890s. As writers engaging in internationally-focused highbrow journalism they were tangential to the traditional orientation of Irish national narratives, yet their place at the heart of one of Britain's most influential monthly journals enabled them to articulate a vision of social justice as a means of challenging some of the hegemonic and gendered discourses of the day. Their pieces utilised and transcended boundaries, not only between Ireland and England, but also on a broader scale between Irish and world affairs. Pivoting on issues of emigration and empire, the articles throughout the 1880s and 1890s convey a sense of social conscience and responsibility that informed the wider worldview of the publication as well as influencing the direction of British intellectual debate. Green's and O'Brien's public interventions in political and current affairs, moreover, represent a shift in the accepted narrative of late Victorian women working as journalists. Their presence in London's publishing scene and pioneering work writing about victims of transatlantic migrancy and the Boer War, respectively, was at the highest and most visible level of investigative reporting. In their periodical writings, they counteracted notions of Irish provincialism (still evident at the time in the cartoons of *Punch*, for instance) and brought questions of gender to bear on issues of serious political and national import.

It should not, however, be presumed that the *Nineteenth Century* was liberal and progressive in all aspects of women's literary authority. The infamous 'Appeal against Female Suffrage' appeared in the June 1889 issue, prompted by Knowles and Frederic Harrison and signed by 104 high-profile women in protest against women's direct involvement in politics.⁶ This strain of social conservatism was echoed, albeit in different ways, by another Irish commentator in the journal during these years. John Pentland Mahaffy's collected contributions positioned him as the unofficial voice of Anglo-Ireland, and of an intellectual class uncompromising in its rejection of Irish social and cultural changes at the turn of the century. Responding to moves to widen the educational franchise in Ireland in the 1890s, Mahaffy's vehement attacks in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* speak to his broader interests in the cosmopolitan cultures of Europe and the classical world. His contributions – the most prolific of any Irish writer featured here – encapsulate

⁶ These included Alice Stopford Green and Emily Lawless, among many other prominent writers, activists and society figures.

some of the breadth of the material that came within the purview of the Irish ‘man of letters’ in the periodical press. He established himself as an authority on archaeology and classical civilisation, and the outward-looking, global impulse of these articles (like his belief in a common language as a global means of understanding) was emblematic of a mid-Victorian belief in a social elite and strict class order. If the scandal over the teaching of Irish language in 1899 (which Mahaffy opposed) was to show anything, it was to highlight the pressures coming to bear on an old-world cosmopolitan view of cultural production and consumption. In this way, it reflected Knowles’s distrust of Gaelic Revival literature, or indeed any form of linguistic and cultural nationalism. It also highlighted the broader (and neglected) scope of Irish prose writing and investigative reporting in the years prior to 1900. Much like O’Brien, Godkin or Hennessy, the journal offered Mahaffy an opportunity to turn his intellectual energies away from narrowly ‘Irish’ material and, in this format at least, espouse an alternative vision for the literary, cultural and social possibilities of Irish writing abroad.

E. L. Godkin and John Pope Hennessy: Foreign Correspondence

Both Godkin and Hennessy were products of the aspirational Irish middle class of the late-nineteenth century, which chose for the most part to look beyond Ireland for its manifestation of literary or political ambition. Significantly, both were also graduates of the then newly-formed university system – Godkin from Queen’s College in Belfast, and Hennessy from its counterpart in Cork. Under the burgeoning opportunities in the British Empire’s network of operations, both were attracted at first to the London bar, and then further afield in various spheres of work. For Godkin, it was early experiences as a newspaper reporter that set the tone for his later career. Subsequent to his post as a sub-editor in a Belfast paper, his time in London in the 1850s allowed him to expand his journalistic duties with the *Daily News* and the *London News*. He became a war correspondent during the Crimean conflict, which sparked a latent unease with imperial expansionist activities that would inform much of his later writings. These experiences abroad, however, also granted him an outward-looking, comparative journalistic perspective which became a valuable asset for a transient reporter. In a *New York Times* obituary shortly after his death in 1907, the paper lauded his reports from his time travelling in the US, pointing to his ‘powerful influence in setting before liberal England the actual condition and temper of the South a few years before the Civil War’.⁷ This attention to an

⁷ ‘The Career of E.L. Godkin’, *New York Times*, 20 April 1907, p. 252.

British audience became a marked feature of Godkin's writing, as demonstrated by his *Nineteenth Century* articles in the 1880s. Throughout his career, indeed, this propensity to express his views of government in the face of increasing threats to a classical liberal worldview (to which he subscribed), was perhaps most relevant to Britain, the country that had espoused a Gladstonian rule of fair government over its dominions. As one of his later biographers was to put it, Godkin came to America to witness for himself the 'living demonstration of those democratic principles of government which with him were bred in the bone'.⁸

Ireland also became a recurring template for his analyses of national attitudes and administration, and he maintained a focus on the interactions between Irish and English viewpoints. This can be traced clearly in his first article for the *Nineteenth Century* in August 1882. Purporting to be 'An American View of Ireland', the piece could just as easily be described as an Irish expatriate's view of Anglo-Irish relations as refracted through a transatlantic lens.⁹ It opens with the claim that 'some things ... are better seen at a distance than hard by' as a means of addressing, with some level of objectivity, the anti-Irish sentiment that he saw at play in England.¹⁰ Implicit in this is an insight into the kind of identity negotiations that would undoubtedly have been familiar to Godkin. In many crucial ways, he claims,

Irishmen succeed in England not as Irishmen but as Englishmen. That is to say, an Irishman who shows the kind of qualities which Englishmen love and honour undergoes an unconscious transformation in their minds. They cease to think of him as an Irishman, they annex him as it were; and the less frequently he reminds them of his origin, either in speech or manner or tone of mind, the better they like him.¹¹

This insistence on a fractious relationship was inevitably coloured by the context of the Home Rule crisis that was to escalate in the latter years of the decade. Godkin was a believer in the aims of Parnell, and the article largely endorses the legislative independence called for by the Irish members of the British parliament. He also credits, however, the failure of amelioration and assimilation on behalf of the English as key factors in the campaign for Home Rule. The article serves an explanatory purpose in illuminating Irish

⁸ Rollo Ogden, *Life and Letters of Edwin Lawrence Godkin Vol. 1* (London: Macmillan, 1907), p. 109.

⁹ E.L. Godkin, 'An American View of Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 12 (Aug 1882), pp. 175-192.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 175

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

views and grievances for an English audience – a readership that the piece assumes is an enlightened, educated and sympathetic one. In this regard Godkin's appeal to a sense of imperial patriotism is significant, highlighting the extent of Ireland's 'contribution to the greatness of the Empire in capacity of all kinds, both military and civil'.¹² Indeed throughout this piece, and his subsequent ones in the journal, Godkin adopts the role of 'constructive outside critic', keen both to display his objectivity and to point out the 'egregious' statements of Goldwin Smith, around whose 'reactionary anti-Irish bigotry' much of the article revolves.¹³

Alongside these discussions of proposed political solutions and details of policy, the piece also displays an awareness of how Ireland and its cultural life is rendered in the English public imagination. Much like Hennessy's article two years later, on 'What do the Irish Read?', Godkin is keen to impart a knowledge of the cultural heritage of both nations, and how the displacement of much of Ireland's literary output had left an ambiguous and disillusioned national tradition in his home country. 'Englishmen', he writes, 'have on everything connected with Ireland the ear of the world. They control the only literature through which Irishmen can reach other civilised nations, and wherever they go they are in a certain sense preachers of Irish inferiority'.¹⁴ Godkin also gestures, albeit with reservations, towards the trend of cultural nationalism that was tentatively beginning to gain purchase in London around this time. He dismisses it as all but useless to the rationalities of political debate, a phenomenon devoid of reality where 'the Ireland which is talked of at Irish meetings and sung about by Irish poets has never been known'.¹⁵ In the same paragraph he underlines the significance of American constructions of such a heritage, drawing together a tripartite system of imaginary inheritance that places the emigrant's experience of Irish-America at the heart of growing anti-English sentiment.

There is also, however, a sustained sense of where the Irish figure in an American sphere of political thought. The United States in the article is positioned as a possible precursor or precedent for the Irish experience under British rule, the 'curious power of assimilation' that tends to negate a distinctive national identity.¹⁶ These feelings are echoed in an article of August 1887 entitled 'American Opinion on the Irish Question', in which the writer is once again concerned with the progress of Irish matters in the English

¹² Ibid., p. 181.

¹³ Leslie Butler, *Critical Americans: Victorian Intellectuals and Transatlantic Liberal Reform* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), p. 236.

¹⁴ Godkin, 'An American View of Ireland', pp. 180-1.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 179

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 176.

parliament, but also with their resonance in the transatlantic public sphere. The piece, written in reaction to Matthew Arnold's assaults on American writers' reluctance to engage with the ramifications of Home Rule in the British parliament, takes issue with the implication of anti-intellectualism among the American press and letters. Opening with a quote from Arnold's barb that 'Mr Godkin is [but] an Irishman', Godkin goes on to defend the reputation of American journalists and academics against Arnold's accusations.¹⁷ He canvasses opinion on the Irish question among prominent college professors, and interprets the results in a manner of formal data collection. Summing up the evidence (largely in favour of Home Rule), he presents it to the readers of the *Nineteenth Century* as a rebuttal to the 'almost childish delusion' of Arnold, Goldwin Smith and others that

intelligent Americans, whether they understood the Irish question or not, disapprove of Home Rule, and that English statesmen have their sympathy in refusing it, an that American legislatures in supporting it by resolution, and American newspapers in arguing in its favour, are simply trying to please Irish-American voters.¹⁸

Despite this rather volatile language that tended to raise hackles – A.V. Dicey's pro-Unionist views on the subject in the *Contemporary Review* also prompted Godkin into a disparaging retort – the critic Leslie Butler has pointed to the 'evidence of a liberal consensus [that] emerged around the principle of local self-government for the Irish' at the time.¹⁹ Indeed, within a year even the wrangling between Arnold and Godkin had died down, with Arnold writing to recommend the Irish journalist to stand for parliament 'instead of editing even so good a paper as the *Nation* at [sic] New York!'²⁰

If Ireland was often taken as a flash point for American engagement with questions of national identity and self-government, an article from Godkin a year earlier had shifted the perspective to show how the US could stand as a model for modern conceptions of Home Rule. Tracing examples of how a successful confederate government might function, 'American Home Rule' outlines how 'the extraordinary love and admiration with which Americans now regard the Federal government are the result of eighty years' experience of its working'.²¹ In this article, perhaps more than any other in his *Nineteenth Century* oeuvre, Godkin utilises a transnational frame of reference in support of his theory that 'the

¹⁷ E.L. Godkin, 'American Opinion on the Irish Question', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Aug 1887), p. 285.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 291.

¹⁹ Butler, *Critical Americans*, p. 239.

²⁰ As quoted in Ibid.

²¹ E.L. Godkin, 'American Home Rule', *Nineteenth Century* 19 (Jun 1886), p. 794.

Irish are not peculiar in their manner of expressing their discontent with a government directed or controlled by the public opinion of another indifferent or semi-hostile community which it is impossible to resist in open warfare'.²² Through a history of the constitutional acts that led to the establishment of the American confederation, Godkin is answering back to the notion that the US example undermined the Irish case for self-government.²³ Allied to this, his writing demonstrates a keen awareness of the centrality of historiography in how politics is played out in the English and Irish public spheres – even from his viewpoint as editor of the *Nation* in America. Echoing W.E.H. Lecky, his editorial pronouncements during these years place the controversial imperialist James Anthony Froude in the crosshairs of a firm anti-colonial invective. He laments how

Mr Froude's attempts to secure from the American public a favourable judgement on the dealings of England with Ireland has had one good result – though we fear only one – in leading to a little closer examination of the real state of American opinion about Irish grievances than it has yet received.²⁴

This attack was in line with his observant but heartfelt critique of how a certain strand of British intellectual life had historically underplayed the significance of liberal American concerns, and the worry that crucial political developments across the Atlantic would be viewed as off limits to an enfeebled American audience.

In his preoccupation with desirable forms of government and national issues of self-rule, therefore, these *Nineteenth Century* articles establish Godkin in the tradition of the liberal man of letters. They also emphasise the transnational forms that his writing took. In the February 1886 issue of the journal he turns his gaze most closely to his adopted country and to 'An American View of Popular Government'. The piece takes as its central focus a review of the legal historian (and founder of the *Saturday Review*) Henry Maine's work, 'The Prospects of Popular Government', in which he was circumspect about the viability of democracy in mid- to late-century Britain. Godkin uses Maine as a starting point to depict for his English audience the workings of the American legislative assembly, as well as examples of other democratic governments. Admitting to his own laissez-faire leanings in the area of government and social policy ('I am not an enthusiast for Popular Government

²² Ibid., p. 801.

²³ Daniel Mulhall, 'Men at War: Nineteenth-Century Irish War Correspondents from the Crimea to China', *History Ireland* 15.2 (Mar 2007), p. 33.

²⁴ E.L. Godkin, *Reflections and Comments, 1865-1895* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), p. 56.

... I believe politics to be an extremely practical kind of business'), he nevertheless largely agrees with the claim that 'the United States ... [is] the one country in the world in which Popular Government, as he defines it, really exists'.²⁵ But the deficiencies in such a system occupy the most space in Godkin's article, drawing as he does on the anti-intellectual impulse in American popular thought and the alarming influence of cheap newspapers. These feelings, a 'pessimistic but perceptive reading of the flaws of American democracy', were to develop in later years into a conviction that 'the American "experiment" had betrayed its ideals and the moral possibilities it held for Britain, Ireland, Europe and the rest of the world'.²⁶

Within these articles, Godkin's emphasis on ideals of government and their ethical implications find echo in the writings of his contemporary, John Pope Hennessy. Similarly concerned with the international aspects of British policy, Hennessy's pieces drew more on his practical experiences of the administrations and personalities involved. His time as a British colonial governor, which will be explored in more detail further on in the chapter, no doubt sharpened his focus on British dealings with Ireland, within a context of imperial expansion at the time. Like Godkin, he was also geographically removed from the wrangling of Irish and British politicians in Westminster of the 1880s. He was colonial governor of Hong Kong from 1876 to 1882, and moved to a post in Mauritius in early 1883. His contribution to the *Nineteenth Century* in 1884, entitled 'Lord Beaconsfield's Irish Policy', adopts a somewhat different approach to Godkin. Hennessy concentrates on the Tory figurehead and former Prime Minister Lord Beaconsfield (or Benjamin Disraeli), in contrast to Godkin's more generalised assessment of governmental rule. The piece stresses Beaconsfield's compelling strength of personality as having a formative influence on policy, particularly in relation to Ireland. In this way it paints Hennessy as an adherent of the 'great man' theory of history and governance. Written only four years after its subject's death, the article also functions as an act of reputational rehabilitation. It traces the history of the statesman's actions in Ireland, especially debates over emigration where Hennessy seeks to correct popular misconceptions in regard to the 'Liberal panacea for Ireland ... I think nothing is worse'.²⁷ Hennessy's is a loyal and largely sympathetic account that draws on testimonies of colleagues, friends and lengthy quotes from Disraeli himself. Justin McCarthy, Hennessy's close friend and Irish nationalist MP, somewhat

²⁵ E.L. Godkin, 'An American View of Popular Government', *Nineteenth Century* 19 (Feb 1886), p. 179, 182.

²⁶ Myles Beupre, 'What are the Philippines going to do to us?' E. L. Godkin on Democracy, Empire and Anti-Imperialism', *Journal of American Studies* 46.3 (Aug 2012), p. 727.

²⁷ John Pope Hennessy, 'Lord Beaconsfield's Irish Policy', *Nineteenth Century* 16 (Oct 1884), p. 665.

remarkably agreed with this admiration. In a letter to Hennessy after reading the draft of the article, McCarthy described it as a ‘highly valuable and most timely essay’, adding (perhaps wishfully) that were Beaconsfield still alive, ‘I think he would make up his mind to go in boldly for Home Rule’.²⁸ However questionable this assertion may have been, Hennessy is keen to point out his regard for Disraeli’s historical acumen, noting how ‘he is the only Prime Minister who has appealed to historic incidents that touch on the hearts of the Irish people’.²⁹ This admiration is unsurprising, perhaps, given the impact that Disraeli had on the young Hennessy’s career; the political patronage that afforded the Irish writer a steady and lucrative job in the colonial service for much of his life.

This influence of intellectual and political heavyweights – an acceptance of the narrative of the ‘great man’ tradition – is therefore tangible even across the Liberal/Conservative divide in the *Nineteenth Century*. The well-documented career of Gladstone within the Liberal journals, for instance, constructed him as a figure of unavoidable importance, and one whose centrality to the writings of W.E.H. Lecky, Justin McCarthy, Emily Lawless and others is explored elsewhere in this thesis. Gladstone was not, however, the only magisterial figure for *Nineteenth Century* Irish contributors. In the same way that Matthew Arnold recurs as a touchstone throughout Godkin’s pieces, John Pope Hennessy lingers on the figure of Beaconsfield for inspiration. Used either as an authority or a baiting hook by the writers, these personalities signalled for readers a connection to the broader sphere of cultural or political affairs, inserting the writers into the ‘star system’ so successfully cultivated by the journal’s editor. Perhaps the most striking example of this focus on celebrated figures in the Irish context, however, is Hennessy’s life-long interest in Walter Raleigh, as expressed in his *Nineteenth Century* piece of November 1881. This significant article, in many ways drawing on the personal elements of politics, is similar in approach to ‘Lord Beaconsfield’s Irish Policy’ but broader in its historical scope. The article traces the legacy of Raleigh in Ireland during his administration in the late sixteenth century and some of the questions that had beleaguered his reputation ever since. Hennessy’s assessment of this controversial figure is, nonetheless, rather even-handed, even if its leanings are more sympathetic than critical. What is arguably more interesting in the piece is the rendering of Irish history under an imperial lens, perhaps inadvertently reflecting Hennessy’s own career which, like Raleigh’s, included ‘structures

²⁸ Letter from Justin McCarthy to John Pope Hennessy, 14 June 1884. Hennessy papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS.Brit.Emp.s.409, 4/5 f.16.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 668.

of governance and rule, geopolitical concerns and strategies, racial ideologies and all manner of colonial projects'.³⁰

Indeed the question of historiography asserts itself as an immensely important one for Hennessy in this piece. He states at the opening that 'British historians have touched but slightly on Raleigh's Irish exploits', implying that his article is aimed to address that historical wrong.³¹ The article itself draws for a large part on already published sources, such as those by the seventeenth-century chroniclers George Taylor and John Hooker, in order, ironically, 'to engage in a contemporary political debate'.³² Although they grant the piece historical authority, they also throw the narrative somewhat off course. The picture that emerges is of an unstable historical depiction, pulled between competing interpretations of Raleigh's colonial actions. James Anthony Froude, perhaps inevitably, comes in for a degree of criticism over his inexplicable omission of Raleigh in the seminal history *English in Ireland*. It was probably the case, moreover, that the initial impetus for Hennessy's article was a piece published by Froude in the same journal some months earlier.³³ In this sense Hennessy joins Godkin, Lecky, and any other number of Irish commentators in the *Nineteenth Century* who took issue with Froude as 'the ideological vanguard of the imperial establishment and a conservative hardliner on Irish policy'.³⁴ Within the article Hennessy also addresses the question of academic history writing, particularly the correct use of sources, awareness of historiography, and the role of oral history and memory. He points to the peasants of Munster, from whom it is easier 'to pick up more of the real doings of Raleigh and his comrades in Ireland than from Hume and the historians', and the contentious historiographical repute of Raleigh as 'a question of the belief of the long-remembered people on the one side, and the incredulity of ill-informed writers on the other'.³⁵ The Irish writers Lecky and Edmund Burke are noted as sources for Hennessy, as are Justin McCarthy, the Irish Party MP and another *Nineteenth Century* contributor.

³⁰ David Lambert, 'Reflections on the Concept of Imperial Biographies', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 40.1 (2014), p. 27. This mirroring, on the other hand, may not have been quite so inadvertent – Hennessy, in both his career and lifestyle, self-consciously fashioned himself after the Elizabethan explorer, with commentators remarking on 'Pope Hennessy's uncanny resemblance to his subject' as well as the 'similar identity and "literary space"' that they shared. Thomas Herron, 'Introduction' to John Pope Hennessy, *Sir Walter Raleigh in Ireland* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2009), xv, xix.

³¹ John Pope Hennessy, 'Sir Walter Raleigh in Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 10 (Nov 1881), p. 661.

³² Hiram Morgan, review of John Pope Hennessy, Thomas Herron (ed.), *Sir Walter Raleigh in Ireland: Classics of Irish History Series* (2009), *History Ireland* 17.5 (2009), p. 59.

³³ James Anthony Froude, 'Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 8 (Sep 1880), pp. 341-69.

³⁴ Herron, 'Introduction', xxv.

³⁵ Hennessy, 'Sir Walter Raleigh in Ireland', pp. 661, 668.

Hennessy was to extend this article into a book-length study a number of years later, described by its recent editor as ‘a classic example of post-colonial writing from a period of political transition, wherein the writer, consciously and unconsciously, both identifies with and fiercely resists the image and actions of the coloniser’.³⁶ Contemporary readers concurred: the Liberal MP Joseph Chamberlain acknowledged its historical importance in a letter to Hennessy, stating ‘I imagine we should agree as to the past, though I fear we cannot do so as to the future’.³⁷ It is significant, therefore, that Hennessy’s portrait of the Elizabethan ruler found its first published format in the *Nineteenth Century*, the site of so many identity negotiations by Irish writers throughout the late Victorian Era. It could be argued, indeed, that Pope Hennessy’s collected contributions mirror his progression from a wealthy landowner (like Raleigh), to a sophisticated colonial commentator and historiographer like his icon Disraeli. They certainly follow his career across the British Empire and, in the later years, provide a series of important reflections on his experiences. Broadly speaking, they embody the ‘open platform’ attitude of the *Nineteenth Century* and its attendance to, if not global affairs, then at least those relating to Empire. Hennessy’s pieces may also, at least in part, function as a retroactive validation of his imperial successes. His period of governance in the colonial service was plagued from the outset by significant scepticism (and often animosity) from the incumbent imperial administration. Following a succession of controversial postings in Sierra Leone, the Bahamas, Barbados and Hong Kong, Hennessy was forced to retire from his stewardship in Mauritius in 1887 under pressure from various political and colonial allegations.³⁸ He managed, however, to regain his position – as, indeed, he had remained untarnished from the various disagreements that had marked his previous periods of service. This transience allowed him to develop a kind of multifaceted ‘imperial identity’, though not, perhaps, altogether by choice. As Lambert and Howell argue, his mobile lifestyle ‘tell[s] us something about the

³⁶ Herron, ‘Introduction’, xxii.

³⁷ Letter from Joseph Chamberlain to John Pope Hennessy, 14 June 1884. Hennessy papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS.Brit.Emp.s.409, 11/1 f.75.

³⁸ These were largely politically motivated, and focused on the alleged mismanagement of financial affairs, partiality against the English, cronyism and cultural antagonism. Many of his accusers also took issue with his perceived ‘pro-native’ stance in colonial affairs, something that has been remarked on time and again in the literature. See Philip Howell and David Lambert, ‘Sir John Pope Hennessy and Colonial Government: Humanitarianism and the Translation of Slavery in the Imperial Network’ in David Lambert and Alan Lester (eds.), *Colonial Lives across the British Empire: Imperial Careerings in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 231.

fractures that could open up between the metropolis and the colonies, between the entrenched, settled colonial elites and the transient, “excentric” agents of the metropole’.³⁹

It is somewhat ironic, then, that his 1888 article ‘The Chinese in Australia’ deals largely with questions of international diplomacy. Drawing on his time as governor in Hong Kong between 1877 and 1882, the article underlines the delicate and often intricate nature of colonial relations and hierarchies. It discusses the dynamics of Chinese emigration to Australia, and the possible solutions to a problem faced by the commonwealth country, but ultimately controlled by the imperial state. In this way, Hennessy was caught between an English and Australian point of view – in the piece, he is in favour of curtailing immigration to Australia, but is keenly aware of his place within the British political system. In matters of immigration policy and reform, he is critical of Downing Street’s strong-arm attitude, noting that ‘we say to our self-governing colonies, ‘In this matter, of such general interest to you and so vital to your future, you are not to be self-governing’’.⁴⁰ He points to the risk of ‘embittering relations between Australia and England’, but also to alienating America; the United States had, in 1888, recently introduced stringent measures to prohibit Chinese immigration. Pushing home the key argument of the article, he calls on the British government to address the problem in Hong Kong, the ‘conduit pipe’ of outward emigration and a flashpoint for Anglo-Chinese relations.⁴¹ According to Benjamin Mountford, Hennessy’s article was ‘read widely across the Empire and is a feature of most subsequent histories’, but he claims that it should be understood in the context of a ‘calamitous’ career and as part of a ‘thinly-veiled campaign to obtain a new vice-regal position in China or Australia’.⁴² This is a somewhat questionable assertion: Hennessy’s public interventions in the *Nineteenth Century* were certainly strategic, but his motives and career – especially by 1888 – were more nuanced than Mountford’s reading would lead us to believe.

Hennessy’s own record of administration and diagnosis of the colonial condition were further elaborated across journal articles in the following years. Two pieces in particular, published in 1890, again take on issues of pressing imperial importance to Britain. This time, however, the writer’s field of vision is that of Central Africa instead of Chinese Australia. The subject provides the context for questions of colonial value, located

³⁹ David Lambert and Philip Howell, ‘John Pope Hennessy and the Translation of ‘Slavery’ between late Nineteenth-Century Barbados and Hong Kong’, *History Workshop Journal* 55 (Spring 2003), p. 2.

⁴⁰ John Pope Hennessy, ‘The Chinese in Australia’, *Nineteenth Century* 23 (Apr 1888), p. 618.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Benjamin Mountford, *Britain, China, and Colonial Australia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 112.

within the discourse of both slackening economic growth and a liberal European anxiety over further imperial expansion. ‘The African Bubble’, in the journal’s July 1890 issue, deals with the history of colonial enterprise, emphasising the failures of European dominance through private companies ‘chartered to govern millions of negroes, to acquire territory, and to wage war upon those tribes that may object to European rule’.⁴³ Like the previous article, Hennessy’s outlook is refracted through an European dimension, with a consideration of German and Dutch experiences to the forefront of his piece. It also pays testament to the author’s peripatetic colonial background, concluding with the cautionary statement that ‘as long as the land hunger of Germany and France can be gratified by devouring Africa, Her Majesty’s Government have perhaps an opportunity of setting themselves right with Newfoundland, and paying a debt they owe to Australia.’⁴⁴ In the context of the ‘prestige game’ he saw himself entangled in with France and Germany, colonial Africa becomes a space of not only political tension, but of ideological cultural and social battlegrounds.

The vacillation displayed here, between ‘principles and pragmatism’, is central to an understanding of his place within a broader imperial discourse. This placing took on a material form in the two-part symposium published in the *Nineteenth Century* in September 1890. In the article entitled ‘Is Central Africa worth having?’, he is firm in his conviction that the answer to the question is no. The wealth of material resources reported from the continent did not impress a sceptical Hennessy, and in many ways echoed Godkin’s unease at the Empire’s expansionist activities between 1882 and 1895.⁴⁵ Hennessy’s intervention was in response to Henry Hamilton Johnson, a colonial administrator advocating the benefit of African territory to the British nation and empire, whose article in the August 1890 issue of the journal was itself a riposte to Hennessy’s earlier piece on Central Africa.⁴⁶ In a very striking way, then, both Hennessy and Johnston were echoing broader debates and cultural positioning over the progressive disillusionment with Empire. Hennessy certainly saw himself within a literary tradition of colonial commentary: his article quotes at length from various sources on Africa, including Matthew Forster and Henry Drummond. His co-author in the *Nineteenth Century* symposium, moreover, was none other than Edward Dicey, who (somewhat surprisingly), agreed with Hennessy in his rejection of Hamilton’s claims.

⁴³ John Pope Hennessy, ‘The African Bubble’, *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Jul 1890), p. 3.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁵ John S. Galbraith, ‘Gordon, Mackinnon and Leopold: The Scramble for Africa, 1876-84’ *Victorian Studies*, 14.4 (Spring 1971), p. 370.

⁴⁶ Henry Hamilton Johnston, ‘The Value of Africa: A Reply to Sir John Pope Hennessy’, *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Aug 1890), pp. 169-75.

Arguing that ‘the acquisition of vast territorial rights in Central Africa’ would not ‘prove beneficial to the interests of Great Britain’ and that Britain was therefore ‘competing for stakes not worth the winning’, Dicey’s staunch imperialism was tempered by his conservatism: he could only advocate *profitable* expansion of the Empire.⁴⁷

Considered together, both Hennessy and Godkin arguably brought a level of nuance to Irish writing in the *Nineteenth Century* that refutes traditional narratives of the Irish abroad, and indeed gestures towards previously ignored entanglements between Ireland, England, America and the British Empire. As the material above suggests, both writers were sharp-eyed observers of a political system where Ireland was just one part of a broader global, liberal operation of Empire; a network of intellectual exchange, moreover, where the practicalities of governance and elevated political ideals came into contact. The importance of the *Nineteenth Century*’s ‘open platform’ in this respect should not be understated. Its commitment to a diversity of subjects and array of viewpoints were ones reflected in Godkin and Hennessy’s own professional trajectories. As journalists and bureaucrats who developed their careers largely outside Ireland, they are peripheral to contemporary critical discussion, and stood at a remove from the Home Rule-dominated discourse of the day. Yet they expanded the notion of what Irish political writing was and what it could encompass: from Hennessy’s juxtaposition of colonial Africa with a sixteenth-century English settler, to Godkin’s modern-seeming concerns with the experience of Irish-America in the arena of British political thought, they stood at the vanguard of this coterie of Irish writers seeking an audience beyond the traditional avenues of the British and Irish literary fold.

Alice Stopford Green and Charlotte Grace O’Brien: Gendering an International Outlook

Irish women’s international material in the *Nineteenth Century* also represents a significant publishing achievement: in its geographical scope, certainly, but also the resonance it generated in other sectors of the press.⁴⁸ Both Alice Stopford Green and Charlotte Grace O’Brien, two of the most notable examples in these years, challenged conventional or assumed forms of women’s journalistic enterprise in their articles. The close association of

⁴⁷ Edward Dicey, ‘Is Central Africa Worth Having?’ *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Sep 1890), p. 488. Mira Matikkala, *Empire and the Imperial Ambition: Liberty, Englishness and Anti-Imperialism in late Victorian Britain* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011), p. 31.

⁴⁸ Both the Green and O’Brien collections in the National Library of Ireland contain multiple newspaper cuttings commenting on and responding to the *Nineteenth Century* articles. See for example Alice Stopford Green papers, MS 10, 465 (1–5); Charlotte Grace O’Brien papers MS 36, 803/1.

women and literary matters tended to exclude female writers from ‘serious’ issues and news reporting, and it is therefore significant that all O’Brien’s and Green’s *Nineteenth Century* pieces focus on topics of a social and political bent.⁴⁹ Apart from notable exceptions such as Frances Power Cobbe and Emily Crawford, news reporting, especially from an international perspective, was still novel for women journalists. Tied up in the ‘production of authority and authenticity,’ a recent study of the topic asserts, ‘the cultural capital of women’s reporting [in newspapers] accrued to the publication they wrote for, not to them directly.’⁵⁰ The *Nineteenth Century* may have deviated somewhat in its rejection of anonymity and adherence to the ‘star system’ of named contributors, but the promulgation of a woman’s perspective on global affairs was still peripheral to the commercial instincts of its editor, James Knowles. Literary historiography, also, has tended to neglect female intellectual prose journalism, preferring to remember only their fictional or autobiographical presence within periodicals.⁵¹ In this context it is worth highlighting the politicised stances that O’Brien and Green adopt in their periodical submissions. Green is highly critical of what she calls, in an article of June 1897, ‘the comparative aloofness of woman from theological, metaphysical and political speculation’.⁵² Her interventions in the 1890s can be understood, therefore, in terms of their uniquely personal approach, and are reflective of both the contemporary political situation and her own convictions around the intersecting roles of gender, nation and empire in women’s journalism.

Stopford Green was born to a relatively wealthy, Protestant family in 1840s Ireland. Her marriage to the historian John Richard Green was short but influential, with his death in 1883 leaving her with a substantial income and a large network of important contacts. At their London home in the 1880s and ’90s she would frequently host soirées for a range of journalists, politicians, Irish nationalists and writers, effectively placing her at the heart of a liberal, transnational salon culture of the late nineteenth century.⁵³ In perhaps a tribute to her husband’s professional legacy, much of Green’s intellectual energies in these years

⁴⁹ Many of the women who appeared in the *Wellesley Index* were limited to literary reviewing, an activity ‘perceived as demanding, intellectual, and closer to literature than other forms of journalism.’ See F. Elizabeth Gray, ‘Introduction’ to F. Elizabeth Gray (ed.), *Women in Journalism at the Fin de Siècle: Making a Name for Herself* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 6.

⁵⁰ F. Elizabeth Gray and Nikki Hessel, ‘Gender and Journalism: Women and/in the News in the Nineteenth Century’, *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies* 10. 2 (2014) [no pagination].
<http://www.ncgsjournal.com/issue102/introduction.htm>

⁵¹ Sally Mitchell, *Frances Power Cobbe: Victorian Feminist, Journalist, Reformer* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004), p. 3.

⁵² Alice Stopford Green, ‘Women’s Place in the World of Letters’, *Nineteenth Century* 41 (June 1897), p. 968.

⁵³ R.B. McDowell, *Alice Stopford Green: A Passionate Historian* (Dublin: A. Figgis, 1967), p. 49.

found their expression in works of history, from which she was to draw inspiration in her later nationalist sympathies during the Irish revolutionary period. Her connection to professional historians, in particular, was significant: John Morley commissioned her to write a biography of Henry II in 1888, while the Irish writer W. E. H. Lecky was an early and stimulating mentor. Although, much like O'Brien, she is better remembered for her contributions to the nationalist cause in the early twentieth century, it is arguably this more formative experience as a late Victorian journalist that is key to her literary development. Green's roles as activist, historian and foreign correspondent during the 1890s provided the ideological cornerstone for much of her public output, and her ability to bring historical perspectives into play in her Boer War articles appealed to the broad-interest readership of the *Nineteenth Century*. Drawing together her interest in personal narratives, empire and the status of African nations (she was to co-found the African Society in 1901), her *Nineteenth Century* articles on Boer prisoners and Anglo-Dutch history speak to her cosmopolitan, socially aware outlook that ensured she 'remained on the frontline of public polemics' during these years.⁵⁴

Charlotte Grace O'Brien, meanwhile, was born to a somewhat more illustrious family—her father was the former MP William Smith O'Brien, credited as the leader of the 1848 Young Ireland rebellion, and landowner of a large estate in County Limerick. Growing up in a highly-charged political atmosphere no doubt influenced the young O'Brien, who was to devote much of her life to social activism and political change. Her most recognised political contribution was to the cause of Irish emigrants to the US, particularly young women, and the conditions and abuses that faced them on the journey. She established a lodging house in Cobh for emigrants pre-departure, and carried out inspections of the conditions of steerage accommodation on transatlantic ships in the harbour. Much of her activism, however, was mediated through—and indeed would not have been possible without—the periodical press. She was an accomplished writer who used the platform of newspapers, magazines and highbrow journals to articulate the injustices she saw as facing Irish women both at home and abroad. During her project of investigating the conditions and abuses of poor passengers in Cobh, she produced a major exposé in an article entitled 'Horrors of an Emigrant Ship.' Its publication in the influential *Pall Mall Gazette* in 1881 prompted a public outcry and a government investigation into the practices of the White Star Shipping Line.⁵⁵ Her use of the press in this way very much

⁵⁴ Angus Mitchell, 'Alice Stopford Green and the Origins of African Society', *History Ireland* 14.4 (July 2006), p. 23.

⁵⁵ Helen Rappaport, *Encyclopedia of Women Social Reformers* (Oxford: ABC-CLIO, 2001), p. 499.

links her to New Journalism, and its practices of advocacy, immediacy and reader engagement. Her lecture tours of North America between 1881 and 1883, promoting the cause of disenfranchised Irish emigrants, brought her into contact with a number of early members of the Gaelic League and supporters of her father's Young Ireland movement. Yet despite a number of successful books and poems that were sympathetic to the cause of burgeoning Irish nationalism, O'Brien, like Stopford Green, continues to suffer from a critically blinkered view of 'orthodox' Irish writing.

This was perhaps due in part to their participation, in F. Elizabeth Gray's words, in the broader phenomenon of 'women journalists' search for new sources of recognition and new forms of identity through their writing for periodicals.⁵⁶ Green and O'Brien fulfilled this criterion by cultivating distinctive voices in their respective *Nineteenth Century* articles. Through the social and political activism of these pieces both women sought a public profile for their work; a task which was beset by challenges amid the late Victorian explosion in periodical enterprises. Writing anonymously for *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in June 1893, another Irish litterateur in London, Charlotte O'Connor Eccles, describes how in attempting to find a break on Fleet Street '[o]ne is horribly handicapped as a woman. A man meets other men at his club; he can be out and about at all hours; he can insist without being thought bold and forward; he is not presumed to be capable of undertaking only a limited class of subjects, but is set to anything.'⁵⁷ O'Brien and Green may have been cushioned somewhat from the urgent material needs of Eccles, but her experience points to the frustrations inherent in the construction of a professional identity as a woman writer within the elite press.

In various senses, also, Green and O'Brien occupy a complex cultural dislocation within canonical accounts of Irish literature and history.⁵⁸ Not only did they eschew the cultural and geographical focuses of the Irish Revival in their writings, but also, unlike many other Irish women who published for an English audience, they were not primarily novelists or involved in the business of the *fin-de-siècle* literary marketplace. Instead, they demonstrate the complexities of national character in the face of cosmopolitan publishing market and, within their periodical articles, show how Irish transnationalism impacted upon imperial and transatlantic exchanges. Specifically, as a literary identity, theirs was not insular or necessarily self-reflective but outward-looking and humanitarian in its impulses.

⁵⁶ Gray, 'Introduction' to *Women in Journalism at the Fin de Siècle*, p. 10.

⁵⁷ Charlotte O'Connor Eccles, 'The Experiences of a Woman Journalist', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 153 (June 1893), p. 831.

⁵⁸ Whitney Standlee, *'Power to Observe': Irish Women Novelists in Britain, 1890–1916* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 24.

In the tradition of upper-class philanthropy of the late Victorian era, both Green and O'Brien's articles focus on the plight of displaced people. For Green, it was the prisoners of war in St Helena during the Boer War, while O'Brien concerned herself with Irish emigrants to America whom she visited and campaigned for. These articles, then, represent the fruits of a mobile lifestyle and access to networks that enabled their reporting. Green, for instance, was in contact with the War Office during and prior to her visit in 1900, and was allowed access to the prisoners within the camps, while O'Brien enlisted the help of Bishop Ireland while in New York. In this way, their writings and careers were very much transnational, allowing them to transcend (in a Revivalist sense) the limited dichotomy of England and Ireland and bring to the readership of the *Nineteenth Century* a clear-eyed criticism of colonial and government policy abroad just prior to the crystallisation of nationalist sentiment in the twentieth century.

Alice Stopford Green's two most significant articles in the journal concerned her visit to St Helena, the British-controlled island off mainland Africa used to house prisoners during the Boer War. As the conflict raged in South Africa, and enraged the scion of British Liberals and Irish nationalists who opposed Britain's strong-arm policies in the Transvaal, Green's sympathies were drawn to the displaced Boers on these offshore prisoner-of-war camps. Sparked by the death in June 1900 of Mary Kingsley, a friend of Green and a prominent pro-Boer activist, Green's visit represented the start of a more active interest in Africa and colonial affairs in her writings. Although 'warned by my wiser friends against the Quixotic idea of going,' the trip was to prove beneficial for her journalistic reputation.⁵⁹ The resulting press coverage—of which the *Nineteenth Century* articles were central—was instrumental in constructing a public perception of both penal conditions and the work of Green herself. Her first article, in the December 1900 issue, professed its purpose as 'simply to tell a few incidents which I saw for myself, and of which I speak only because they came within my personal knowledge.'⁶⁰ This careful emphasis on a first-person narrative is a key feature of the piece, which places to the fore interviews with prisoners and their accounts of British treatment. Significantly, she viewed the article as contributing to (and indeed improving) the broader purpose of journalism, being 'anxious to form for myself a clearer impression of the Boers than I could gain from the public press.'⁶¹ The highly detailed, descriptive renderings of camp life and the island's landscape and climate

⁵⁹ Alice Stopford Green, 'A Visit to the Boer Prisoners at St. Helena', *Nineteenth Century* 48 (Dec 1900), p. 972.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

did, however, form part of her criticism of what she saw around her. The island, ‘a colossal slag-heap’ in severe weather conditions, had been corrupted under British use to expose ‘a sordid Nature, tattered and battered, ignoble, dingy, vulgar and unashamed! Everything is foreign, dejected, incongruous. The Kaffir thorn, the African palm, the Indian banyan, the Scotch fir, the Port Jackson, willow, are not at home, but transported as it were to a friendless inn.’⁶² These images (with their undertones of colonial seediness) stand starkly against visions of moral and national purity embodied in the Boers, whom she describes at various times as industrious, grateful, cheerful and self-respecting. They also feed into her implicit critique of imperial actions and infrastructure, which makes itself felt in reports of injustices against the Boer population. Moreover, the article hints at a morally corrupt and unfit political system in England that has, through its public organs, contributed to the shameful state of things she witnesses. The common stereotype of the Boer, Green claims, ‘belongs to the cheap emotional politics of the day,’ while their common British ancestry ‘ought to be better understood and appreciated by those who would extend the true influence of England.’⁶³

If the piece’s conclusion veers away from explicit criticism of the English (she admits to being on the side of ‘making Imperial rule beloved’), her second article in May 1901 pulls no such punches.⁶⁴ More strident in tone, ‘Our Boer Prisoners—A Suggested Object-Lesson’ again bases itself on the impressions and opinions of inmates, this time taking them as a starting point for some ‘very grave considerations.’⁶⁵ She devotes long sections to Boer grievances surrounding the war, which display a demonstrable hardening of attitudes as compared to the previous article. One recurring element here is loyalty to their cause in the face of ‘unjust’ British demands, gesturing towards a more bitter and entrenched political opposition on behalf of the Boers. The treatment of prisoners in the camps, furthermore, is shown to be detrimental to English policies in the Transvaal, as ‘“there is one good thing in this war,” a Boer said to me. “When we get back we shall all be one. All sides [against the British] will understand one another now”.’⁶⁶ In the second section of the article Green is more overt in her views, putting forward political considerations for the management of the conflict and potential solutions for the tensions caused by Boer mistreatment. Speaking from a historian’s perspective, she points to ‘the whole problem of the intellectual and moral impression produced on the prisoners, and the

⁶² Ibid., 974.

⁶³ Ibid., 980, 977.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 983.

⁶⁵ Green, ‘Our Boer Prisoners: A Suggested Object-Lesson’, *Nineteenth Century* 49 (May 1901), p. 755.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 764.

political ideas presented to them, with the effect such things have on the hearts of men, and the lasting influence of these feelings in history.’⁶⁷

Perhaps unsurprisingly, these two articles received considerable coverage in the English press. The *Daily News*, some months later, described Green (and her articles) as ‘of the greatest importance, as helping to make known the truth about the character and views of the people with whom we are at war.’⁶⁸ In general, however, her views were perceived as outright condemnation of English imperial policy, which Green, in a number of high-profile correspondences, sought to correct. In a letter to the editor of the *Spectator* later that year, she disputes their coverage of her *Nineteenth Century* articles, writing that ‘my paper, your reviewer says, was “intended to produce an impression that the government of South Africa by Englishmen is hopeless.” My intention, it seems to me, was the opposite of this’.⁶⁹ But Green’s aim was always to bring her campaign into the public sphere, and indeed she witnessed a measure of success in this respect. Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, saw fit to write to her a number of times concerning her visit, and she became involved in the visit of the Boer Generals to England after the declaration of peace, describing that day as ‘one of the greatest I have known, perhaps the greatest.’⁷⁰

Green’s contributions to the *Nineteenth Century*, however, were not confined to foreign correspondence. Her wartime articles are given historical resonance by a piece some months previous, near the start of the conflict, entitled ‘English and Dutch in the Past.’ Published in December 1899, and depicting over four centuries of Anglo-Dutch relations, the article pays testament to her public standing as a historian. Although clearly prompted by the outbreak of hostilities three months earlier, it avoids any overt references to the contemporary situation or didactic lectures on historical contingency. The tone is markedly different to her later articles in its measured and seemingly objective standpoint, from which she discusses topics ranging from fifteenth-century trading wars to Cromwellian alliances in considerable detail. Shared religion is a recurring theme, traced throughout its various challenges and ‘lofty enthusiasms for liberty and a common Protestantism.’⁷¹ But Green’s reservations around English activities abroad make themselves felt in passages where she castigates the impulse that ‘made the English little

⁶⁷ Ibid., 768.

⁶⁸ *Daily News*, 30 April 1901, Green Papers, MS 15, 118.

⁶⁹ Green Papers, MS 10, 465 (1).

⁷⁰ Green, Letter to Mr Fisher, July 1902, MS 421. As quoted in Stephen A. Royle, ‘St Helena as a Boer Prisoner of War Camp 1900–2: Information from the Alice Stopford Green Papers’, *Journal of Historical Geography* 24.1 (Jan 1998), p. 60.

⁷¹ Green, ‘English and Dutch in the Past’, *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Dec 1899), p. 894.

willing to understand the passion of a free people for political liberty, or to treat with respect the rights of a small state.’ The article’s conclusion, pointedly claiming that ‘every impartial observer must feel how difficult it is to make the British policies of 1795, 1815 and 1830 consistent on any principle save that of British interests alone,’ is as damning an indictment of the contemporary conflict as it is of historical grievances. Moreover, these are particularly germane comments in considering Green’s developing Irish nationalism and anti-colonial activities, and may help to shed light on some of the latent tensions in her earlier reading of colonial histories.

Each issue of the *Nineteenth Century* in 1900 saw a wealth of articles discussing training, strategies, recruitment, militia ballots and the weakness of empire. War-related content during these months was foregrounded both thematically and materially (the articles all tended to appear at the front of the journal), and in July 1900 the publication was the instigator for an ‘Administrative Reform Association.’ In an editorial piece entitled ‘The Lessons of the War,’ James Knowles outlined a proposed scheme to conduct military and political affairs according to ‘ordinary business principles and methods.’⁷² Prompted by a broader scrutiny of the institutions of nation and empire following the outbreak of war, the scheme (although winning support from some prominent names, including Lord Rosebury) was eventually to lose steam.⁷³ And although ultimately futile, it pointed towards the business and economic interests that underpinned the periodical trade as well as war management in these years. Significantly, one of the most strident voices for the management of war in the *Nineteenth Century* was the Irish colonel J. G. B. Green, brother of Alice Stopford. Between January and July 1900 he contributed three articles on the Boer conflict, focusing on the issues of army conscription, volunteers, and British settlements in South Africa. Writing from a strongly military perspective, his pieces convey a pragmatic stance on the realities of battle expenditure and stand in contrast to his sister’s more personal, investigative accounts. The evidence of a working relationship between Stopford Green and her brother at this time is hazy, but we know they collaborated on the subsequent Congo Reform Association, where one critic has suggested that he acted as her ‘eyes and

⁷² James Knowles, ‘The Lessons of the War: A Proposed Association’, *Nineteenth Century* 48 (July 1900), p. 1.

⁷³ As Searle has noted, one reason for this may have been that ‘the sort of fierce anti-aristocratic resentment which had fuelled the campaign for administrative reform during the [Crimean] War was altogether lacking in 1900.’ G. R. Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899–1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), p. 88.

ears.⁷⁴ They were also both close friends and correspondents with the Irish nationalist Roger Casement in the early years of the twentieth century, which suggests a similar awareness and sympathy with the movement for Irish independence as it developed in the years after the Boer War.⁷⁵

Green's articles in their diversity and range, then, illustrate how the Boer War was mapped onto the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*. She was undoubtedly aware of the deep sympathies that many of her Irish friends (among them Casement) held for the plight of the Boers in 1900, yet commentators on her work have been somewhat too eager to read into all of her writings a residual and driving Irish nationalist sentiment.⁷⁶ These *Nineteenth Century* articles, for their part, avoid any reference to parallels with the Irish situation, and indeed often work hard to stress her loyalty to the British Empire and the duty of care that she saw as integral to the colonial project. What she did do, however, was attempt to give a voice to the voiceless within the articles. It was an impulse that was mirrored in Charlotte Grace O'Brien's pieces for the same journal a decade earlier, focusing on the experience of Irish emigrants to America. As a platform for social and political activism, the *Nineteenth Century* allowed O'Brien, like Green and indeed a number of other women, to fashion 'an identity as a humanitarian and social advocate that burnished her reputation among contemporaries as a formidable literary crusader.'⁷⁷ In O'Brien's case, this was complemented by an incisive reporting style that highlighted her awareness of new dynamics in popular as well as higher journalism. The importance of a name and established reputation were fundamental to this, as she was to elucidate in a letter from 1908 where she 'realised I could do nothing until I seized the ropes into my own hands. This I knew was possible owing to the confidence of the Irish people in my father's name, William Smith O'Brien.'⁷⁸ She was speaking with a certain degree of modesty here: in the preceding three decades her own work had won her much admiration from the highest levels of public life in Ireland, Britain and the United States. In much the same vein as

⁷⁴ Dean Pavlakis, *British Humanitarianism and the Congo Reform Movement: 1896–1913* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), p. 71.

⁷⁵ See P.J. Mathews' important study of how the Boer War created a context in which various strands of Irish nationalists could express their ant-imperial sentiments, notwithstanding the fractures within these groups and 'the fact that the conflict precipitated the first significant moments of tension between parliamentary Home Rule and an emerging separatism, when "attitudes to the empire and the real nature of Irish loyalty and disloyalty" became central issues'. Mathews, 'Stirring up Disloyalty: The Boer War, the Irish Literary Theatre and the Emergence of a New Separatism', *Irish University Review* 33.1, (Spring 2003), p. 100.

⁷⁶ See for example McDowell, *Alice Stopford Green*, p. 65.

⁷⁷ Michelle Tusan, 'Humanitarian Journalism: The Career of Lady Isabella Somerset.' In F. Elizabeth Gray (ed.), *Women in Journalism at the Fin de Siècle: Making a Name for Herself* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 92.

⁷⁸ Charlotte Grace O'Brien Papers, MS 36,803/2.

Green she had brought pressure to bear on a system of government that had, literally, dispossessed some of its most vulnerable dependents overseas.

Within the *Nineteenth Century*, her three articles address the overlapping issues of Irish emigration, the plight of the rural labouring class and the position of women within working-class society. In their detailed, lengthy analyses they reflect the extent of her social activism in spheres both in Ireland and abroad, reflecting important intersections within the traditional scope of discourse in British intellectual writing. Indeed they are arguably more informed by the rhetoric of New Journalism, drawing from O'Brien's own experience and investigative work. Much like Stopford Green, the emphasis on a personal connection with her subjects is paramount in O'Brien's depictions of people's livelihoods as by-products of an oppressive system. We can see this clearly in an October 1884 article, 'The Emigrant in New York,' which describes the conditions of Irish workers in New York tenements. Although O'Brien herself was a wealthy Protestant woman, her insistence on staying in tenement housing during her time in the city bespoke her deep-seated commitment to humanitarian causes. Throughout this piece she gives us, in absorbing detail, an insight into the slums of New York and the prospects of its inhabitants, as well as the gritty facts of their existence:

In the typical tenement house the staircase passes up a well in the centre of the house. It has no light from the open air, no ventilation; it is absolutely dark at midday, except for such light as may find its way from the open hall door or from the glasses over the doors of the flats, and possibly from a skylight at the top of the house. It is a well for all the noxious gases to accumulate in; it cannot be aired; the rays of the sun never penetrate to it.⁷⁹

It should be understood that O'Brien's articles represent one of the very few times that the experience of the Irish working class was articulated at all within British periodicals, let alone the life of those who emigrated abroad. There is a clear sense of audience in entreaties to 'let not English people be deceived' and her lament that 'it is into this degradation England, by refusing to make any attempt whatsoever to open any other door than that to America, is driving these people.'⁸⁰ Perhaps most tellingly, she acknowledges her aim of raising awareness by 'writing for this Review [where] one addresses as large an

⁷⁹ Charlotte Grace O'Brien, 'The Emigrant in New York', *Nineteenth Century* 16 (Oct 1884), p. 530.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 532, 533.

American audience as an English one.⁸¹ These journalistic strategies, facilitated by the broad reach of the *Nineteenth Century*, explicitly targeted the decision-makers of both countries. The article is particularly concerned to highlight the need for government action on behalf of a largely disenfranchised Irish emigrant community, and indeed more generally the necessity of representation for Irish citizens across large areas of America.

Such convictions of the need for urgent social reform also underpin her article on 'The Irish 'Poor Man'' in 1881. This time it is the conditions of rural labourers and the 'push' factors for emigration that aroused her energies. Like the previous article, her writing displays strong feelings of community responsibility, especially community responsibility from abroad. She writes that 'as Ireland stands now...there is small danger of checking emigration,' but proposes that one solution is to capitalise upon the wealth of 'the Irish out of Ireland.'⁸² 'I believe that Ireland,' she says, 'might be as a lake to which the fertilizing streams of capital might flow in from the most distant and unheard of sources.'⁸³ This ambitious and at times confusing vision is characteristic of much of her periodical output, concerned as it is with articulating all aspects of the situation she sees before her. Much like the later article, her depictions of everyday life are vivid and speak to her preoccupation of representing the causes and pervasiveness of grinding poverty in Irish rural areas. Yet there is also a firm pragmatic stance, and she devotes the last part of the piece to proposed solutions for the issues of generational poverty and the land crisis. The scheme she outlines in many ways foreshadows the later campaigns of Michael Davitt and various land commissions, calling on the government to 'take up compulsorily from the present [large landlords] a reserve of land...[and] from each twenty or thirty acre farm reserving one acre.'⁸⁴ Shaped by the experience of her childhood on a wealthy Limerick estate, O'Brien's grasp of the connected intricacies of land ownership, labour laws and assisted emigration is forcefully underlined in this article. It also displays the influence of the Land War on her writings, which was to develop her interest in nationalist politics during the 1880s. This 1881 piece pulls back from supporting Home Rule outright, yet by 1885 she was writing to her cousin that 'I, for one, am less of a separatist than I was before the land league started, and I feel sure many would say the same.'⁸⁵

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 544.

⁸² Charlotte Grace O'Brien, 'The Irish 'Poor Man'', *Nineteenth Century* 8 (Dec 1880), p. 881.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 882–83.

⁸⁵ As quoted in Stephen Gwynn, *Charlotte Grace O'Brien: Selections from Her Writings and Correspondence with a Memoir* (Dublin: Maunsel and Co., 1909), p. 49.

Her nephew Stephen Gwynn, himself a prominent Irish voice in London periodicals, was to pen O'Brien's biography in 1909, in which he describes these articles as existing within 'the higher regions of journalism.... The two essays published in the *Nineteenth Century* are as vigorous and direct in their expression as the works of the best journalists.'⁸⁶ The articles certainly established her presence in the (elite) public sphere, and, like Green's, generated no small amount of controversy in the broader press. But they also afford us a glance into aspects of her personal life, which remains relatively unknown. She was deaf for most of her adult life, never married, and spent her early middle age caring for her father and living with her brother and sister-in-law. It was this rather isolated existence that arguably gave her the impetus for her searchingly independent, investigative field reporting. Just as Alice Stopford Green was operating at something of a remove from the institutional field of history, 'writing outside the academy at a time when a university post was gradually becoming a badge of credibility,' O'Brien's work was never formally accepted by the political or religious establishment. Anne O'Connell has correctly noted how her humanitarian activities 'received support from neither the Catholic church, nor the institution of the State, and while neither body was openly hostile towards her, their collective silence meant that she was obliged to work alone and with limited resources.'⁸⁷

It could also be argued, moreover, that both women were themselves wary of institutions. Charlotte Grace O'Brien never became a member of the Ladies' Land League, despite many of her views and activities falling within its purview. Green may have been visible within the salon circles of *fin-de-siècle* London, yet her support for the Boer victims of the war placed her firmly outside the prevailing intellectual culture. Their philanthropic instincts, therefore, provoked individualised responses that inform much of the material of these *Nineteenth Century* articles.⁸⁸ In a reductive reading, this foregrounding of the personal experience could be seen as a specific, limiting characteristic of female writing. But neither Green nor O'Brien prioritised the personal over the political in their periodical writings, instead working to highlight the nuanced entanglements of both worlds as evidenced by the highly opinionated slant of their political reportage. It must be emphasised, however, that both women also maintained a complex relation towards issues

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 132.

⁸⁷ Anne O'Connell, 'Charlotte Grace O'Brien' in Mary Cullen and Maria Luddy (eds.), *Women, Power and Consciousness in 19th-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Attic Press, 1995), p. 232.

⁸⁸ This was a marked contrast with the general philanthropic culture of the day which was financial, institutionalised and inextricably tied into the politics, rhetoric and values of bourgeois respectability. See, for example, the account of Lady Frederick Cavendish in Andrea Geddes Poole, *Philanthropy and the Construction of Victorian Women's Citizenship: Lady Frederick Cavendish and Miss Emma Cons* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

of gender and the nature of women's livelihoods. In a somewhat surprising remark in 'The Irish "Poor Man"', O'Brien seems to advocate marriage as a means of consolidating gender relations: 'Irishmen, with all their faults, are affectionate, lovers of children, of home, and of women; chaste, and of a religion that counts marriage as a sacrament. For all these reasons marriage must be counted with. Also, for the labourer, who is abroad from early morning to nightfall, a wife is a necessity.'⁸⁹ This stance evinces a more conventional take on gender roles, and points towards some of the reasons why, perhaps, O'Brien never found a comfortable home within standard accounts of late-nineteenth-century women's (or indeed feminist) writing.

In a somewhat different way, we can see elements of this in what was perhaps Green's best-known periodical piece, 'Woman's place in the World of Letters', published in June 1897 in the *Nineteenth Century*. Written just before she achieved success with her books on Irish history, the article rails against the male monopoly on the world of letters, and women's adherence to such a system.⁹⁰ It depicts the role of women writers, both historical and contemporary, as totally alienated from the life of the intellect. The dispiriting effect of this, she says, is a protective 'mimicry' that characterises so much of female writing:

For even in her literary venture woman remains essentially mysterious. It is as though some inherent diffidence, some over-mastering self-distrust, had made her fear to venture out into the open unprotected and bare to attack. She covers her advance with a whole complicated machinery of arrow-proof hides and wooden shelters.⁹¹

The last sentence of this quote, where we can discern quite strongly the language of military, colonial ventures, speaks perhaps to Green's abiding interest in the discourse of imperial conquest and its ramifications for the disenfranchised subject. In this sense it is an interesting, and in ways quite a complex, article. She deals with the category of 'woman', and the possibility of an alternative, gendered contribution that women might bring to intellectual life. As the 'unhistorical 'Other' of history', as Christina Crosby has termed it, women can only find true expression in a totally separate sphere.⁹² Men, she claims, operate

⁸⁹ O'Brien, 'The Irish "Poor Man"', p. 877.

⁹⁰ Helen Kingstone, 'Feminism, Nationalism, Separatism? The Case of Alice Stopford Green', *Journal of Victorian Culture* 19.4 (2014), p. 447.

⁹¹ Alice Stopford Green, 'Women's Place in the World of Letters', *Nineteenth Century* 41 (Jun 1897), p. 965.

⁹² Christina Crosby, *The Ends of History: Victorians and 'the Woman Question'* (New York: Routledge, 1991), p. 1.

culturally within a world defined by laws, rules and behaviours. It is a world in which women's modes of thought are 'not only deemed invalid, but are also utterly alien to the structures, goals and values of the workings of a male civilisation'.⁹³ In this way, then, we can perceive a common thread running throughout these articles. Green's experience as an outsider in South Africa, as an outsider in the intellectual life of the nineteenth century, and indeed as an outsider in Britain, all inform in different ways the tone of her journalism.

Furthermore, such comments can help to illuminate the central paradox in many of these articles. A nuanced reading of gender often sits alongside a more conservative stance on social issues, as was the case with Green. Her May 1900 article on 'Growing Bureaucracy and the Parliamentary Debate' details her avowed opposition to the suffrage movement. She explains how, due to a 'greatly strained' Constitution and a broken political system, the female vote will be worse than useless, stating significantly, 'there has been nothing in my memory, till this war [referring to the Boer campaigns], that has roused women to the same degree as the question of Home Rule, [but] they have contributed nothing to the campaign except heat.'⁹⁴ Later on in the piece she adds, as a sort of pacifier, 'the magazines are open to them, the press, and the platform; all the most powerful means of guiding public opinion; the most powerful, too, of winning respect for the whole class.'⁹⁵ This is a key quote, pointing up the irony in confining an acknowledged political stance to the pages of a magazine. But in doing so it underlines the fundamentally important position that the elite press occupied, and its potential as a channel for authoritative means of female expression. If Stopford Green was perhaps echoing the *Nineteenth Century's* 'Appeal against Female Suffrage' from some eleven years earlier, she was also echoing the tradition of Irish women's political conservatism within the periodical press – sticking one's head above the parapet was, it seems, a business best left to the literary and imaginative field of New Woman fiction in the late 1890s.

It would appear, then, that Fraser, Johnston and Green's reading of the periodical as 'a site of multiple discourses, always intersected by gender' can be usefully applied to the cases of both Green and O'Brien.⁹⁶ In this context we can begin to situate these Irish women writers of the late Victorian era as reflecting the broader place of women in journalism at the time. Challenges of publication, representation and the demands of an

⁹³ Kingstone, 'Feminism, Nationalism, Separatism?', p. 448.

⁹⁴ Alice Stopford Green, 'Growing Bureaucracy and the Parliamentary Debate', *Nineteenth Century* 47 (May 1900), p. 840.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Hilary Fraser, Stephanie Green and Judith Johnston, *Gender and the Victorian Periodical* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 20.

unstable market were critical and often had adverse effects on their presence in the public sphere. Moreover, as Sally Mitchell writes, nineteenth century British novelists and poets are valued for their imagination, emotion and realistic depiction of female lives, but ‘the women who published intellectual prose remain almost invisible.’⁹⁷ I would add that a further layer of invisibility lies over those women from Ireland who came to London to forge a publishing career. Although their Irish identity was rarely a defining element of their writings, it cannot be ignored for the purposes of illustrating their place in British literary society. Their avoidance of either cultural revival discourse or Irish political commentary is perhaps indicative of their reluctance to be constricted by national identity, and an unwillingness to be read as simply an Irish author. Indeed, their adherence to international subjects was arguably a way to sidestep a provincialism so often attached to Irish authors in London, and give them a purchase on material beyond the confines of cultural nationalism. Charlotte Grace O’Brien’s and Alice Stopford Green’s professional identities were self-consciously shaped to negate the limitations of national and gendered boundaries of the day. We can see this in their engagements with a wide array of titles and topics, their shifting relations with established modes of discourse, and most significantly, the subtle balancing act between polemical and personal that enabled them to negotiate the often precarious world of the late Victorian periodical press.

John Pentland Mahaffy

It was not, however, just the writers with an overtly international focus who ‘opened up’ the idea of Irish writing within the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*. Both along geographic and aesthetic lines, one of the most important contributors in this regard was the Irish scholar John Pentland Mahaffy. His position as one of the foremost cultural commentators and prolific public intellectuals of the 1890s was indicative of the sometimes incongruous role of highbrow Irish writing at the time. A lifelong association with Trinity College Dublin, and an adherence to the entrenched unionism and elitism that the institution was seen to engender, has meant that his output has not always harmoniously aligned with the currents of cultural nationalism. Much like Hennessy, Godkin or Alice Stopford Green, Mahaffy has fallen out of favour with historiographical and critical trends where press interventions, in the form of long-form essays, are not easily categorised as ‘literature’. But the Trinity fellow stands as an intriguing figure in the seams of cultural influence that

⁹⁷ Sally Mitchell, *Frances Power Cobbe: Victorian Feminist, Journalist, Reformer* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004), p. 3.

flowed between Ireland and Britain in the years surrounding the turn of the century. Perhaps the last major Irish man of letters, in the truest Victorian sense, Mahaffy flexed his intellectual muscles along a range of subjects – from the languages of classical civilisation to the challenges facing contemporary second-level curricula. He was also a rigorous classical scholar, at the cutting edge of his academic field of classical archaeology. In this way he was somewhat different to his earlier peer at Trinity, William Hartpole Lecky, who – though similarly prolific and a gifted polymath – remained outside the academy for most of his career. Mahaffy's determined cosmopolitanism, meanwhile, not only helped to strengthen the reputation of his discipline, but endeared him to a culture of the Victorian generalist, where the flavour of Knowles's *Nineteenth Century* tended resolutely towards a wide-ranging, internationalist sphere of thought.

His large corpus of work in the journal reveals a man with a voracious and wide-ranging intellect, therefore, someone who managed to bridge the divide between specialist and generalist, modern and ancient, Irish and British. Although, as he would have pointed out, he saw little tension or conflict in combining these concepts. He was a deeply urbane thinker who was committed to the British Empire and what he viewed as its ideals of liberal government. Furthermore, he had a remarkably Europeanised (although not quite globalised) view of cultural connectivity, and remained closely attuned to currents of intellectual thought and culture on the continent throughout his life. But however broad his scope of interests may have been, readers of the *Nineteenth Century* would have been in little doubt where his speciality lay. Four of his most important articles between 1894 and 1897 concerned archaeology and the study of ancient civilisations. For Mahaffy, the subject was not simply a minority or purely scholastic pursuit, but fell within the purview of a broader intellectual movement towards the spread of knowledge. The articles also place Mahaffy's writing within the context of the time: as Tomás Irish has pointed out, the importance of the classics to the Victorians had by no means diminished by the end of the century, preoccupied as they were with the anxieties surrounding empire and increasing threats to a stable civilisation.⁹⁸

As much as Mahaffy was central to these debates (and they were often highly fractious debates), the classical tradition was arguably more important to Mahaffy's worldview and public persona within English periodicals. His May 1894 piece, 'Recent Archaeology', is perhaps the most striking example of this ability to present the subject in its most engaging form whilst mounting a defence of the discipline. The article opens with

⁹⁸ Tomás Irish, 'A Man Called Mahaffy: An Irish Cosmopolitan Confronts Crisis', *Historical Research* 89.246 (Nov 2016), p. 848.

an audacious claim to equivalence, that ‘archaeology is making strides as rapid as those of physical science’.⁹⁹ It was not an altogether incorrect assumption, as by the late Victorian era archaeology was indeed ‘transcending the domain of amateur antiquary’, becoming what one commentator had termed earlier in the century ‘an indispensable link in the circle of sciences’.¹⁰⁰ The consistent allusions to disciplinisation – the ‘old-fashioned’ versus the new professional schools – that occur throughout the piece, moreover, speak to Mahaffy’s tenure as a university don, and his inextricable association with the institutional context of classical learning. In laying out the state of Egyptian archaeology, the article adopts a largely utopian perspective in its advocacy for the advancement of knowledge. It is allied, however, to a particularly British slant. With one eye to the French and German schools in Rome, the piece declares it ‘a great scandal that the English nation has not ... established a school of the same importance’.¹⁰¹ The colonial history of the development of the field is also evident in the interrelated discussions of museums and pillaging, with Mahaffy admitting that, despite his having benefited from its results, ‘we have invaded Egypt under the pretence of civilising the country’.¹⁰²

This trenchant defence of the value of archaeological knowledge for its own sake is expanded in two further *Nineteenth Century* articles in the following years, ‘The Present Position of Egyptology’ in August 1897, and ‘About Alexandria’ in March 1897. Somewhat surprisingly, despite Mahaffy’s lifelong and well-noted admiration for Greek Hellenistic culture (he accompanied his student Oscar Wilde on a visit to the country in 1877), it is to Egypt rather than Greece that this *Nineteenth Century* material more closely attends.¹⁰³ Patrick Maume has claimed that Mahaffy’s interest in Ptolemaic rule in Egypt stemmed from the parallels he saw in it to English rule in Ireland, but it was more likely due to the context of writer’s professional career during these years.¹⁰⁴ In 1891 he had made his name as a classical scholar with the collation and publication of the Petrie Papyri, an

⁹⁹ J.P. Mahaffy, ‘Recent Archaeology’, *Nineteenth Century* 35 (May 1894), p. 845.

¹⁰⁰ Rebecca Welshman, ‘Archaeology’ in Phillip Mallett (ed.), *Thomas Hardy in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 221.

¹⁰¹ Mahaffy, ‘Recent Archaeology’, p. 846.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 847.

¹⁰³ See Blanshard’s chapter for a good overview of how Mahaffy’s afterlife has largely been shaped by his ‘role as midwife to one of the most important intellectual relationships in Wilde’s life’, and how ‘his passionate advocacy of the Hellenistic became one of the most distinctive features of his intellectual output’. Alastair J.L. Blanshard, ‘Mahaffy and Wilde: A Study in Provocation’, in Kathleen Riley, Alastair J. L. Blanshard, and Iarla Manny (eds.), *Oscar Wilde and Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 19, 24.

¹⁰⁴ Patrick Maume, ‘John Pentland Mahaffy’, *Dictionary of Irish Biography* <http://dib.cambridge.org/quicksearch.do;jsessionid=20A9A8FF52720E629912A62C54D158F5> [Accessed 24 April 2018].

invaluable source in the study of Greek and Egyptian classical literature. In many ways, as Phillipa Levine has pointed out, despite nurturing interest in a variety of subject areas like his peers E.A. Freeman and W.E.H. Lecky, Mahaffy's claim to posterity largely rested on his success in breaking ground in this single field.¹⁰⁵ The findings were the result of archaeologist Flinders Petrie's excavation of the Fayyum district of Egypt. They revealed fragments of ancient Egyptian and Greek texts dating from 300 BC, and gave an hitherto unknown insight on the organisation of Hellenic society of the time. Mahaffy was invited to work on these papers with Professor Sayce in Oxford, where he spent two years cataloguing and transcribing the large sections of the collection.

'The Present Position of Egyptology', therefore, is partly an attempt by Mahaffy to take stock of the subject as he saw it in 1894, and partly a means of sketching a blueprint for its future course. Drawing from a largely Whiggish concern with the ideals of progress, the article presents recent discoveries in Egyptian translations as steps towards a general social and cultural enlightenment. For Mahaffy the developments in the understanding of Egyptian history were as important for the general public as for the academic community. In a nod to the ephemeral nature of the periodical press, he also acknowledges that 'we know vastly more now, but even now the historian hesitates to commit his views to the public, when there is a likelihood every year that important additions will be made to our knowledge'.¹⁰⁶ His overarching regard for scholarly prowess is again evident in the discussions of the Egyptian translator Champollion's success, 'rather like those in sociology or linguistic [sic]'.¹⁰⁷ In staking a claim for Egyptology and its scholars in this way, Mahaffy is once again underlining his preoccupation with defining and preserving certain cultural forms. The afterlife of great works of genius, particularly, he sees as under threat:

We may cite as examples of such inchoate, but yet incomplete, discoveries the great *Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith - a work which still stands out, and will ever stand out, as that of a pioneer, and the only book on political economy which displays its genius to every kind of intelligent reader. But among the specialists and the schools, this work of genius, which swayed all Europe in its day, is laid upon the shelf as an antiquated affair, superseded by the smaller and duller men who have

¹⁰⁵ Phillipa Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 26.

¹⁰⁶ J.P. Mahaffy, 'The Present Position of Egyptology', *Nineteenth Century* 36 (Aug 1894), p. 277.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

pulled his system to pieces, and are offering us the fragments as a science most of whose first principles are still under dispute.¹⁰⁸

One key example of this phenomenon – the incursion on scholarly or cultural integrity – was embodied for Mahaffy in Egypt’s ancient city. ‘About Alexandria’ illustrates the continued neglect of the city’s treasures by ‘the fashionable tourist, the pre-occupied archaeologist’.¹⁰⁹ The article takes aim at the prejudices of an academic community more interested in staking out a reputation than any regard for historical posterity. Mahaffy here is vehement in his arguments about the value of classical antiquity, a position that he contrasts to that of the classicist D.C. Hogarth – a figure, he claims acerbically, who shows how ‘a scholar may sometimes wander in more ways than one’.¹¹⁰

Indeed in many ways the success that Mahaffy had achieved by the late 1890s with the Petrie papers and various high-profile publications marked the ultimate refutation of his many detractors (especially in the press) over the course of his career. Since the 1870s, a string of observers had taken to newspaper and journal pages to point out flaws in Mahaffy’s scholarship. He was criticised for, among other things, blatant elitism, factual inaccuracies, a condescending style, unoriginality and contempt for Irish culture. Alice Stopford Green vilified him in the magazine *The Leader* as having ‘the pose of a learned man, and the vulgarity of a man who thinks that there is no shame in blazoning out his ignorance and mocking at the learning he does not know’.¹¹¹ Mahaffy, too, was not always the innocent party in these invectives. His long-running dispute with the Cambridge classicist Richard Cleaverhouse Jebb was played out in journal reviews, press articles and retaliatory pamphlets between 1875 and 1877. It became a virulent public controversy, involving accusations and counter accusations of plagiarism, and centred on opposing definitions of Hellenistic culture. Similar academic skirmishes occurred with the Trinity Professor Robert Tyrrell, a conflict Stanford and McDowell have described as essentially between Mahaffy and a ‘pure’ scholar (a jibe Mahaffy would have taken very seriously).¹¹² But perhaps the most deeply felt criticism came from Oscar Wilde. His scathing review of Mahaffy’s *Greek Life and Thought* in November 1887 stated that ‘not merely does Mr

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 269.

¹⁰⁹ J.P. Mahaffy, ‘About Alexandria’, *Nineteenth Century* 41 (Mar 1897), p. 437.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 440.

¹¹¹ As quoted in Leon Ó Broin, *Dublin Castle and the 1916 Rising* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1970), p. 173.

¹¹² W.B. Stanford and R.B. McDowell, *Mahaffy: a Biography of an Anglo-Irishman* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), p. 174.

Mahaffy miss the spirit of the true historian; but he often seems entirely devoid of the temperament of the true man of letters'.¹¹³ While this tone would not have been uncommon in press reviews, its attack on Mahaffy's professional abilities points to a certain scepticism about the place of learned men in the public sphere, as well as to Wilde and Mahaffy's uneasy relationship.

These academic disputes were accepted, even welcomed, by periodical editors such as Knowles, who saw the sales value in controversy played out over a number of issues.¹¹⁴ But Mahaffy's press interventions in the *Nineteenth Century* were not just on an intellectual or cerebral level. His interest in the preservation of ancient civilisations and their artefacts extended to the threats posed to them by modern development. For his part, he was not unaware of the close interdependency of archaeological discovery and colonial expansion during the latter years of the century. Other articles touch upon this theme ('even my dear friend Mr Petrie is not free from the charge of casting out the dead and rifling their tombs') and the cultural tensions inherent in the work of preserving and displaying.¹¹⁵ These reservations, however, paled in comparison to the writer's reaction to the proposed project in 1894 to erect a large-scale dam on the Nile reservoir in Nubia. This was to involve flooding large parts of the area of the Philae, an important site for Ptolemaic Egyptian research. Mahaffy took this as an affront to his very vocation, and his June 1894 article pulls few punches in its heartfelt attack on the scheme. 'The Proposed Nile Reservoir' is a direct response to a previous piece in the same journal by Benjamin Baker, the engineer in charge of the project. Although Mahaffy's argument nominally centres on the impending destruction of the Nubian people's homes and livelihoods, the subtext – or indeed context – of the piece is the increasingly threatening power of engineers in controlling sites of historical significance, a position from which Mahaffy passionately believed they should be barred. The article's appeal to the civilised, aesthetic leanings of an intellectual community is strikingly clear, begging the question that 'is the technical sentimentality of the engineer to override the archaeological and artistic sentiments of the mass of cultivated men?'¹¹⁶ Pointing to the cultural impoverishment of the project, 'If Londoners were willing to pay the price for an extra supply of water', he argued in an analogy to Philae, engineers would

¹¹³ Oscar Wilde, 'Mr Mahaffy's New Book' [unsigned review], *Pall Mall Gazette*, no. 7066, 9 Nov 1887, p. 3.

¹¹⁴ It was a similar situation with *Macmillan's Magazine*, where in 1884 Mahaffy agreed to continue his feud with Jebb, 'but I want £25 for the two articles'. Letter from J.P. Mahaffy to George Macmillan, Macmillan Archive Vol. CCCXXXIII, British Library Add MS 55118/44.

¹¹⁵ Mahaffy, 'Recent Archaeology', p. 853.

¹¹⁶ J.P. Mahaffy, 'The Proposed Nile Reservoir', *Nineteenth Century* 35 (Jun 1894), p. 1016.

‘gladly dam up the Thames, so as to submerge its valley, as far up as Oxford’.¹¹⁷

Overriding all of this, of course, was the broader threat to Mahaffy’s own worldview and place in the Victorian intellectual order. As Casper Anderson has put it, ‘in the controversy that unfolded over Philae loomed large a broader Arnoldian cultural critique of the ‘utilitarian spirit of the age’, of which the rise of engineers to a position of affluence and influence was easily seen as tangible evidence’.¹¹⁸ It should come as little surprise, then, that the article essentially functions as a call to arms by Mahaffy, leading his charge with a vivid portrayal of ‘civilisation as contrasted with barbarism’.¹¹⁹

These themes – namely, the upkeep of educated civilisation in the face of encroaching threats to modern society – were recurrent ones in Mahaffy’s broader oeuvre. In the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*, they manifested themselves in a series of articles on education published throughout the second half of the 1890s. Mahaffy’s biographers have pointed out that these pieces are beholden to the idea that ‘any member of the classical ascendancy might still believe that he was entitled to give an authoritative judgement on all matters of education and culture’.¹²⁰ Mahaffy, indeed, saw himself very much within this tradition. He despised what he called the ‘herd of specialists ... each master of his own subject, but absolutely ignorant and careless of all that is going on around him in kindred subjects’.¹²¹ Modern forms of education he saw as tending dangerously towards this. His 1897 article for the *Nineteenth Century*, ‘Modern Education’, rails against the new systems of examination and university organisation. His unashamedly elitist views in this piece express a discomfort with the growing availability and access to higher education across Britain. ‘The successes of the Socialist, the mutterings of the thunder or the earthquake which may shatter our society’, he states, ‘arise from the large number of malcontents in the land who have learned to feel new wants’.¹²² In typical Mahaffian bombast, he goes on to compare the situation to the fall of the Roman Empire, where inviting the ‘outlying barbarians’ to settle within the civilised walls led inexorably to the ‘horror and confusion of the dark ages’.¹²³ These kind of analogies with antiquity, of course, were a reliable feature of Mahaffy’s writings. Often deliberately inflammatory, his portrayals of Greek rule in Egypt as similar to British rule in Ireland, or calling Aristotle a ‘Liberal Conservative’ and

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 1017.

¹¹⁸ Casper Anderson, *British Engineers and Africa, 1875-1914* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011), p. 158.

¹¹⁹ Mahaffy, ‘The Proposed Nile Reservoir’, p. 1017.

¹²⁰ Stanford and McDowell, *Mahaffy*, p. 108.

¹²¹ J.P. Mahaffy, *A Survey of Greek Civilisation* (London: Macmillan, 1897), iii.

¹²² J.P. Mahaffy, ‘Modern Education’, *Nineteenth Century* 42 (Nov 1897), p. 704.

¹²³ Ibid., p. 716.

Polybins a ‘busy politician for the Home Rule party of his day’ all but ensured a continuous stream of critics in the periodical press.

Eager to assert his credentials as a practitioner as well as theorist, moreover, this *Nineteenth Century* material gives voice to his concerns that, as in classical archaeology, the general standard and appreciation for education was being fatally eroded. Like many other commentators in the highbrow press, his greatest fear centres on growing democratisation of the system. The vocabulary employed here by Mahaffy is evocative of broader debates within intellectual journals, where there existed a ‘sense of urgency’ around the ‘explosive expansion in the arena of ‘knowledge’ that was signified by an overwhelming abundance of printed matter’.¹²⁴ This rhetoric of urgency was applied by Mahaffy to the danger of extending the educational franchise, with the same implication that it would contribute to a broader degeneration of societal values. In these pieces the author paints himself in the role of gatekeeper, not only to the educational institutions themselves (from primary to third-level), but to the discursive arena surrounding them. He writes in 1893 that ‘not only do the vulgar who affect the title of being refined, the *dilettanti* who desire to pose as authorities, ventilate theories on this topic’, but that the growing mass of periodical literature allows them to be heard.¹²⁵ In this sense he is to a large degree echoing an Arnoldian worry over the place of learning in the public sphere; who, indeed, are allowed to be the arbiters of cultural taste? Allied to this is the hierarchical view of social relations that starkly underlines some of the main issues for Mahaffy. ‘Inequality is, and ever must be, the first condition of any society’, he writes in 1893, and that ‘so long as some people are cultivated and others not, there must be at least an intellectual aristocracy, and any attempt to lower the highest sort so as to bring it ... within the reach of the poor ... will end in the worst kind of failure’.¹²⁶ Expanding on this some years later in a lecture republished within the *Nineteenth Century*, he again appeals to the sensibilities of his audience: ‘that a small class should have the leisure to pursue science and literature at their ease is not only fair and right, but of real use to the majority who are unable to do so’.¹²⁷ Where others may have seen entrenched elitism – as did, certainly, Alice Stopford Green – Mahaffy, it could be argued, was merely staking a defence of his place in an increasingly threatened academic and social order.

¹²⁴ Kelly J. Mays, ‘The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, in John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (eds.), *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 165.

¹²⁵ J.P. Mahaffy, ‘Sham Education’, *Nineteenth Century* 33 (Jan 1893), p. 19.

¹²⁶ J.P. Mahaffy, ‘The Future of Education’, *Nineteenth Century* 34 (Aug 1893), pp. 214, 225.

¹²⁷ Mahaffy, ‘Modern Education’, p. 715.

This reactionary standpoint is perhaps most evident in his efforts to define the ‘ills’ underpinning the fabric of modern society, and to elucidate them for his journalistic readership. Aligned with Victorian conservative ideas of morality, Mahaffy outlines a utopian idea of a stratified society – as illustrated above – by holding it up to the shameful examples of other European countries. Those nations, he claims, who have advocated a ‘widely diffused’ intellectual progress, have proven failures in the ‘rapid deterioration of their public morality’.¹²⁸ Mahaffy’s reading of the decreasing standards of educational achievement in Ireland and Britain required this kind of contextualisation. He was fluent in the discourse that allowed him to make sweeping statements about the direction of European enlightenment. But much like his discussions of classical studies, he was also adept at combining high ideals with more immediate real world problems. The slow-moving but ominous changes that threatened a traditional nineteenth-century university way of life – the fracturing of a broad-church idea of liberal education into disciplines, increasing technical instruction, and Mahaffy’s despised ‘herd of specialists’ – became for the writer a rallying-cry around which his ideals of a cosmopolitan, intellectual culture could coalesce. In this sense the broad reach of the *Nineteenth Century* provided a vitally important vehicle for such pronouncements. His 1893 article heralded a bleak vision of the future for universities, where the ‘old faculties ... are in great danger of becoming too practical, and so admitting all manner of collateral and non-liberal studies’.¹²⁹ It was a feeling that was also echoed in the system of second-level education, where cramming, for Mahaffy, was simply a symptom of the same disease.¹³⁰

Underpinning these assertions was a deeply held conviction in preserving the status quo through a common means of understanding for the intellectual classes. This included, of course, justifying a predominantly elitist form of education, but also campaigning against the taint of linguistic diversity threatening to undermine his beloved ‘republic of letters’. In this regard it is significant that perhaps Mahaffy’s most infamous views on the subject, namely the Irish language and its perceived worthlessness to schools, were articulated most fully within the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*. There are a number of things to consider here: most importantly, by 1898, when the controversy broke, ‘the *fin de siècle* marked the beginning of a breakdown in Mahaffy’s cosmopolitan world as it was challenged by the

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 718.

¹²⁹ Mahaffy, ‘The Future of Education’, p. 221.

¹³⁰ See J.P. Mahaffy, ‘How to Circumvent ‘Cramming’ in Irish Secondary Education’, *Nineteenth Century* 44 (Nov 1898), pp. 867-880.

Irish language revival'.¹³¹ The incident also highlights a number of cultural currents of the 1890s, the most significant being the threatened position of the elite university don within Irish political and cultural discourse. Despite the tercentenary of Trinity College Dublin being celebrated only a couple of years previously with much aplomb, the Irish language movement only emphasised the pressures on the Victorian intellectual and imperial worldview. Certainly these challenges did not go unnoticed by Mahaffy – the 'Celtic Craze', as he saw it, drew his most sustained and indignant arguments to the pages of the journal.¹³² In response to proposed changes on the Irish intermediate examinations, Mahaffy weighed in with the opinion that Irish as a language should not be taught on school curriculums, seeing it as of no practical use to schoolchildren. This standpoint was outlined in his main article of August 1899, entitled 'The Recent Fuss about the Irish Language'. Mahaffy's views were by this time widely recognised (as Kevin Whelan has pointed out, Mahaffy was known as the 'quintessential Trinity man ... taken to speak as the official voice of Anglo-Ireland' who therefore epitomised the 'contempt in which the Irish language was held by the end of the nineteenth century'), but were stated in vigorously defensive terms in the article.¹³³ He points to dangerous examples set by other countries in order to undermine the authority of Irish language adherence, 'which will have even worse effects than the maintenance and cultivation of Welsh in Wales.'¹³⁴ But as later commentators have noted, the result of this dismissiveness was in fact a shot in the arm to many of his opponents in the Gaelic League. Douglas Hyde, in his article 'A University Scandal' in the *New Ireland Review*, attacked the blinkered view of culture that he saw as emanating from Mahaffy and his supporters, lamenting 'how I wish that Trinity College would not thrust herself forward as the undying opponent of all things Irish ... How I wish that he and his colleagues would recognise the fact that a new intellectual Ireland has arisen and strive to place their university en rapport with it'.¹³⁵ It was perhaps Mahaffy's legacy to provide this galvanising effect for Irish nationalists, where, despite later changes of heart, he remained an 'oppositional figure', whose 'words were more important than his actions, and the former were selectively invoked'.¹³⁶

¹³¹ Irish, 'A Man Called Mahaffy', p. 847.

¹³² J.P. Mahaffy, 'The Recent Fuss about the Irish Language', *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Aug 1899), p. 214.

¹³³ Kevin Whelan, 'Between: The Politics of Culture in Friel's *Translations*', *Field Day Review* 6 (2010), p. 19.

¹³⁴ Mahaffy, 'The Recent Fuss about the Irish Language', p. 214.

¹³⁵ As quoted in Irish 'A Man Called Mahaffy', p. 848.

¹³⁶ Irish, 'A Man Called Mahaffy', p. 853.

It is important to note here the centrality of Trinity College for Mahaffy in both cultural and political terms. As an institution, it can also be seen as a useful parallel to the *Nineteenth Century* in providing the context for Mahaffy's various forms of identity negotiations. Both were places where the writer defined himself by alliance to a particular type of 'establishment' intellectualism. They were also both spaces where cosmopolitanism and certain forms of Irishness sat side by side, where a dedication to the high-Victorian free exchange of ideas was unencumbered by nationalist checks on language or cultural politicisation. In 'Provincial Patriotism', an article from 1895, Mahaffy writes that 'from the purely cosmopolitan point of view patriotism is, therefore, either unnecessary or mischievous'.¹³⁷ Patriotism, in this respect, can be read as a jibe at the linguistic sectarianism of the Gaelic League, the empty hypocrisies that Mahaffy viewed as subversive. Nevertheless, there emerge in these articles moments of tension in Mahaffy's idea of himself. The pieces display his ability to hold supposedly oppositional views in balance, such as this riposte from 'Recent Fuss':

I, for example, may protest that I am Irish of the Irish, that I have lived all my days since boyhood in Ireland, striving to help young Irishmen to get on in the world – yet because I have the firm conviction that it is unpractical and mischievous to make Irish children spend their time studying this no longer literary language, and express this opinion publicly, I am at once set down as an enemy of my country, or at any rate no Irishman.

These sentiments gesture towards a more nuanced sense of (Anglo-)Irish identity and belonging, which has perhaps too eagerly been glossed over in studies of Mahaffy the reactionary imperialist. He certainly was a proponent of Ireland's openness to competition on the world stage, opining in one article that in technical education 'we are still far behind our neighbours'.¹³⁸ Unreservedly an enthusiast for Empire and the broader currents of European intellectual exchange, he appears in other senses deeply parochial. Warning of the dangers of educational retrogression, he quips 'do we indeed desire the next generation to pose as second-hand Germans?'.¹³⁹ This can partly be read as an attempt by Mahaffy to stake a claim for the intellectual progressiveness of Ireland, and partly perhaps as a siege mentality around the increasingly fragile place of the Victorian generalist in English and

¹³⁷ J.P. Mahaffy, 'Provincial Patriotism', *Nineteenth Century* 37 (Jun 1895), p. 214.

¹³⁸ Mahaffy, 'Modern Education', p. 712.

¹³⁹ Mahaffy, 'Sham Education', p. 35.

Irish discourse. Critics have naturally focused on the pressures coming to bear on idealistic notions of cosmopolitanism by the late 1890s, which forced Mahaffy to confront the ‘Irish question’ and indeed other matters unfolding outside the bounds of Trinity College.¹⁴⁰ As the writer himself probably recognised, the simple moniker ‘man of letters’ was no longer sustainable in a society where the consensus around literary and cultural authority was gradually but irrevocably breaking down.

The *Nineteenth Century* did, of course, offer Mahaffy the chance to articulate his fullest defence of this role, and the implications of the above developments for general language and culture. ‘The Modern Babel’, published in the November 1896 issue, hinges upon the importance of a universal imperial language and is in ways a summation of his arguments against the Gaelic Revival, which he dismissed as merely ‘a diseased version of provincialism’.¹⁴¹ Irish, he reiterates, is ‘a most difficult and useless tongue, not only useless, but a mischievous obstacle to civilisation’.¹⁴² These views have been well-rehearsed, and are recurrent examples for Mahaffy scholars. Kevin Whelan has noted, however, that the article was particularly directed at a British audience, a point which was no doubt important for Mahaffy and his concern with readership. And it ties into what is perhaps a less-commented upon aspect of Mahaffy’s periodical output. There are numerous references throughout these articles to other ‘obstacle[s] to civilisation’; namely, the pernicious influence of increasingly mass-produced, popular reading material that threatened the traditional bastions of literary orthodoxy and learning – institutions such as Trinity College and the *Nineteenth Century* that Mahaffy relied upon for status. In Kelly Mays’ analysis, Mahaffy was part of an elite culture of the late nineteenth century where ‘lectures and books, as well as the pages of periodicals, were devoted to answering the questions of how, why, and what readers were and should be reading, while they individually and collectively urged the vital social importance of such questions and of the practices they sought to define’.¹⁴³ This was a deeply Victorian anxiety, and it throws light not only on Mahaffy’s view of cultural value and authority, but on the self-reflexivity so common in the intellectual press.

Mahaffy locates what he calls the ‘decline in the *quality* of our reading’ in the malaise in contemporary literary and cultural taste.¹⁴⁴ In a telling remark, he decries the state of affairs where ‘our reading masses discard ... the *Quarterly* for the *Strand*

¹⁴⁰ Irish, ‘A Man Called Mahaffy’, p. 850.

¹⁴¹ Whelan, ‘Between’, p. 19.

¹⁴² J.P. Mahaffy, ‘The Modern Babel’, *Nineteenth Century* 40 (Nov 1896), p. 785.

¹⁴³ Mays, ‘The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, p. 165.

¹⁴⁴ Mahaffy, ‘Modern Education’, p. 705.

Magazine, the *Times* for the *Telegraph*'.¹⁴⁵ This practice, described in another article as 'the reading of the lowest and worst forms of ephemeral literature', stood for Mahaffy as an omen of moral degeneration among the lower classes; or worse, as an active incitement to dangerous behaviour.¹⁴⁶ 'Most of what poor people read', he writes in 1893, 'is not only not improving, but positively injurious to them'.¹⁴⁷ He goes on to lay blame at the door of the penny press, and 'those weekly papers which season their news with allusions or direct references to the immoralities of modern society'.¹⁴⁸ His article 'Modern Education' goes further in his critique of the 'not only free but licentious press', where

it may well be doubted, for example, whether the antipathy which a large body of Irishmen feel towards England could live and last were it not for the continual and malicious falsehoods which are served up to them in the papers which they read. This is likewise the case with the American outbursts of apparent hatred towards this country. In France, too, the same feeling is created by a lying press.¹⁴⁹

In this way he draws into his overall critique of social and cultural decline the tangential spread of periodicals and newspaper press across Europe. Much like George Moore, T.P. O'Connor and other contributors who used the platform of *The New Review* to denounce what they saw as the threat to national standards of public taste and literary appreciation, Mahaffy clearly did not consider his own periodical writings as in any sense related to that genre of 'cheap literature'.¹⁵⁰

Of course Mahaffy was not the only one decrying the state of the nation's reading habits in the highbrow press. His writings tie into a strand of Irish commentary on Irish reading practices that were scattered throughout the *Nineteenth Century* in the 1880s and 1890s. Partly reflecting the extent to which the Yeatsian agenda of cultural nationalism sought visibility in the literary press (like the poet's famous *Bookman* pieces 'where his strictures were illustrative of a prescriptive note in Irish criticism around the turn of the century'¹⁵¹), these pieces depict the beginnings of a cultural self-awareness and self-fashioning. They were also natural companions to Richard Barry O'Brien's 'Best 100 Irish

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Mahaffy, 'Sham Education', p. 22.

¹⁴⁷ Mahaffy, 'The Future of Education', p. 217.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Mahaffy, 'Modern Education', p. 706.

¹⁵⁰ Mahaffy, 'The Future of Education', p. 217.

¹⁵¹ James H. Murphy, *Irish Novelists and the Victorian Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 12.

Books' in the *Freeman's Journal* in 1886, as well as many other essays in *Irish Fireside*, *Irish Monthly* and *New Ireland Review*.¹⁵² Andrew Murphy too has pointed to the nationalist strain of anxiety over Irish readers' appetite for texts from England at this time: 'exposure to such texts', he writes, 'was thought of as leading both to denationalisation and to a general reduction in Irish morals'.¹⁵³ The articles featured in Knowles's journal, however, particularly two by John Pope Hennessy and Michael MacDonagh, were arguably more antiquarian in their views than forthrightly nationalist. These two writers – one a titled colonial governor, the other a largely unknown parliamentary reporter – both encapsulate this growing trend of literary forecasting in their articles of 1884 (Hennessy) and 1900 (MacDonagh). Much like Mahaffy's articles some years later, their pieces demonstrate the degree to which an expanded Irish readership was attracting the attention of the traditionally educated classes within the press. As Hennessy pronounces at the opening of his piece 'What do the Irish Read?', 'Irishmen who return to their country after a few years' absence cannot fail to see, as one of the most noticeable changes, an extension of popular literature; a great increase in the number of readers, not, however, in the upper or middle classes, but in the lower classes'.¹⁵⁴

These lower, predominantly rural, classes were ones which Hennessy encountered on his travels in Ireland. Their books and lyrics form the bulk of this article, which features detailed quotes from Gaelic sagas, modern writers and popular songbooks – a noticeable contrast to Hennessy's other articles within the *Nineteenth Century*. Here, he indulges a more leisurely study of his homeland from a perspective that balances comfortable familiarity with the curiosity of a foreign observer. Describing the Irish peasant, he wonders 'how did he get this taste for Clarence Mangan's poems? As well might it be asked how did he get his Celtic nature?'.¹⁵⁵ There is a notable preponderance of songs and poems in Hennessy's analysis, with the *Harp of Tara Song Book* and Thomas Moore's *Melodies* joining Mangan as recurrent features of the households he visits. This is echoed in Michael MacDonagh's 1900 piece, 'In the Bye-Ways of Rural Ireland', where he finds Moore's writings and other street ballads in the *Song Book* 'a distinctive or national feature

¹⁵² Margaret Kelleher, "'Wanted an Irish Novelist": The Critical Decline of the Nineteenth-Century Novel' in Jacqueline Belanger (ed.), *The Irish Novel in the Nineteenth Century: Facts and Fictions* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p. 192.

¹⁵³ Andrew Murphy, *Ireland, Reading and Cultural Nationalism, 1790-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), p. 76.

¹⁵⁴ John Pope Hennessy, 'What do the Irish Read?', *Nineteenth Century* 15 (Jun 1884), p. 920.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 925.

of Irish life'.¹⁵⁶ Margaret Kelleher has noted the importance of anthologies in this period, especially those affordable enough for the subjects of MacDonagh and Hennessy's articles.¹⁵⁷ Both writers pick up on the price of much of the literature in rural Ireland, with MacDonagh noting that both the *Harp of Tara Song Book* and the *Brian Boru Song Book* cost a reasonable three pence each. Literary consumption also occurred in the more institutionalised settings of regional clubs and societies, and what was circulated among members clearly fascinates Hennessy. He namechecks the Catholic Young Men's Societies, the Munster Club and the Land League Rooms, the latter 'the true heirs-at-law of Thomas Davis's Reading Rooms of forty years ago, with ... readers of pure, vigorous, national literature'.¹⁵⁸ This late Victorian growth of instructional or self-improvement literature can also be seen in popular histories, especially those of A.M. Sullivan, Justin Huntly McCarthy and W.E.H. Lecky, which appear in both articles.

Similar to Mahaffy, these writers display a recurrent interest in the impact and extent of periodical literature among the lower classes. MacDonagh notes – or rather laments – how the Irish peasant 'reads few books', filling his time instead with cheap newspapers and pamphlets.¹⁵⁹ Hennessy's take on the situation was somewhat different and within the context of his growing sympathy with forms of nationalist expression. He quotes a Catholic Bishop describing national (periodical) literature as 'some small antidote to the printed poison sold in the great towns here'.¹⁶⁰ There is the unspoken implication of Irish literature as morally purer than British, a reminder, perhaps, of the gradual conflation of Catholicism with a certain brand of Irish nationalism in these years. Even MacDonagh, a more disinterested observer in his articles than Hennessy, acknowledges that it is 'from London rather than from Dublin that the people of Ireland now obtain the bulk of their reading matter', and that, according to Easons, 'within the past ten years the circulation of these journals in Ireland has almost quadrupled'.¹⁶¹ This focus on the national origin of reading material was, nonetheless, merely a side-note for MacDonagh. Making reference to Mahaffy's despised national education system, he praises the commonalities of periodical reading in noting how 'the enormous increase in late years in the readers of this cheap London periodical literature is not peculiar to Ireland alone. It is common to England,

¹⁵⁶ Michael MacDonagh, 'In the Bye-Ways of Rural Ireland II', *Nineteenth Century* 48 (Aug 1900), p. 299.

¹⁵⁷ Margaret Kelleher, 'The Anthology and the *Duanaire*', in James H. Murphy (ed.), *The Oxford History of the Irish Book, Volume IV: The Irish Book in English, 1800-1891* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 453.

¹⁵⁸ Hennessy, 'What do the Irish Read?', p. 925-6.

¹⁵⁹ Michael MacDonagh, 'In the Bye-Ways of Rural Ireland [I]', *Nineteenth Century* 48 (Jul 1900), p. 86.

¹⁶⁰ Hennessy, 'What do the Irish Read?', p. 931.

¹⁶¹ MacDonagh, 'In the Bye-Ways of Rural Ireland I', p. 86.

Scotland and Wales as well'.¹⁶² However, unlike Mahaffy's wariness over the cultural dilution of such practices, or Hennessy's objection to their colonial overtones, MacDonagh's main problem with the cheap London press was its impact on the young people of rural Ireland: its ability 'to impress them, by descriptions of scenes of urban life, with the monotony and loneliness of the country as compared with the companionship and varied pleasures of the towns.'¹⁶³

Hennessy and MacDonagh may have been interrogating a distinctive culture of Irish literary consumption, but their pieces, highly sentimentalised and idealistic, are perhaps more indicative of wider notions of audience and readership. They certainly caught the attention of contemporary observers in Britain, attuned to the mass market for periodical literature. Justin McCarthy, commenting on Hennessy's article, notes the reception in Westminster where 'we all thought it was most interesting and it was much talked of here'.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, the primitivistic notes of these pieces can be set against the general expansion of literacy throughout the 1880s and 1890s, and the *Nineteenth Century's* various efforts to address this increasing threat to its status in British intellectual life.¹⁶⁵ Mahaffy might be the most prominent example of this unease, but the growing concerns around the integrity of liberal democracy and its public discourse that both Godkin and Hennessy articulate in their political articles also speak to deeper social changes of the *fin-de-siècle* period. It is arguably because of these quiet revolutions that the journal had in large part turned its critical gaze to international material by the end of the century. James Knowles, a perceptive observer of public taste, moved his review subtly on from the philosophical debates of the 1870s to a more politically engaged forum for imperial, American and indeed transnational commentary. In doing so, the scope of the platform that Irish writers were afforded in these years became a viable means for asserting their journalistic presence on an international stage. In turn Irish writing in the *Nineteenth Century* may be said to have generated a more expansive perspective than its counterparts in other areas of the highbrow press. Its outward-looking impulse, from colonial commentary to Egyptian archaeology, was reflected in the general ethos of the journal itself. Moreover, as Charlotte Grace O'Brien and E.L. Godkin's contributions indicated, a

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁶⁴ Letter from Justin McCarthy to John Pope Hennessy, 14 June 1884. Hennessy papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS Brit.Emp.s.409, 4/5 f.16.

¹⁶⁵ As noted earlier in the chapter, Harrison estimated the circulation of the journal to be at 20,000 by 1884. By the 1890s, however, most critics agree that this was on a steady downward trend, with readers being lost to an ever-increasing number of new titles and publication formats.

strong transnational emphasis helped to establish Irish voices as major journalistic authorities on both sides of the Irish Sea, and indeed within the burgeoning transatlantic press networks.

While there were other Irish writers who used the political currency of ‘Irishness’ within the journal (most notable were Michael Davitt, Justin McCarthy and Richard Barry O’Brien), the contributions here illustrate how it was not a necessity in forging visibility and a career in the press. Instead, it was peripheral to these authors’ main interests in connecting to broader currents of debate in a European and transatlantic cultural arena. Mahaffy’s Victorian cosmopolitanism may have been tempered by his reactionary stance on matters of Irish education, but his critical worldview blurred the borders, not merely in a geographical sense, but between the roles of academic specialist and public intellectual. This eagerness to contribute to an international dialogue is a main trope of these articles, in their simultaneous advancement of wider perspective and assertion of their authors’ aesthetic claims to prominence. In the same way that Alice Stopford Green was self-consciously positioning her articles at the heart of intellectual discourse on the Boer War and Charlotte Grace O’Brien was reaching out to an enlightened and sympathetic audience, both Hennessy and Godkin display a continued awareness of the cultural clout of Knowles’s review as an institution and organ of public opinion. Its insistence on being the outward-looking face of British politics and culture was emphasised, not only by the continued presence of well-known individuals within its pages, but by moves towards expanding circulation in countries beyond Britain in the latter years of the century.¹⁶⁶

These Irish writers, moreover, were poised at the cusp of a transformational era in the perceived role of the intellectual in Irish politics and culture. As Yeats and his coterie of cultural nationalist litterateurs were to establish more selective definitions of what constituted an appropriate literary heritage, the cumulative effect of these writings in the British press was to harness Irish cultural authority to an alternative, cosmopolitan republic of letters.¹⁶⁷ Whether it was far-reaching political and journalistic commentary, scrutiny of Liberal values or an adherence to an Arnoldian sense of pedagogical gatekeeping, all of these writers championed the international instead of the parochial, imaginative expansion rather than entrenchment. In doing so they bought into the foundational vision of Knowles’s journal in reflecting the highest level of journalistic and literary discourse of the

¹⁶⁶ The *Nineteenth Century* publishers had a formal arrangement with an American firm for exclusive rights sale in the US; they struck a deal for £21 per 1,000 copies. James Knowles Papers, Westminster Public Archives, London, MS 716/127.

¹⁶⁷ See Chapter Five on the *Fortnightly Review* for a discussion of how Paschal Casanova’s study of the so-called ‘World Republic of Letters’ can be utilised (and challenged) in an Irish context.

day, and furthermore, underlining the neglected interfaces between Ireland and the world in the closing years of the nineteenth century.

Chapter Four

Emily Lawless and Hybrid Identities in the Press

A good deal of talk goes on in these days about the Celtic spirit, but does any one really know what that spirit is? Has any one ever tracked it to its secret home; ascertained where it was born and of what elements it was originally composed?¹

Emily Lawless might have viewed herself as singularly unsuited to such a task as uncovering the true essence of Celtic nature, at least as she put forward in this 1897 essay. She was a successful novelist who had left Ireland early in her career in order to take advantage of the considerably more lucrative market in Britain. Her most famous works were written for a largely English audience and renounced by the Irish cultural nationalist movement. Yet Lawless's association with her home country remained a not-insignificant element of her literary production. Figured within a cultural milieu that included the historian William Hartpole Lecky, the politician Horace Plunkett and Lady Gregory, her writings carefully trace the complicated interface between Irish and English, history and fiction, amateur and professional. In the words of one critic, she 'eludes Irish identity constructions and benefits ... from being understood in terms of her *liminal* position, as a writer who lived on both sides of the Irish sea'.²

As this thesis explores, the sizable number of aspirational Irish writers who exploited these fluidities in the latter half of the nineteenth century formed a London-based transnational literary scene to which Lawless undoubtedly belonged. In this sense her cultural responsiveness, and to a degree subversiveness, was embodied most clearly in contributions to literary journals of the 1880s and 90s. These periodical writings, beyond being an outlet for diverse reflections and styles, exemplified the kind of discourse that furnished many of the highbrow magazines of the era with a distinctly Irish flavour. The *Nineteenth Century*, under the astute editing philosophy of James Knowles, was perhaps the

¹ Emily Lawless, 'A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery', *Nineteenth Century* 41 (Jan 1897), p. 92.

² Eve Patten, 'With Essex in India? Emily Lawless's Colonial Consciousness', *European Journal of English Studies* 3.3 (1999), p. 286.

defining journal in this respect. Lawless's correspondence with Knowles reveals the importance of the journal for the development of her literary thought, and indeed showcases her awareness of its intellectual currency. In 1890s, while her article 'Art Kavanagh' was in print, she wrote that 'I am collecting material for another article and hope to have it ready in the time you want it', expressing her adherence to editorial wishes by checking whether Knowles 'would mind one of the articles being antecedent in point of time to Art?'³ The *Nineteenth Century* was therefore a fitting publishing opportunity for Lawless, whose interests as expressed within its pages ranged across a spectrum of history, nature and ethics. It did not confine her to a narrow social identity as either a woman or Irish writer, but facilitated her engagement with a class of self-consciously highbrow thinkers attuned to the cultural mores of late Victorian Britain. Prior to her publication in this journal, however, Lawless had tested the market for periodical fiction in the competitor *Macmillan's Magazine* with three serialised stories between 1881 and 1885. Largely subsumed into the mass of periodical fiction that was regarded as of little critical worth, they speak today to Lawless's canonical position on the periphery, as a seemingly second-rate short fiction writer of limited imaginative reach.

It is precisely this that provides the essential motivation for an examination of Lawless's periodical writings. She can productively be read within the recent moves of Irish studies to realign focus away from the magisterial figures of the nationalist canon and more towards an appreciation of the 'anti-exceptionalism' of much cultural production. Emily Lawless is particularly suited to such a project, as her works defy the static categorisation and ideological viewpoints redolent of Revivalist ethos. The critic Heidi Hansson has provided the most comprehensive commentary on this aspect of Lawless so far in her 1996 monograph, where she identifies an indeterminacy of both place and identity in Lawless's fiction writing while situating it within its defining cultural and historical contexts.⁴ But studies of the journalistic outputs of Lawless, as in the case of most Irish writers of the time, are afforded only a cursory consideration in critical inquiries. It has been mainly left to historians such as Roy Foster and Fintan Cullen to map the breadth of Irish cultural influence in British publishing markets.⁵ The significance of Lawless's work in these journals, then, can be understandably difficult to elucidate in terms of a perceived ideological or national standpoint. Unlike fellow contributors in the *Nineteenth Century*

³ Papers of James Knowles, City of Westminster Archives, MS 716/68c.

⁴ Heidi Hansson, *Emily Lawless 1845-1913: Writing the Interspace* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996).

⁵ Fintan Cullen and R.F. Foster, *'Conquering England': Ireland in Victorian London* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2005).

such as Charlotte O'Brien or Michael Davitt, she did not seek to advance or inflame political opinion, agitate on behalf of social causes or even offer a perspective on contemporary issues. Most readings of Lawless tend to use her periodical writings as a secondary resource or as a type of window to her longer fiction, and it is undoubtedly true that she saw herself chiefly as a novelist and author. But her importance in this respect cannot really be separated from the medium of communication in which she chose to write – the intertextual and discursive environment of the *Nineteenth Century* and *Macmillan's Magazine* helping to chart the wider movement of ideas and attitudes, images and perceptions of Ireland within the cultural sphere.⁶

This chapter, therefore, aims to examine the full range of Emily Lawless's contributions to *Macmillan's Magazine* and the *Nineteenth Century* between the years 1881 and 1900. It firstly considers Lawless as an Irish (and Anglo-Irish) writer in the specific context of the *Nineteenth Century*, focusing on a major element of Lawless's periodical writings in the form of her historical fiction. The four stories published here – 'A Bardic Chronicle', 'How Art Kavanagh fought Richard the King', 'The Builder of the Round Towers' and 'Gerald the Great' – draw upon many of the themes that characterise her longer works, most strikingly questions of historical appropriation and cultural translation. The chapter deals with the formulation and use of voice in her narratives, and how Lawless deliberately moves away from attempts at authoritative representation in recourse to Ireland's Gaelic past. The interaction with colonial and Celtic Revivalist concerns, meanwhile, demonstrates an awareness on Lawless's part of contemporary national discourses that were being replayed throughout the whole of the *Nineteenth Century* and the intellectual press.

These also included an exploration of one of Lawless's most personal and abiding interests throughout her life. The natural world and entomology form the basis of three of her contributions (or one-third of the overall number) in the *Nineteenth Century*, where she details the vagaries of Ireland's land and sea-scapes in two of the pieces. Situated alongside these is an 1899 article on Florentine gardens, where she draws her reader into the exoticised landscape of northern Italy and its famous cultivated gardens. Drawing on the tools of ecofeminist thought, this section analyses notions of imperialism and gender as displaced onto natural environments. The instability and constant flux of identity that mark the flora and fauna of Ireland's west coast mirror the author's complex identification with

⁶ Joep Leerssen, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996), p. 5.

the region, while the sculpted gardens of southern Italy invoke patriarchal forms of management and control. It furthermore attempts to place Lawless alongside other geographers and nature writers in the *Nineteenth Century*, with a view to countering their predominantly patriarchal, highly rational outlook.

Another set of writings that can be seen to work towards similar ends, her *Macmillan's* stories are explored in an in-depth reading that attempts to tease apart some of the intricacies that lie beneath the surface of these apparently light, upper-class social romances. Utilising Eve Sedgwick's influential theories on male homosocial desire in Victorian fiction, we can view the repeated patterns of male bonds within all three stories as Lawless's way of gesturing towards the queer potential of serial fiction. Whether consciously or not, these tales reveal an inherent instability of both textual and narrative signifiers that works against the perceived direction of the conventional romance. Indeed, the love triangle trope that recurs throughout the stories can be inverted to examine an alternative view of sexuality, one that latently acknowledges homosexual desire and male intimacy. While never overtly stating the possibility of queer relationships in the public sphere, Lawless does provide her readers with clues that rework traditional expectations; they also signify a certain 'interplay of economies' current in the Victorian periodical press, pointing to various currents and attractions that may not necessarily be apparent on first reading.⁷

Furthermore, her consciousness of and her affiliation with a network of influential personages through the pages of the journal can be brought to bear on her published fictions of English society, Ireland's past and accounts of the natural landscape. It also relates to another concern of many Irish authors; namely, issues of cultural and literary criticism. In the period of the early Gaelic Revival, questions of authenticity and a 'proper' mode of writing and discourse were important for those wishing to forge careers in the creative industries of nineteenth-century London. It is little surprise, then, that Emily Lawless was not alone in engaging with debates surrounding aesthetic criticism within the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*. Her longest article, 'A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery' was published in 1897, and recalls many of the themes of Oscar Wilde's seminal 1890 piece on 'The True Function and Value of Criticism' (itself later anthologised by Wilde under the title 'The Artist as Critic'). Both authors forward a manifesto for what they see as the proper appreciation of art and literature, and both pieces avoid overtly addressing Irish

⁷ Laurel Brake, *Subjugated Knowledges: Journalism, Gender and Literature in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), p. 56.

affairs, as Wilde was to do in most of his writings. As Gerardine Meaney has noted, however, Lawless was also ‘concerned to refute the polarisation of Celtic sensibility and Saxon reason current in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries . . . [It is a piece] where the definition of the artist’s role in relation to the nation is replaced by the definition of the artist as one who transcends the national’.⁸ Furthermore, the two writers utilise the subversive power of wit to keep the pieces light-hearted in tone but with a serious intent; as Wilde quips, the difference between literature and journalism is that ‘journalism is unreadable, and literature is not read’.⁹ This kind of dialogue on high art was one with which Lawless was familiar, and she was keen to have a say on its significance. As the privileged daughter of the Anglo-Irish ascendancy, she clearly saw herself as an artist first and foremost who agreed that only highbrow ‘criticism . . . makes culture possible’. ‘The Ethics of Literary Forgery’ rails against practices of imitation and, by implication, unscrupulous journalism in press writing. Wilde’s own complex antagonism towards the press is likewise evident in his article, where hints of the controversies in which he was enmeshed present themselves. Journalism, his narrator explains, ‘justifies its own existence by the great Darwinian principle of the survival of the vulgarest’ (the influence of Darwin was also, in quite a different sense, essential to Lawless in her nature articles).¹⁰

Through the glib veneer of such aesthetic concerns, then, both writers deal here with very real issues of power and authority. Lawless makes a compelling case against the ‘telling – worse, printing – [of] lies’ by asserting that forgers and impersonators will not merely face ‘a literary or aesthetic [judgement], but a purely and most formidably *moral* one.’¹¹ It is this struggle for intellectual rights and protection of the artist’s livelihood that similarly moved Wilde to launch such a passionate defence of art for art’s sake. In the spirit of the decadent movement, the fictional conversation between the two characters in ‘The True Function and Value of Criticism’ works to deconstruct the conventional Victorian values of sincerity, morality and realism as defended by Ernest. It is a provocative appeal to those that would enforce belief in a ‘true’ identity or character or writing, and perhaps an inspiration for Emily Lawless’s artistic hybridity. For Lawless, as much as Wilde and his

⁸ Gerardine Meaney, ‘Aesthetics and Politics, 1890-1960’ in Angela Bourke et al. (eds.), *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing, Vol. V: Irish Women’s Writing and Traditions* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002), pp. 1073, 1069.

⁹ Oscar Wilde, ‘The True Function and Value of Criticism’, *Nineteenth Century* 28 (July 1890), p. 129.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Emily Lawless, ‘A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery’, *Nineteenth Century* 41 (Jan 1897), p. 90.

decadent compatriots, ‘artificiality was life-giving and the demand for authenticity mere political prescription’.¹²

Of course, it is tempting to read these two pieces in isolation and on their own (considerable) merits. But it should not be forgotten that some years later W.B. Yeats was to mount his own highly successful campaign in support of a distinctly ‘Irish’ literature, with all the associated aspects of authority and authenticity (a subject not unburdened by its own ideological significations by the late nineteenth century). Much as Lawless and Wilde may have eschewed politics and disparaged the work of journalism, furthermore, it cannot be denied that these pursuits helped consolidate the very networks of privileges that they relied upon for both personal and professional success. Ultimately, this chapter aims to reinscribe Emily Lawless, not within an updated taxonomy of Yeats’s ‘great writers’, but as part of a cultural enterprise among the Irish in England that went beyond the bounds of national self-definition to interrogate the very paradigms of identity, authorship and imaginative authenticity.

Lawless’s *Nineteenth Century Fiction Writings*

The Lawless papers in Marsh’s Library, Dublin contain, among other reviews and magazine clippings, one unidentified newspaper article from the late 1880s. Entitled ‘The Real and Ideal in Fiction’, it details the rise and fall in fashion of the historical novel, and asserts that ‘the best novel is that in which imagination is subordinated to truth’. The author mentions Emily Lawless’s novel *Major Lawrence F.L.S.* as ‘an excellent illustration of this ... fashion of workmanship’, alongside Defoe, Thackeray and Rider Haggard.¹³ The vogue for narratives rooted in the past had indeed taken hold during the nineteenth century, and by the closing decades had established itself as a legitimate and widely popular literary genre. To a certain degree it drew upon the phenomenon of early Victorian antiquarians and their work in detailing the habits and idiosyncracies of past ages. As Joep Leerssen has pointed out, for a certain brand of Irish intellectual consciousness embodied in writers like Samuel Carter Hall the past was ‘an undifferentiated reservoir of Old Things’ that ignored historical development and analysis.¹⁴ Its relationship with the fiction of the day was therefore a profitable one. Although by the end of the century the distance between narrative and

¹² Gerardine Meaney, ‘Decadence, Degeneration and Revolting Aesthetics: The Fiction of Emily Lawless and Katherine Cecil Thurston’, *Colby Quarterly* 36.2 (Jun 2000), p. 161.

¹³ ‘The real and ideal in fiction’, unnamed paper, Lawless Papers, Marsh’s Library, Dublin, z.2.1.15(2).

¹⁴ Leerssen, *Remembrance and Imagination*, p. 68.

empirical history was widening, ushered in by rapid developments in scholarly specialisations, historical fiction had not yet been totally relegated in critical thinking.¹⁵ Public appetite, at least in the form of the general monthly periodical, was not discriminating. The *Nineteenth Century*, in addition to providing the platform for Lawless's historical stories, regularly published work from the historians W.E.H. Lecky and James Anthony Froude, and indeed enlisted the former to review Lawless's historical novel *With Essex in Ireland*.¹⁶ This section, then, will address the interaction between history and stories in Lawless's short fiction, drawing on her use of voice in cultural representation and ultimately situating her work within the context of Ireland's colonial history.

During the years 1890 and 1895, all five of Lawless's fiction pieces published in the *Nineteenth Century* were drawn from tales of Irish history. Reaching from the eighth to the fifteenth century, they document the feats of saints, warriors and kings in both epic and parochial struggles. The significance of this historical focus is perhaps highlighted best in comparison to her other major works. The novels *With Essex in Ireland* (1891) and *Maelcho* (1894) are broadly contemporaneous with the shorter stories, and are set respectively in sixteenth- and early nineteenth-century Ireland.¹⁷ 1890 also saw the publication of her full-length study of Irish history, *The Story of Ireland*, a symbolically important juncture in her historical thought – and not least in the designation of 'Story' as a title.¹⁸ Despite her admitted interest in Ireland's past, Lawless was undoubtedly aware that she was no historian. These five subsidiary stories may speak of a desire to test her skills, and the marketplace, in a less concrete and permanent format than a scholarly book. Her publications in the journal are more interested in exploring the links between myth and historical 'truth', and treading boundaries that might be considered risky in more mainstream works. Lawless was open about her views on the subject in a later piece for the *Nineteenth Century*. 'A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery' addresses the problem, as

¹⁵ Meaney, 'Aesthetics and Politics', p. 1069.

¹⁶ W.E.H. Lecky, 'Noticeable Books (no.1): *With Essex in Ireland*', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Aug 1890), pp. 236-238. See Chapter Three for more details.

¹⁷ Patrick Maume has discussed *Maelcho* as a form of 'the national tale, an early nineteenth-century literary form seeking to reconnect with a prequest bardic tradition' in 'Emily Lawless's *Maelcho* and the Crisis of Imperial Romance', *Éire-Ireland* 41.3 (Fall 2006), p. 246.

¹⁸ Lawless may have been deliberately referencing A.M. O'Sullivan's 1867 book *The Story of Ireland*, although an earlier version of her text had been published three years previous under the simple moniker of *Ireland*. See Heidi Hansson, 'History in/of the Borderlands: Emily Lawless and the Story of Ireland', in Irene Gilsenan Nordin and Elin Holmsten (eds.), *Liminal Borderlands in Irish Literature and Culture* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2009), pp. 51-68. For a further analysis of the historiographical importance of Sullivan's *The Story of Ireland* (especially in relation to Standish O'Grady's 1893 book of the same name), see R.F. Foster, *The Irish Story: Telling Tales and Making it up in Ireland* (London: Penguin, 2002).

she sees it, of historical and cultural appropriation, and decries anachronism in literary endeavours.¹⁹ In a surprisingly self-reflexive passage, Lawless suggests that ‘before allowing our vagrant pens to take any further liberties with kings, queens, bards, chiefs, culdees ... let us ascertain how far such liberties are permissible, and how far they are not’.²⁰ This also acts in part as a defence of *With Essex in Ireland* which had reportedly been mistaken by critics (among them Gladstone) as a true account of sixteenth-century English manoeuvres in Ireland.²¹ Whether or not this was the case, Lawless’s rhetorical manoeuvres suggest a playfulness in her own work regarding the traditional boundaries between author and chronicler, history and story.

In these shorter fictional narratives of the Irish past similar concerns with authorship and authenticity can be traced. Issues of translation are particularly to the fore: in the first instance, how to represent and define a culture (or cultures) several centuries removed? The protagonists Gerald the Great, St. Fechin and Richard the King are as much historical symbols as they are rounded characters, bringing a mythological resonance to their part in Irish history and, arguably, acting as a ‘way in’ for audiences unfamiliar with the conventions of Gaelic Irish literature. In ‘A Bardic Chronicle’ Flann MacFlathri embodies the transition involved in adapting to new peoples and societies, kidnapped from his tribe as a young man and eventually becoming trapped between his loyalties for his old and new clanspeople.²² MacFlaithri suffers the alienation and liminality typical of a captive experience, unable to truly identify with either the O’Mores or the Ossorys, and suffering a tragic fate because of it. Heidi Hansson reads the story as a critique of ‘inflexible constructions of Irishness at the end of the nineteenth century’, but it is just as likely to assert the necessity of complexity in retellings of Irish history.²³ Meanwhile, the difference

¹⁹ Lawless, ‘A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery’, pp. 84-95.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 94. The short story at this time can be seen as an explicitly experimental form, ‘unhampered by generic boundaries and conventions’ as D’hoker and Eggermont have shown, and where ‘the lack of fixed generic forms [for the short story] granted women writers a considerable degree of freedom’ in the periodical press. Elke D’hoker and Stephanie Eggermont, ‘Fin-de-Siècle Women Writers and the Modern Short Story’, *English Literature in Transition 1880-1920* 58.3 (2015), p. 294.

²¹ This claim has been refuted by, among others, Eve Patten who argues that the text reflects clearly late Victorian moral and philosophical concerns, ‘plays consciously on the question of its own authenticity’ and therefore would have been unlikely to pass as a genuine sixteenth-century document. Patten, ‘With Essex in India?’, p. 293.

²² This narrative, Hansson has pointed out, deliberately parallels the experience of an actual fourteenth-century chronicler Castide (who appears in the accounts of Jean Froissart), who was held captive by the Irish lord Bryan Casteret for some years before adapting to his new life and marrying the lord’s daughter. Heidi Hansson, ‘Emily Lawless and History as a Story’ in Elke D’hoker and Stephanie Eggermont (eds.), *The Irish Short Story: Tradition and Trends* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 73.

²³ Ibid., p. 75

in attitudes and morality between nations (and also between past and present) is sharply analysed at the close of ‘Gerald the Great’:

[In looking] back at his career as a whole, what sort of impression, one wonders, does it leave upon the mind of the polite and discriminating reader? Has one’s own sense of ...the lawful got so warped by dwelling upon such inveterate defiers of it, that the first sense of their misdoings has grown blunted, nay, become, if not acceptable, at any rate customary? With the old chroniclers it clearly was so, and why not with their modern admirer?²⁴

In drawing the reader’s attention to the temporal foreignness of the tale, Lawless is underlining the profound imaginative stretch needed for nineteenth-century readers to accurately comprehend these (already twice-mediated) stories.

On a more literal level, translation in language and dialect also presents a challenge for the author. While the characters in the eight-century ‘The Builder of the Round Towers’ and ‘A Bardic Chronicle’ would clearly have spoken Irish and therefore are fully translatable, the speech of both the Anglo-Irish and Gaelic persons of her fifteenth-century narratives proves more problematic. In her introduction to *Grania*, Lawless condemns the use of peasant ‘brogue’ (in a pointed reference to her literary peers) and the elevation of that culture as ‘authentic’ within Revivalist discourse.²⁵ She navigates – and in some respects sidesteps – this issue of representation through a striking paucity of dialogue in the stories. In ‘How Art Kavanagh fought Richard the King’, the snatches of speech we do hear are dramatic in their effect, and, in their bilingual constructions, heighten the essential strangeness of ancient Ireland for a nineteenth-century metropolitan readership. This deliberate withholding of direct communication can sometimes work to quite humorous ends, as in the case of the horse whose ‘name in Irish was ten syllables long, and meant ‘The Tree Leaper’.²⁶ In this sense, Lawless may have been an unwitting player in late-nineteenth century developments around language transfer and bilingualism, particularly, as Margaret Kelleher has explored, in the complexities of linguistic history between Ireland

²⁴ Lawless, ‘Fragments of Irish Chronicles: Gerald the Great [II], *Nineteenth Century* 29 (Mar 1891), p. 443.

²⁵ As quoted in James M. Cahalan, ‘Forging a Tradition: Emily Lawless and the Irish Literary Canon’, *Colby Quarterly* 27.1 (1991), p. 32.

²⁶ Lawless, ‘How Art Kavanagh fought Richard the King’, *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Sep 1890), p. 359.

and Britain.²⁷ Bilingual references serve a dual purpose in these stories: first, in opening up a line of contact between character and reader, and secondly, in providing a means of understanding that directly underscores the role of author as translator and cultural arbiter as well as narrator.

This method also serves to emphasise the use of voice, which Heidi Hansson has recognised as a key consideration in Lawless's work. 'The Builder of Round Towers', in her view, is a symbolic comment on the importance of being heard, where the role of an authoritative voice – such as St Fechin's – enables the possibility of influencing cultural developments.²⁸ As an author, the correct and ethical use of voice is of central significance in establishing an authentic reading experience, and Lawless's technique sets up an illusion of historical veracity in the stories here. Her narratives are supposedly mediated through contemporary chroniclers, either in the first person (such as 'The Builder of the Round Towers', whose 'poor monk ... dare scarce for shame inscribe his name') or with a dependence on outside authority.²⁹ 'Gerald the Great' is the most noticeable instance where excerpts from other sources pepper the tale, creating a multiplicity of voices and enhancing the supposed 'authenticity'. References to the Annals of the Four Masters, perhaps the most important source on early Gaelic society, occur throughout this story alongside many other unnamed contemporaries. Indeed this layering of first-person, documentary and authorial interventions threatens to overburden the story, undermining the stability of the text and constantly breaking any attempt at narrative semblance. 'If the reader insists on asking how far these and similarly reported utterances are or are not strictly historical', Lawless confesses at one point, 'I own that I am at a loss to reply'.³⁰

In this respect, it calls into question the broader notion of telling history – or what Lawless herself would refer to as the gap between 'evidence' and 'imaginative reconstruction'.³¹ The collision of myth and history, indeed, was one that was coming under increased scrutiny by the turn of the century, and of which Lawless was certainly not unaware. As Hansson has remarked, her *Nineteenth Century* stories act as implicit refutations to Frederic Harrison's assertion in the same journal that all historical writings

²⁷ Margaret Kelleher, '“An Irish Problem”: Bilingual Manoeuvres in the Work of Somerville and Ross' in Anna Pilz and Whitney Standlee (eds.), *Irish Women's Writing 1878-1922: Advancing the Cause of Liberty* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), pp. 121-136.

²⁸ Heidi Hansson, *Emily Lawless 1845-1913: Writing the Interspace* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996), p.127.

²⁹ Lawless, 'The Builder of the Round Towers: A Chronicle of the Eighth Century', *Nineteenth Century* 37 (Mar 1895), p. 421.

³⁰ Lawless, 'Gerald the Great', p. 736.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 735.

should aim for the highest ‘accurate understanding of the past’.³² Uneasy perhaps at such highly rational and rigid definitions of what was by no means a stable or uncontested enterprise, Lawless makes the pointed assertion that the quest for verifiable truth ‘is not of any profound consequence’.³³ In what is perhaps a defence of the historical imagination, these stories self-consciously reference debates surrounding the Whig-sanctioned narrativisation of history by accentuating the uncertainties and contingencies in their construction, and in doing so precluding any attempts at conclusive readings. The search for historical veracity becomes a central element of the narratives, for example, but it takes place alongside a reliance on folkloric structures and deliberately unclear secondary sources. While ‘Fragments of Irish Chronicles’ attempts a pseudo-scholarly analysis of the surviving contemporary sources on Gerald the Great, as a character within the story the earl is also inserted within ‘the year-long tragic-comedy of Rebellion and Pardon’.³⁴ This authorial ambivalence that characterises so much of Lawless’ writing alerts us to the potentially tricky balancing act in transitioning from ‘the ostensibly objective truths of the historical sketch to the affective truths of short fiction’.³⁵

Questions of history and memory were topical issues of debate which the *Nineteenth Century* sought to bring under its purview, commissioning several controversial reviews of historians’ work as well as engaging with reinterpretations of imperial history.³⁶ They were also ones with which Lawless continuously engaged, not just through her historical fiction but as a matter of personal interest. In a 1901 article entitled ‘Of the Personal Element in History’ she recounts anecdotes from her youth as examples of the way historical consciousness works on an individual level: as ‘a rush of half-obliterated impressions, so dim and evanescent for the most part, that even as I try to touch them they elude me’.³⁷ For her, the problems of consciousness and the emotive way in which a reader relates to past events complicated any attempt at objective readings of history. Moreover, there are moral and aesthetic questions to be asked when approaching any period of history both as writer and reader, where ‘if we want to read it with any feeling of vividness and

³² Frederic Harrison, ‘A Pompeii for the Twenty-Ninth Century’, *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Sep 1890), p. 381. As quoted in Hansson, ‘Emily Lawless and History as a Story’, p. 64.

³³ Lawless, ‘Gerald the Great’, p. 736.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 749.

³⁵ Hansson, ‘Emily Lawless and History as a Story’, p. 65.

³⁶ See for example Gladstone’s review of Ingram’s *History of the Irish Union* (Oct. 1887), Walter Frewen on ‘Protection and the Empire’ (June 1893), or W.S. Lilly’s ‘The New Spirit in History’ (Oct. 1895). See Chapter Two for an extended examination of the debates over Irish history writing between W.E.H. Lecky and James Anthony Froude.

³⁷ Emily Lawless, ‘Of the Personal Element in History’, *Nineteenth Century* 50 (Nov 1901), p. 790.

reality we ought to contrive to get ourselves into it, and to put oneself into the foreground of any event'.³⁸ Clearly the impetus for many of the stories in the journal, this attitude invited readers to consider the experience of inhabiting the world of the tale. 'To induce history to live and move' was Lawless's stated aim in the 1901 piece, a sentiment that not only pervaded her treatment of historical fiction but also her wider authorial designs. A rather telling indication of her approach to history lies in the title of one essay in her 1897 collection *Traits and Confidences*, entitled 'Irish History Considered as a Pastime'. In this piece, the journey from historical fact to fictional account is interrogated as a vital aspect of her storytelling – and indeed that of a broader Irish *seanchai* tradition – that places it in keeping with the largely self-reflexive tone of the *Nineteenth Century* stories.

There are other aspects of authenticity to consider within nineteenth-century historical fiction. The debate over the origins and use of round towers was one that exercised some of the most distinguished and intellectual minds in Ireland from the mid-century onwards. As George Petrie, Henry O'Brien and others argued out their theories in the Royal Irish Academy (O'Brien had attracted criticisms in the wake of his claims that the towers were the products of, among other things, phallic symbolism and Buddhist origins), Leerssen remarks that these structures 'became a shibboleth by which two conflicting views of Irish antiquities could make their stand'.³⁹ Samuel Ferguson also had his say on the matter, by attesting that by 1845 'no Irish antiquary can be well supposed to write a complete book without giving his own theory of the round towers of that country'.⁴⁰ Lawless's foray into this realm of Gaelic antiquity came in the form of her story 'The Builder of the Round Towers'. Published in 1895, it demonstrates the continued interest in relics of Ireland's ancient past. In this case, however, the fictional St Fechin single-handedly changes the fate of 'Erinn' by bringing the knowledge and mechanics of round towers home with him from France, suggesting a long transnational history of exchange both cultural and material. As a legend, it illustrates the wariness and antagonism that accompanies the imposition of foreign cultural forms, and a clash of attitudes that in many ways echoed contemporary debates over the purity of Irish literary and cultural heritage.

Irish cultural heritage during the years of Lawless's fictional output in *The Nineteenth Century*, of course, was hardly a neglected subject. Yeats, Standish O'Grady, Lady Gregory and others dominated the literary and publishing circuits in London,

³⁸ Ibid., p. 797.

³⁹ Leerssen, *Remembrance and Imagination*, p. 109.

⁴⁰ Samuel Ferguson, 'Betham's Etruria Celtica', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 57 (Apr 1845), p. 487.

promoting a carefully packaged version of Ireland and its essential, historic national values. The selectiveness of this Revival project, however, was undoubtedly a major factor in its success. James Murphy has drawn attention to just how formative and pervasive W.B. Yeats's magisterial comments on the literature of the day have proven to be.⁴¹ The poet's well-publicised lists of best Irish novels sweepingly discount Emily Lawless's writings as being in 'imperfect sympathy with the Celtic nature'.⁴² Much of the recent critical attention on her fiction has focused, then, on reinterpreting her place in respect of the Revival ethos of the late nineteenth century. On the surface, these *Nineteenth Century* stories certainly chime with much of Yeats's and Lady Gregory's wishes for a national literature, based in part on attempts to harness the modern to the ancient world through 'the invocation of a common moral purpose'.⁴³ The focus on a realistic depiction of Celtic Ireland and its inhabitants is evident throughout 'A Bardic Chronicle', where the captured Flann MacFlaithri is forced to face conflicting loyalties and remorseless hardship. But this apparent fixation on the mists of Irish past may well be due to the demands of the marketplace rather than any higher ideals. James Knowles was a canny editor who was quick to perceive and respond to changes in the public taste (he had shifted much of the journal's concerns away from science and religion towards more pressing social and political problems by the 1880s and '90s).⁴⁴ For a periodical that carried relatively few fictional works within its pages, the choice of subject matter was a telling reflection of the ideological environment. The Gaelic League's influence was gaining momentum, and an Irish author could not well be expected to ignore its cultural significance.

Lawless's stories, however, were not motivated by a simple nationalist agenda. As part of a privileged ascendancy tradition, her staunch Unionism prevented too overt a link with contemporary politics within her writing; in one letter to her cousin Horace Plunkett she makes clear her position of not being 'anti-Gaelic at all, so long as it is only Gaelic enthuse and does not include politics'.⁴⁵ Indeed, she rejects many Revival tropes within these tales: notwithstanding the rural settings there is a subtle avoidance of the west, while

⁴¹ James H. Murphy, 'Canonicity: The Literature of Nineteenth Century Ireland', *New Hibernia Review* 7.2 (Summer 2003), p. 52.

⁴² W.B. Yeats, Review of 'Irish National Literature', *The Bookman* (Aug 1895), p. 4.

⁴³ Gregory Castle, 'Nobler Forms: Standish James O'Grady's *History of Ireland* and the Irish Literary Revival' in Lawrence W. McBride (ed.), *Reading Irish Histories: Texts, Contexts and Memory in Modern Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), p. 157.

⁴⁴ Walter Houghton, 'Introduction: Nineteenth Century', in *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900* [no pagination]. <http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk/fullrec/fullrec.do?id=JID-NC&area=intros&forward=search> [Accessed 24 Nov 2016].

⁴⁵ Quoted in Edith Sichel, 'Emily Lawless', *Nineteenth Century and After* 76 (Jul 1914), p. 87.

the reliance on fictional chroniclers to carry the narratives hints at an 'ironic distance ... instead of identification'.⁴⁶ It is exactly this ambivalence, a reluctance to associate fully with any movement or sentiment that has since marked much of the critical discussion of Lawless and her writing.

But in some ways she certainly echoes the motifs of the cultural revival. The natural environment of rural Ireland attains a significance and almost spiritual quality in these fiction pieces, particularly where St Fechin's 'wicked illaun' comes to represent the struggle of good over evil. Its poisonous effect is presumed to be self-evident to the characters, with the chronicler referring to the legend 'being known to all men'.⁴⁷ This close association of communities with their natural surroundings is again suggested through the forests of Gaelic Ireland, whose role Hansson has highlighted throughout Lawless's writing.⁴⁸ The author's keen and lifelong interest in plants, entomology and the natural world lends itself to a heightened awareness of the Irish landscape and its topography. Forests have a uniquely symbolic weight in her work, motivated perhaps by their continued depletion in nineteenth-century Ireland (furthermore, a reminder of the previous century's woodland devastation to build the British Navy).⁴⁹ The Ossory woods are a sinister, smothering presence for Flann Mac Flathri, who is taken prisoner into their 'great stifling' depths and longs to escape the 'wet and cold' trees 'which closed him in on every side'.⁵⁰ Forests are, furthermore, an active instrument of danger and deceit to King Richard's forces in the tale 'Art Kavanagh and Richard the King'. Having defeated the chieftain Art Kavanagh on his first foray into Munster, the king eventually meets his downfall in a battle that favours the local knowledge and camouflage afforded to the native fighters in the forest. Hansson has put forward a reading of *With Essex in Ireland* that views the conquering forces in pursuit of a controllable image of the land and the regulation of unknown territory.⁵¹ These stories certainly map similar struggles for control, but they are less concerned with imperial dynamics than the anchoring of a community and its regional identity. The establishment of the western landscape as an actor with agency has important implications for Lawless's historical consciousness, switching the emphasis away from an anthropocentric-driven narrative (central to Revival conceptions of the rural western

⁴⁶ Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 116.

⁴⁷ Lawless, 'The Builder of the Round Towers', p. 422.

⁴⁸ Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 132.

⁴⁹ Dorinda Outram, 'The History of Natural History: Grand Narrative or Local Lore?' in J.W. Foster (ed.), *Nature in Ireland: A Scientific and Cultural History* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1997), p. 645.

⁵⁰ Emily Lawless, 'A Bardic Chronicle', *Nineteenth Century* 31 (Oct 1891), pp. 648, 650, 651.

⁵¹ Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 124.

communities, for example) to one concerned with a more expansive identity of Ireland in its environmental and literary representations.

This awareness of the colonial question, however, grounds the stories in a late Victorian anxiety about Britain's imperial exercise.⁵² The immediate context of these tales and their place within the journal's content is illuminating, since virtually every issue of the 1890s contained commentary on the Empire. The September and November 1890 numbers feature articles such as 'The Loyalty of the Colonies' and 'Is Central Africa worth having?' alongside the narratives of Art Kavanagh and Gerald the Great. Likewise, 'A Bardic Chronicle' and 'The Builder of Round Towers' are juxtaposed with considerations over 'Commercial Union within the Empire', 'Stray thoughts of an Indian girl' and 'Federating the Empire: a colonial plan'.⁵³ Far from acting as mere distraction from more weighty matters, then, this physical (if not thematic) proximity situates Lawless and her writing at the heart of important debates among an educated colonial class. The nature of the cushioning material unquestionably had strong ideological reverberations, and the response from a largely upper-class reading audience would have reflected this. As one critic has noted, this heterogeneous publishing context would have affected and interacted with the 'production of meaning' in the stories to a greater extent than publication in a periodical dedicated to fiction.⁵⁴ Furthermore, it posits Lawless as a highly equivocal figure who socialised with imperial diplomats, peers and the English literary intelligentsia and spent much time on the continent, yet whose fiction (in the *Nineteenth Century* at least) appeared deeply patriotic.

In many ways, Lawless was involved here with forms of representation that defied (and still defy) easy categorisation. Firstly, as one of the very few authors who had fiction published within the journal, she stood as an important, if complex, exemplar of the tastes and culture of the 1890s. To an audience, frequently a distinguished and influential one who, we can assume, did not buy the *Nineteenth Century* for light entertainment purposes, her historical fiction provided a perspective for viewing the ambiguous and problematic status of Ireland itself. If Emily Lawless was writing as an elite, metropolitan, transnational woman, her characters, including the impetuous and barbaric Art Kavanagh and the Fitzgeralds, spoke of a very different kind of national identity. Secondly, like many other writers, critics and publishers in Victorian London, she was consciously marketing views of

⁵² Patten, 'With Essex in India?', p. 286.

⁵³ See *Nineteenth Century*, October 1891 and March 1895.

⁵⁴ Hansson, 'Emily Lawless and History as a Story', p. 63.

Ireland and its people. Indeed by the 1890s she would have fitted into a decades-old tradition of trading on romantic conceptions of ‘the other island’ that did not begin and end with the era of Yeats, Shaw and Synge. Earlier in the century Daniel Maclise’s visual rendering of Thomas Moore’s poem ‘The Origins of the Harp’ focused on a representation of Ireland that not only would make it acceptable to a wider population, but whose artistic form would put it on a par with other European nations.⁵⁵ Lawless’s strategy was to gain a similar degree of visibility and recognition through her writings, and to inscribe her interpretation of Ireland within the pages of a respected journal. This combination of romanticised representations with keen commercial and social awareness was not, however, unprecedented. Articles in the *Nineteenth Century* still paid lip-service to notions of an Irish belief in witchcraft, ‘innate quaintness of expression’ and ‘humours of Ter-na-nÓg’, not to mention the figure of the stage Irishman which the literary revivalists were assiduously combating.⁵⁶

Emily Lawless is often linked to Lady Augusta Gregory, another Anglo-Irish woman writer who spent long periods of her literary career residing in London, and exerted a considerable degree of influence over her social and cultural milieu.⁵⁷ According to Gregory’s diary’s, indeed, their paths crossed a number of times in the literary networks of 1890s London and indicate the often-ignored significance of Lawless’s writings for the early Gaelic Revivalists.⁵⁸ Despite contrasting attitudes over the aims of cultural nationalism and in particular its burden on the allegorical representation of Irish women, both authors were engaged in the same public discourse of national self-definition.⁵⁹ Significantly, the fictional depiction of Gaelic Ireland was expressed by the two within the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*, albeit in separate ways. In November 1898 Lady Gregory laid out the blueprint and justification for the Gaelic League’s Irish cultural regeneration in an article entitled ‘Ireland, Real and Ideal’. The achievement of Irish artists, writers and intellectuals was no longer to be confined to a purely aesthetic field, but to present the nation’s literary and imaginative heritage as rooted deep in history. In essence, the ‘real’

⁵⁵ Cullen and Foster, ‘*Conquering England*’, p. 56, 57.

⁵⁶ Michael MacDonagh, ‘In the Bye-Ways of Rural Ireland [II]’, *Nineteenth Century* 48 (Aug 1900), pp. 298-314, and Lina Orman Cooper, ‘The Humours of Ter-na-nÓg’, *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Aug 1899), pp. 282-288.

⁵⁷ See Anna Pilz, ‘Lady Gregory’s fans: the Irish Protestant Landed Class and Negotiations of Power’ in Ciaran O’Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), pp. 185-196 for a historical discussion of the social mobility and influence facilitated by Lady Gregory’s ‘salons’ in late Victorian London.

⁵⁸ James Pethica (ed.), *Lady’s Gregory’s Diaries 1892-1902* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1996), p. 20.

⁵⁹ Meaney, ‘Aesthetics and Politics’, p. 1069.

was to be recruited to complement the ‘ideal’ in Irish cultural output, with the aim of countering the supposed colonial mindset or ‘mask’ that had dominated nineteenth-century Irish artistic expression. Asserting a defence of Irish potential in its imaginative and creative forms, Gregory was articulating the principles of the self-help consensus that would draw together not only the ‘new’ Irish writers but the agricultural co-operative pioneers Horace Plunkett and Standish O’Grady (discussed in the next chapter), and in this way indicating the complex web of connections within Irish periodical culture.⁶⁰

There is little doubt that Lawless would have protested against inclusion in such a project, but as one anonymous reviewer attested, she frequently tested the boundaries of the real and ideal in her own historical fiction.⁶¹ Writing against the ‘discourse of racial degeneracy’ that distinguished an era of colonial enterprise, her short stories are testament to the careful manoeuvring between ideological standpoints vital to publishing success in late nineteenth-century London.⁶² The recourse to narratives of Ireland’s ancient past was not a stale rehashing of antiquarian values, but an awareness of the difficulty of realistic representation of contemporary Ireland in a period of political and aesthetic transition. Lawless may not have made a transformative impression of Irish literature in the *Nineteenth Century* or *Macmillan’s Magazine*. But in her fictional treatment of the past she negotiates the relationship of authenticity, authorship and antiquity with a steady and informed sensitivity.

Lawless’s Non-fiction Writings

If one were seeking a simple binary to describe Lawless’s contributions to the *Nineteenth Century*, one could do worse than establish them along the lines of History and Geography. While her fiction concerned itself with Ireland’s mythical past, the non-fiction writings reflect her abiding interest in the natural world and entomology. Nature was undoubtedly Lawless’s passion. It is a recurrent subject in her writing career, from her earliest submission to the *Nineteenth Century* in 1881 (‘A Dredging Ground’) to her full-length monograph *A Garden Diary* of 1901. Even when not explicitly addressing the topic, many of her most important works rely upon vivid depictions of landscape, flora and fauna for visual and thematic effects. The novels *Grania* and *Hurriah* are rooted in the unique

⁶⁰ P.J. Mathews, *Revival: The Abbey Theatre, Sinn Féin, the Gaelic League and the Co-Operative Movement* (Cork: Cork University Press/Field Day, 2003), p. 6.

⁶¹ ‘The real and ideal in fiction’, unnamed newspaper, Lawless Papers, Marsh’s Library Dublin, z.2.1.15(2).

⁶² Meaney, ‘Aesthetics and Politics’, p. 1069.

environment of the west of Ireland, a place that Lawless visited and revisited throughout her life. But despite the draw of such familiar landscapes (Lawless spent much of her childhood in Castlehackett, Co Galway) her nature writings are not limited by national borders, as the article ‘Florentine Gardens in March’ demonstrates.⁶³ Nor did she feel herself confined to casual amateur observations; indeed, she carefully posits her methods and discoveries alongside some of the foremost environmental thought of the day. It is clear, therefore, that she used the *Nineteenth Century* as a platform not only for fictional experiments but to present informed accounts of her entomological and botanical pursuits. The following section aims to situate these themes in a discussion of the ecofeminist implications of natural historiography, alongside more general national and imperial considerations that underpin much of Lawless’s work.

Lawless contributed three nature articles to the *Nineteenth Century*: ‘A Dredging Ground’ was published in July 1881, ‘Florentine Gardens in March’ appeared in February 1899, and ‘North Clare: Leaves from a Diary’ in October 1899’. A further piece, entitled ‘Iar-Connaught: A Sketch’ was published by *Cornhill’s Magazine* in March 1882 (her only article for that journal). At first glance these pieces illustrate little more than light-hearted pursuits of the leisured class. The earliest of these journalistic contributions, ‘A Dredging Ground’, is typical of naturalist exploration to no particular end, an indulgence in antiquarian fancies and trivia of rural Ireland. The piece describes a boat ride taken by the author and her companions in Killary Harbour, an isolated part of west Galway, to practise ‘dredging’ up treasures from the seabed. What was to become a lifelong interest in insects and entomology is piqued in this article, and at one point she describes running ‘away in pursuit – up hill and down dale’ after butterflies; ‘an invitation what entomologist could resist?’⁶⁴ Her subsequent expedition onto the sea is facilitated by her helpers, ‘local men’ engaged to do the heavy labour of rowing the boat while she engages in ‘decidedly a capricious, not to say skittish pursuit’.⁶⁵ The only allusion to local life and conditions is a short digression on the history of the area’s kelp trade, perhaps of passing interest to the magazine’s educated, metropolitan readership.

But this is only one perspective on Lawless’s nature writings. Within the text there is also a deep awareness and appreciation of land and geographical space that was to become a hallmark of her work in the years to come. Her vivid identification with the

⁶³ Emily Lawless, ‘Florentine Gardens in March’, *Nineteenth Century* 45 (Feb 1899), pp. 327-335.

⁶⁴ Emily Lawless, ‘A Dredging Ground’, *Nineteenth Century* 10 (Jul 1881), p. 134.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

landscape of Killary roots the piece in its local geography, where the Mweelrea mountains give way to ‘those beyond Doolough; these in their turn to those above Aasleagh, whence, via Maum-Turk and the hills of Joyce country, we arrive at the Twelve Pins’.⁶⁶ Like Lawless’s other articles it personifies nature to convey a sense of close belonging and intimacy, as well as appreciation of aesthetic beauty. When she notes that ‘the clouds draw back and begin to dispose themselves more becomingly’, she appeals not only to the sentiments of the reader, but to a tradition of nature writing that differed from the contemporary symbolist movement in its insistence on the real, observable experience.⁶⁷ It is a feeling that is echoed in the 1899 article on Florentine gardens, where she admires the ‘magnificent deportment’ of a Florentine violet who ‘takes up the sunshine upon his damask petals, and ... even on the dullest days, seems to give us back our full journey’s worth in the mere joy of being temporarily the neighbour of such a vision!’.⁶⁸ In this way she manoeuvres her specialist botanical knowledge into the realm of the a general reader through a sense of personal delight and familiarity with the natural world – a stylistic choice that pays testament to her consideration of periodical audiences. It also points to her ability to straddle the growing divides in intellectual culture between specialist and generalist (a skill reflected in the periodical works of her close acquaintance Lecky, as well as many others in the *Nineteenth Century*).

A geographical identity and natural awareness, furthermore, is fundamentally linked in Lawless’s work to a sense of self. She talks frequently about developing an ‘intimacy’ with a region, generally in Ireland’s wilderness, and how ‘coming back [to the Burren] after a lapse of years is a test not so much of a place as of oneself’.⁶⁹ The perception of space as represented here is not unusual or simply peripheral for the author. Her landscapes are a source of spirituality and knowledge, as can be seen throughout ‘Florentine Gardens in March’, and are of crucial importance to life itself. In one letter to a friend she expounded how her authorial aim was ‘an attempt to lift the small natural history problem into a region where all Nature and Life (including our own) becomes, as it were, one’.⁷⁰ It is feeling that infuses all her other works, the idea that people and geography are indelibly shaped by one

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 135.

⁶⁷ Heidi Hansson has pointed out that in this way, as in her later poetry, Lawless appeared ‘out of step with the fin de siècle aesthetes who refer to nature almost exclusively in symbolic terms’. Hansson, ‘Kinship: People and Nature in Emily Lawless’s Poetry’, *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 13.2 (2014), p. 6.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 133 and Lawless, ‘Florentine Gardens in March’, p. 328.

⁶⁹ Lawless, ‘North Clare – Leaves from a Diary’, *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Oct. 1899), p. 604.

⁷⁰ As quoted in Sichel, ‘Emily Lawless’, p. 88.

another.⁷¹ Grania, the eponymous heroine of her 1892 novel, is rooted in nature and appears as elemental as her environment, where her ‘dreams ... clung limpet-fashion to these naked rocks, these melancholy dots of land set in the midst of an inhospitable sea, which Nature does not seem to have constructed with an eye to the convenience of so much as a goat’.⁷² *Hurriah*, meanwhile, is a study of the ‘land’ problem as suffered by the people living off it. This fundamental connection is reflected in these periodical pieces by topographies that affect the living experience and conditions of local inhabitants – Killary’s kelp trade as well as the parched soils of Florence’s horticultural gardens. The 1882 article published in *Cornhill Magazine*, furthermore, seems to imbue the land of Connaught with a power of its own, giving the inhabitant a unique point of view on the world.⁷³ Hansson has argued persuasively that Lawless’s insistence on the bond between people and the land ‘introduces an ecosystem’s model for humanity’s place in the natural world that anticipates the environmentalism of a much later day’.⁷⁴ While the direct political implications of such a stance may be missing from Lawless’s work, there is potential in this way to see her writing within a more forward-looking context than is generally allowed. It is forward-looking, moreover, by harking back to an older (even pre-modern) understanding of the relationship between people and place – an understanding that is tangible throughout, and may even be drawn directly from, her historical fiction of these years.

Lawless is, however, alert to the complications of her place as a frequent tourist in foreign regions. In ‘Florentine Gardens’, aware of her own precarious position as amateur explorer, she notes, not without a certain degree of irony, that ‘we are all trespassers in Italy’.⁷⁵ The issue of trespassing is one with added significance in Lawless’s nature-based compositions, reflecting perhaps some of the attendant late nineteenth-century unease over an unchecked expansionist programme of Liberal politics.⁷⁶ As with her short fiction in the *Nineteenth Century*, there is a keen sense of the tense dynamics of an Anglo-Irish relationship, where the anxieties of imperialist discourse were beginning to figure within the cultural consciousness of Irish *literati* on both sides of the Irish Sea.⁷⁷ The land of Ireland had taken on the mantle of a contested national space by the mid-1880s, with the

⁷¹ Heather Edwards, ‘The Irish New Woman and Emily Lawless’s *Grania: The Story of an Island: A Congenial Geography*,’ *English Literature in Transition* 51:4 (2008), p. 423.

⁷² Lawless, *Grania: The Story of an Island* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1892), p. 29.

⁷³ Lawless, ‘Iar-Connaught: A Sketch’, *Cornhill Magazine* 45 (Mar 1882), p. 312.

⁷⁴ Hansson, ‘Kinship’, p. 7.

⁷⁵ Lawless, ‘Florentine Gardens in March’, p. 328.

⁷⁶ See E.L. Godkin’s material in Chapter Three for further discussion of the debates around Gladstonian expansion in the colonies.

⁷⁷ Patten, ‘With Essex in India?’, p. 296.

activist and nationalist MP Michael Davitt's articles in the same journal highlighting its growing centrality to not only Irish but British political thought.⁷⁸ Lawless can hardly have been unaware of implications of these developments for her geographical depictions. There is indeed a measurable shift from the directness – arguably blissful ignorance – of 1881's 'A Dredging Ground' to the more informed and politically-aware style of 'North Clare' in 1899. The intervening years had seen the rise and fall of Parnell's Irish party, and foregrounded the issue of rural land ownership in the Westminster parliament. Despite Lawless's avowed reluctance to address these matters in her writing, the latter article displays a definite understanding of the significance of colonial relations. Her own sense of a national character in particular appears undermined in the western region, where 'identity seems to go swimming about as if through a vacuum'.⁷⁹ This recalls perhaps Ireland's ambiguous position within the empire, both as part of the expansionist programme and victim (or beneficiary) of its rule of law. Here, the problematic contrasts between 'Irishness' and 'Englishness' are juxtaposed on the landscape itself, which assumes political significance:

I laugh when I find myself continually thinking of this region as mountainous one, and being as continually brought up sharp against the fact that its loftiest peak barely touches the thousand-foot line. At that rate East Surrey is another mountainous region, while West Malvern is a positive alpine one!⁸⁰

Systems and differences of measurement emerge strongly here, with Lawless subtly highlighting a comparative framework that rests on hierarchical categorisations, or in other words, where 'the rules governing [measurement] are determined by conditions in England whereas Ireland remains a passive object of study'.⁸¹

Heather Edwards has drawn attention to Lawless's understanding of empire, and in general how colonial contexts reshape discourses and the nature writing such contexts produce.⁸² What could be labelled the geo-political discourse of these articles, then, is worth a thorough consideration. As a privileged member of the ascendancy, Lawless was

⁷⁸ See, for example, 'The Report on the Parnell Commission' (Mar 1890), 'Ireland: Retiring the Landlord Garrison' (May 1890) and 'The Evicted Tenants Problem' (Apr 1894).

⁷⁹ Lawless, 'North Clare', p. 604.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 606.

⁸¹ Heidi Hansson, 'Emily Lawless and Botany as a Foreign Science', *Journal of Literature and Science* 4.1 (2011), p. 67.

⁸² Edwards, 'The Irish New Woman and Emily Lawless's *Grania*', p. 423.

writing from within a nineteenth-century tradition that saw the study of natural sciences as the preserve of the Anglo-Irish, in what one commentator has termed their designated ‘places of knowledge’.⁸³ Her articles here complicate this situation somewhat, exploring both western peripheries of the United Kingdom and the cultural differences of European gardens. As readers, we are reminded of themes of possession and land-control that pervade her fictional stories of historical conflict. In those histories, the power of forested landscapes as agents of chaos, deceit or protection was underscored in relation to the various invading forces of early Gaelic Ireland. Here these topics are figured differently but still within a colonial context – most clearly in the contrast between her relationship with Florence’s orderly gardens and her complex identification with the wilder Irish landscape. The symbolic division here is obvious: her scholarly instincts towards categorisation and definite understanding are offset by the cultural and geographical instability of Ireland’s wilderness, a ‘site of negotiation’ that resists the classification efforts of a foreign culture.⁸⁴ Ultimately, she seems aware that total knowledge or possession of any geographical region is impossible, either for the botanist or invader. As stated in *A Garden Diary*, a gardener can never really own the space he cultivates but ‘he remains one of its appendages – no more so than in those ‘made’ ourselves’.⁸⁵

In engaging with such politically-laden topics as possession and oppression, do these articles, as James Cahalan has suggested, point ahead to a kind of ecofeminism?⁸⁶ If we take as our definition a viewpoint that resists totalising language and closure, as well as one that conflates the nature/culture hierarchies imposed on women and colonised land, there are certainly possibilities for casting Lawless’s work in this light. Although Lawless may not specifically invoke gender here, she is aware of its dynamics in environmental settings. Her personification of the Florentine flowers pays attention to the restrictive differences assigned to the sexes, describing one specimen ‘as distinctively feminine in the good old-fashioned sense of the word as *fulgens* himself is distinctively the other thing’.⁸⁷ In the same piece she also inscribes patriarchal forms of domination onto the landscape, by decrying how ‘it was as if man’s workmanship at its very finest had set itself in a fit of deliberate competition against the ... column-like tree-trunk, overhanging cloud, or blue-

⁸³ J.W. Foster, ‘Nature and Nation in the Nineteenth Century’ in J.W. Foster (ed.), *Nature in Ireland: A Scientific and Cultural History* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1997), p. 425.

⁸⁴ Hansson, ‘Emily Lawless and Botany as a Foreign Science’, p. 70.

⁸⁵ Lawless, *A Garden Diary, September 1899 – September 1900* (London: Methuen, 1901), p. 40.

⁸⁶ Cahalan, ‘Forging a Tradition’, p. 30.

⁸⁷ Lawless, ‘Florentine Gardens in March’, p. 329.

tinted hillside’.⁸⁸ It is a passage that echoes the sentiment expressed in *A Garden Diary*, denouncing ‘how slight an excrescence this whole business that we call ownership really is; how strong, how deeply rooted the state of things which it has momentarily superseded’.⁸⁹ Ecofeminist thought is thus particularly suited to re-evaluating Lawless and the doubly-marginalised genres in which she works. According to recent critical work on Victorian women’s nature writing, moreover, there is scope for inverting Lawless’s seemingly benign gardening pursuits as subtly, if deeply, political; as during these years ‘the traditional paradigm of woman *as* nature was replaced by women *in* nature, allowing the cross-fertilisation of two major concepts that construct female identity: domesticity and wilderness’.⁹⁰ Using the space of gardens as both a site of control and questioning, Lawless, in articulating her personal interests to a mass audience, was engaging with the vein of Victorian women’s writing that challenged conventional assignments of public and private spheres.

Parallel to this in her periodical work is the struggle against patriarchal categorisation in all its forms. In eco-critical theory, nature writing emerges as a product of Enlightenment and its emphasis on rationalism, classification and hierarchies. These totalising models effectively proscribe a ‘feminine’ viewpoint in favour of masculine scientific observation and are ‘patriarchal ... to the core’.⁹¹ In Lawless’s writings, not least in the *Nineteenth Century* articles, there is a tangible unease at such taxonomies. Indeed, the geographical features of North Clare exist in the text not as definite, classified realities but as things in flux. This instability of essence is embodied in the shellfish Limnea, where ‘members of the selfsame species ... differ so widely that it needs some little faith to believe that they can be essentially the same’.⁹² Heidi Hansson’s critical study of Lawless draws its title from a term deployed in the same article: an ‘interspace’ between two states, where one ‘does not strictly belong to one or the other’.⁹³ It is an appropriate name for a book that, correctly, argues that Lawless cannot be shoehorned into any fixed categories. It is particularly borne out through her writings about nature. Most notably, she avoids the nineteenth-century Gaelic Revivalists’ conflation of the West with ‘real’ Ireland, instead

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 335.

⁸⁹ Lawless, *A Garden Diary*, p. 42.

⁹⁰ Fabienne Moine, ‘Elizabeth Von Arnim’s Gardening Memoirs: Cultivating Feminism?’, *Cahiers Victoriens et Edouardiens* 77 (Spring 2013) [no pagination]. <https://journals.openedition.org/cve/353> [Accessed 3 Aug 2018].

⁹¹ Patrick D. Murphy, *Literature, Nature, and Other: Ecofeminist Critiques* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), p. 32.

⁹² Lawless, ‘North Clare’, p. 609.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 605.

portraying the ‘complexities, contradictions and ambiguities’ of this marginalised region.⁹⁴ Throughout her work she returns time and again to the idea that definitions and systematisations rule out the natural difference extant in all living things. Even her seascapes resist incorporation into absolute models of scientific knowledge:

[Dredging has] an allurements in this very uncertainty ... since dredge when you will, and where you will, and as long as you will, you may be very sure that you will not exhaust – nay, you will not lay bare a hundredth part, or a hundred-thousandth part of the inexhaustible treasures of the sea.⁹⁵

Indeed, it is perhaps in her natural history pieces like these that we can most convincingly locate a subversiveness in Lawless’s writing. She deliberately sets herself in opposition to the presiding male figure of naturalist science, and one who seems to dominate all other nature writing within the *Nineteenth Century*. In WB Carpenter’s 1880 article on ‘The Deep Sea and its Contents’, for instance, the author describes how he formed a scheme for a ‘scientific circumnavigation expedition’, where, ‘at intervals as nearly uniform as possible, we established 362 observing stations along the course of *seventy thousand* nautical miles’.⁹⁶ The contrast with Lawless’s exploration of the Killary fjord above needs little elaboration. She breaks genre conventions and challenges traditional measuring systems, declaring that while ‘the measuring tape is all very well in its own place, but its place, somehow or other, does not seem to be here!’⁹⁷ At the same time, however, she is concerned with writing herself into the male discipline of geography.⁹⁸ She regards herself as having ‘entomological eyes’, a sense that apparently originated in her childhood desire to be a naturalist, remembering ‘What dignity, what majesty lay in its syllables – En-to-mo-logist! Could anything be more entrancing?’⁹⁹ From her earliest writings she evidently viewed herself as an authority on her favoured subject. ‘North Clare’ details the momentous occasion in her youth when she received a letter from ‘a great, nay, greatest zoologist’ in recognition of her solution to a botanical puzzle in the Burren. Despite the incredulity and ‘beatitude’ she expresses, there is also a clear sense of pride in her own abilities. There may

⁹⁴ Edwards, ‘The Irish New Woman and Emily Lawless’s *Grania*’, p. 424.

⁹⁵ Lawless, ‘A Dredging Ground’, p. 132.

⁹⁶ Walter Benjamin Carpenter, ‘The Deep Sea and its Contents’, *Nineteenth Century* 7 (Apr 1880), p. 593.

⁹⁷ Lawless, ‘North Clare’, p. 607.

⁹⁸ Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 62.

⁹⁹ Emily Lawless, ‘An Entomological Adventure’ in *Traits and Confidences* (London: Garland, 1979 [1897]), p. 12.

well be an element of compensation here too, however. As an Anglo-Irish woman she was in a 'very real sense both outsider and insider to the geography she describes', consequently harbouring a compulsion to 'test ... oneself' against the standards set by male peers.¹⁰⁰ Her wide-ranging, specialist knowledge is testament to this resolve, from elucidating the comparative advantages of shallow and deep dredging to a grasp of the Latin flower names of northern Florence ('a matter of merely academic interest').¹⁰¹ She never overtly states her intentions, but displaces at least part of her sentiment onto the natural world, lamenting a flower that was crowded out by others: 'Alas for bashfulness and feminine timidity in an age of push and eager competition!'¹⁰² In an article that uses meticulous scientific language to discuss plant growth, this description stands out not only for its literary technique but also for its vivid personification and gendering of plant life.

Where then can we place Lawless in the wider picture of naturalist and Darwinian thinking within the Victorian press at this time? She was, for one, certainly the only woman writing about the natural world in the *Nineteenth Century* in these decades. It is notable, though perhaps inevitable, that despite the multiplicity of views supposedly catered for by the 'open platform' style of discussion and debate, this periodical reveals itself as a rather conservative publication in matters of evolutionary discourse and nature. During the 1880s and '90s, great debates were still waged within its pages among exclusively male heavyweights such as Alfred Tennyson and T.H. Huxley. A.P. Sinnett, writing in 1894, describes Nature as a 'manifested universe' and praises the virtues of the 'school of super-physical enquiry'.¹⁰³ In an article entitled 'The Interpreters of Genesis and the Interpreters of Nature', meanwhile, Huxley weighs in on a debate between Gladstone and Albert Reville regarding the 'important questions of natural science and religion'. Setting himself up as the voice of reason and authority, the author goes on to proclaim that 'I think it is desirable that the public should know what it is that natural science really has to say on these topics'.¹⁰⁴ In invoking the Bible through the book of Genesis, Huxley arguably serves to reinscribe the patriarchal values that not only underpinned the study of nature, but the fields of theology and natural philosophy to which it was frequently linked in nineteenth-

¹⁰⁰ Heather Edwards, 'The Irish New Woman and Emily Lawless's *Grania*', p. 424; Lawless, 'North Clare', p. 604.

¹⁰¹ Lawless, 'A Dredging Ground', p. 131.

¹⁰² Lawless, 'Florentine Gardens in March', p. 329.

¹⁰³ A.P. Sinnett, 'Behind the Scenes of Nature', *Nineteenth Century* 36 (Aug 1894), p. 212.

¹⁰⁴ T.H. Huxley, 'The Interpreters of Genesis and the Interpreters of Nature', *Nineteenth Century* 18 (Dec 1885), p. 849.

century thought.¹⁰⁵ Similarly, a biblical reading of evolution is forwarded by another writer in arguing that ‘the holy scriptures are built upon the hypothesis of the supremacy and the unique position of man in creation’.¹⁰⁶ This illustrates the rigidly proscriptive perspectives that still prevailed within the intellectual press at the close of the Victorian era, reinforcing the absolutes of male rational enquiry and the attendant submissiveness of nature. It was an approach that was starkly at odds with Lawless’s work on the topics, which could be described as ‘a potpourri of aesthetic, autobiographical and factual discourse’.¹⁰⁷

Moreover, Lawless was clearly uncomfortable engaging with these types of ‘weighty’ questions in the magazine’s pages. She seems to insist throughout that the natural world be understood on its own terms, scientifically certainly, but in all its diversity, harshness and complexity.¹⁰⁸ Like her contemporary George Egerton, she avoided the popular narrative of evolution with the belief that women and nature always emerge as the oppressed Other.¹⁰⁹ Her landscapes of Florence, Killary and the Burren manage to preserve the fascination that nature held for her as a young girl, still regarding it, ‘I must confess, from a sentimental [rather] than a scientist point of view’.¹¹⁰ Yet as Hansson has fittingly pointed out, Lawless was not a Romantic, but enough of a Darwinist to employ precise terminology and accuracy of observation.¹¹¹ Her ideas were, after all, articulated within the framework of popular science that the *Nineteenth Century* represented. Her depth of understanding and prescience as regards nature may have been cast in deliberately amateur terminology, but it displays her characteristic grasp of the topical implications (evolutionary, imperial or gendered) of scientific discourse. As she stated in *A Garden Diary*, ‘we are all of us to-day evolutionists, if some of us still with a certain amount of reservation.’¹¹² It is this that perhaps sums Lawless up best – a careful manoeuvring between accepted standards of natural science, all the while providing her readers with a wry and healthy dose of realism.

¹⁰⁵ J. M. I. Klaver, *Geology and Religious Sentiment: The Effect of Geological Discoveries on English Society and Literature between 1829 and 1859* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p. 199.

¹⁰⁶ Harvey Carlisle, ‘Man’s Place in Nature’, *Nineteenth Century* 10 (Jul 1881), p. 142.

¹⁰⁷ Mary Ellen Bellanca, *Daybooks of Discovery: Nature Diaries in Britain 1770-1870* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), p. 20.

¹⁰⁸ Cahalan, ‘Forging a Tradition’, p. 30.

¹⁰⁹ Iveta Jusová, ‘George Egerton and the Project of British Colonialism’, *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 19.1 (Spring 2000), p. 41.

¹¹⁰ Lawless, ‘North Clare’, p. 606.

¹¹¹ Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 61.

¹¹² Lawless, *A Garden Diary*, p. 191.

Lawless's *Macmillan's* Stories: Queering the Serial Form

While Lawless was a firm adherent of the *Nineteenth Century* and its reach across genres, she arguably had a more productive relationship with *Macmillan's Magazine* in her early years of fictional output. The eponymous publishing house issued a number of her novels throughout her career, including her study of the writer Maria Edgeworth, and Lawless apparently remained in close contact with them over financial and editorial agreements.¹¹³ *Macmillan's* also was an important publishing vehicle for Irish writers in the London market, and Lawless would no doubt have been aware of, among others, W.B. Yeats's, Jane Barlow's and Stephen Gwynn's connection to the house. She seems to have chosen the *Magazine* – a direct competitor of the *Nineteenth Century* in the monthly periodical market – for its more sustained focus on fiction. Unlike the former title with its eye to political and philosophical affairs, *Macmillan's Magazine* had established a reputation for itself by the 1880s as a respected platform for literary expression. In 1882 John Morley was appointed as editor, fresh from a distinguished editorial stint at the *Fortnightly Review* and prior to his appointment as Chief Secretary of Ireland, and during his two years at the helm continued to attract a range of high-quality material across the arts, politics and science – although one critic finds it 'difficult to resist the suspicion that Morley, an exceptionally energetic and versatile man, did not put the same effort into *Macmillan's* that had gone into his editing of the *Fortnightly*'.¹¹⁴ He did, however, give Lawless her first break with fiction for a large readership, serialising three of her stories in quick succession during 1884 and 1885. It was probably due to personal connections that Lawless was able to achieve this success, prompting her acquaintance and head of the publishing house George Macmillan to write to Morley in late 1883 to urge publication along as she was 'anxiously awaiting his verdict'.¹¹⁵

These stories, like one account of their author, remain 'dimly remembered' in the critical opus of the Lawless's work, and are almost entirely forgotten in the deluge of serial fiction of the late-nineteenth century.¹¹⁶ 'A Renegade' was published in March and April 1884, 'Borroughdale of Borroughdale' in November and December of that year, while 'A Millionaire's Cousin' appeared in three parts from January to March of 1885. This last

¹¹³ Heidi Hansson has noted how Lawless was careful to lay out her terms in regard to publication and copyright in correspondence with Macmillan's; she was also aware of issues in printing, proofing and commercial revenues for her books both in Britain and America. Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, pp. 22-3.

¹¹⁴ George G. Worth, *Macmillan's Magazine, 1859-1907: 'No Flippancy or Abuse Allowed'* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 148.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

story was released later that year by Macmillan's and Co in six-pence novella form, and is the only one of these to have attracted any critical attention. James M. Cahalan rates it alongside her earlier novel 'A Chelsea Householder' as positioning the author 'out of her depth in polite English society'.¹¹⁷ It is arguably true that these stories are mainly light accounts of English social life and manners with little of the penetrative social analysis of many of Lawless's more famous novelist contemporaries. But contrary to Cahalan's assertion, genteel English society was in fact where Lawless was most at home. Her aristocratic background meant that a mobile lifestyle between London and Irish big houses was one with which Lawless was familiar from a young age, and her parents' large networks of acquaintances recur throughout her career. Her cousin Horace Plunkett's diaries bear witness to the circles within which she moved; one entry describes a dinner with Mrs Humphry Ward, Lord Morris and Lady Cloncurry, establishing Lawless at the heart of an influential and transnational social network in London.¹¹⁸

These tales, then, can be read as more reflective of both her life and oeuvre than initially thought. Although they all appear as fictional accounts of the English upper class, and thus far removed from previous musings on, for example, dredging in the west of Ireland, the themes in various ways echo some of Lawless's most prevailing interests. Significantly, a heightened sense of the natural world pervades these stories, with highly detailed renderings of flora and fauna forming the backdrop to the exploits of many of the characters. Both 'A Renegade' and 'A Millionaire's Cousin' are set in exotic (and exoticised) locations – Italy and Algiers, respectively – and it is highly probable that Lawless settled on such backdrops in part due to their lush environments. The luxuriant and abundant nature native to both localities is, indeed, a large part of the appeal for the characters in both stories, with one proclaiming 'though neither an author nor an artist, nor belonging to any of those sensitive classes whose souls are supposed to be swayed by every fresh fluctuation of the barometer, that subtle chemistry which lurks in blue skies and sun-swept seas affected me'.¹¹⁹ There are also more specific links in these stories to Lawless's interest in marine biology and entomology. 'Boroughdale of Boroughdale' recounts the life of a wealthy, socially awkward student who finds his calling (and true love) in the scientific study of sea ecology. Working his way up the ranks of the Royal Society, the

¹¹⁷ Cahalan, 'Forging a Tradition', p. 31.

¹¹⁸ Diary of Horace Plunkett, National Library of Ireland, MS 42,222 (23 March 1890). Available at http://www.nli.ie/pdfs/diaries_of_sir_horace_curzon_plunkett/1890_diary_of_sir_horace_curzon_plunkett.pdf [Accessed 16 July 2018].

¹¹⁹ Emily Lawless, 'A Renegade [part I]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 49 (Mar 1884), p. 351.

titular protagonist absorbs himself in ‘strange and slimy beasts’.¹²⁰ There is a knowingly wry undertone to Lawless’s affectionate descriptions of working in a ‘room smelling like a seashore at extremely low tide, one hand excitedly twisting up the screws of a microscope, and the other tenderly caressing a dead crab’.¹²¹ Similar to the *Nineteenth Century* pieces, this story also reflects Lawless’s broader attentiveness to the gendered discourses of natural science. The narrative deliberately foregrounds a woman as the expert in entomological research, with various arch comments on the ‘dinosaurs’ of the profession – the ‘black-capped and spectacled sages’ resembling an archaic gentlemen’s society.¹²² As in her natural science writings for the *Nineteenth Century*, Lawless implicitly refutes the authority of these archaic male authorities, seeking instead to advance a view of scientific knowledge based on a female perspective.

We can read this in the context of what Heidi Hansson sees as Lawless’s efforts ‘to create spaces in her text where she can question the categorisation activities that constitute the core of the discipline’.¹²³ Indeed, as with her articles on history and nature, the writer’s preoccupation with the liminal, the ambiguous, the shifting ‘interspaces’ that allow her to question perceived norms are a continuous feature of her writing. In these stories there is also room for interpretation of these spaces in terms of sexuality, particularly an unspoken sense of queerness. Though all three of these tales in some sense nominally deal with varieties of the marriage plot, there is a sequence of narrative moments and signals that allow, even invite, us to read against the grain of the text. Much like the suggestive undertones of her articles on Irish landscapes, where the topography is figured in its corporeal aspects, here we see a heightened play on kinds of intimacies among men, evoked through the very Victorian trope of an unspoken bond. This can be fruitfully interpreted in the context of Lawless’s own life and relationships. Despite her standing as both a well-known writer and public figure, she was a remarkably private person in regard to personal affairs, and retained a curiously ambivalent attitude on matters of gender rights and sexual freedom. As mentioned above, her paradoxical stance on political issues (where she sided with the conservative voice in appeals against women’s suffrage, for instance) sat alongside a much more liberal, proto-feminist inclination in her nature writing and fiction. There are hints of sexual subversion in Lawless’s private life too: while little can be confidently stated, we do know that she lived for much of her later life with her close companion –

¹²⁰ Emily Lawless, ‘Borroughdale of Borroughdale [part I]’, *Macmillan’s Magazine* 51 (Nov 1884), p. 55.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² Emily Lawless, ‘Borroughdale of Borroughdale [part II]’, *Macmillan’s Magazine* 51 (Dec 1884), p. 141.

¹²³ Hansson, ‘Emily Lawless and Botany as Foreign Science’, p. 62.

presumably partner – Lady Sarah Spencer in a house they built in Sussex.¹²⁴ The spaces, uncertainties and elisions in accounts of the writer's own life are again arguably deliberate, as she left careful instructions for her papers and correspondence to be destroyed following her death.

While this may be little more than an exercise in conjecture, we can map at least an element of this sexual ambiguity onto these *Macmillan's* pieces which, more than anything else, can be read together through a common focus on the vagaries of male friendship and intimacy. 'A Renegade' concerns the travels of the first-person narrator in a small Italian town, where he meets and befriends another Scottish visitor, staying in the area with the intent of courting a local woman. This narrator develops a deep connection with the titular renegade Maclean, in part because both seem drawn to the role of society's outcast. Both have come to Italy – in particular this exotic, remote Ligurian paradise – to escape the suffocating confines of British social expectations and propriety. For our narrator, it is the literally suffocating conditions of the British climate for his lungs, while Maclean, we learn, is fleeing the pressure from his family to join the priesthood. A similar impulse propels the characters of 'A Millionaire's Cousin', where the luxuriant African environment provides the backdrop for Alphonsus's self-imposed exile from England, and the 'insular reproach' of being an untravelled artist.¹²⁵ He stays with his cousin Hargrave, a somewhat mysterious, isolated figure, who again seems to have escaped an upper-class social milieu in which he feels uncomfortable. But it is 'Borroughdale of Borroughdale' that is perhaps the most overt illustration of the intimacy of male bonds in Lawless's stories. There is an unspoken suggestiveness to the closeness of Borroughdale and Farquart's relationship: the protagonist's father, lamenting his son's marriage prospects, tells his friend 'if he could always have a man like yourself, my dear Farquart, at his elbow, the thing would be simplified, but I know, we all know, how impossible it is to expect *that*'.¹²⁶ The impossibility of '*that*', Lawless seems to imply, lies in the strict gender and behavioural codes that all characters seem to chafe against; boundaries and limitations that the story views with irony.

We can read much of this in relation to Eve Sedgwick's seminal work on Victorian sexuality, especially the 'continuum of male 'homosocial desire' ... [which is] bound up with an emerging pattern of male friendship, mentorship, entitlement, rivalry and

¹²⁴ This is detailed in Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 24.

¹²⁵ Lawless, 'A Millionaire's Cousin [I]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 51 (Jan 1885), p. 215.

¹²⁶ Lawless, 'Borroughdale of Borroughdale I', p. 42.

hetero/homosexuality'.¹²⁷ Lawless's characters all occupy different points on this scale, engaging with the notion that Victorian sexuality is unfixed, or at least more open to fluidity that might be assumed. Of particular interest is Sedgwick's insistence that these lines of desire always exist 'in an intimate and shifting relation to class'.¹²⁸ It is little coincidence that the male characters here, such as Hargrave the millionaire cousin, are all cushioned by inherited wealth and financial independence. These material means and freedom underline Sedgwick's assertion of the 'special relationship between male homosocial ... desire and the structures for maintaining and transmitting patriarchal power'.¹²⁹ When Borroughdale and Hargrave eventually decide to marry, neither of their prospective wives seem to have much agency in acquiescing; the vast wealth of their suitors pushes their families to insist upon the match. Their marriages, indeed, seem to contradict the direction of much of the earlier parts of the stories. Both men appear to have an active aversion to female society at the outset of the tales, but the dictates of social norms win out by the end over the male bonds that have stood in their place.

In reworking the categories of permitted desire, Sedgwick's articulation of René Girard's theory of 'triangulation' takes on a particular resonance in these stories. In this schema, the focus is shifted to the connection between man and man, instead of man and woman, in the traditional relations of desire in Victorian literature. In the erotic triangle, according to Girard, the calculus of power is structured by the relations of rivalry, where the bond between two rivals is 'as intense and potent as any other'.¹³⁰ We can see this played out in its most overt fashion in 'A Millionaire's Cousin'. The plot is structured around a love triangle, albeit one that only becomes evident late in the story. The romantic interplay between Hargrave and Miss Bonson forms the centrepiece of the tale, with the narrator Adolphus as a disinterested observer – until, naturally, he isn't, and falls for the charms of the younger woman over conversations in the British Library. This puts him in direct competition with his cousin whom, like Miss Bonson, he has been almost entirely financially dependent on for much of the story. Indeed for both men, holidaying in their isolated mansion for months, each has largely taken the place of a female companion for the other. Lawless, in replaying these normative gender roles, makes a wry comment on the

¹²⁷ Eve Kosovsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), p. 1.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹³⁰ René Girard, *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel: Self and Other in Literary Structure*, trans. Yvonne Freccero (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1965), p. 10. As quoted in Sedgwick, *Between Men*, p. 21.

asymmetries of romantic relations. Adolphus's break with Hargrave after the elder cousin's coupling with Miss Bonson is akin to that of a spurned lover, with much of the narrator's emotional turmoil reminiscent of heartbreak. It is notable also that the final section of the story, where traditional roles are resumed and the heterosexual couple triumph, takes place back in London – the metropole literally displacing the exotic periphery as the field for proper forms of desire.

A version of the love triangle is also evident in 'Borroughdale of Borroughdale', where the indeterminacy of rivalry and love can be mapped onto the relationship between the protagonist and his close friend Farquart.¹³¹ After Borroughdale falls in love with Miss Holland, Farquart becomes moody and irascible, with the removal of his friend's affection prompting 'that aggrieved feeling ... less gratifying than perplexing'.¹³² The two men's intense and then broken relationship is tied up with the expectations of Borroughdale's role as aristocratic heir, and his father's hope for a wife suitable to his son's position. The initial male friendship, which breaks down when a woman enters the picture, is only sustained by Borroughdale's seeming dismissiveness of female society. In this way it underlines the assertion that 'patriarchal heterosexuality [is] seen in terms of traffic in women ... as exchangeable, symbolic property' where, in an inversion of the Freudian schema, she steps in to regulate the bonds of men with men.¹³³ Hansson has pointed to how these stories interrogate the power balances between men that revolve around traditionally 'feminine' ideas of living situations, relationships and positions of dependence.¹³⁴ 'A Renegade' also features a type of love triangle, although not one played out to the full extent of the other stories. Here, the protagonist helps his friend with the courtship of an Italian woman but, as in the other stories, only after a sizeable bulk of the narrative is taken up with male-male relations. It is little wonder, then, that (like one critic's reading of Dickens) 'relationships between men in [her] fiction are more fully charged with erotic energy and conflict than those between men and women'.¹³⁵ Homosocial desire, of course, was a trope that occurred throughout Victorian fiction: from Dickens to the Sherlock Holmes stories to the dramas of Lawless's contemporary Oscar Wilde, an unspoken playfulness around representations of

¹³¹ Sedgwick, *Between Men*, p. 1.

¹³² Lawless, 'Borroughdale of Borroughdale II', p. 144.

¹³³ Sedgwick, *Between Men*, p. 26.

¹³⁴ Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 41.

¹³⁵ Holly Furneaux, *Queer Dickens: Erotics, Families, Masculinities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 7.

same-sex friendships and relationships would not necessarily have been unfamiliar to *Macmillan's* literary readership.

Another of Lawless's gestures towards alternative modes of sexual attraction is embodied in the figure of the artist, a recurrent trope in all of these tales. Influenced perhaps by the aestheticist movement of the late-nineteenth century that popularised the aesthete as a figure removed from everyday society, the artist as an individualised outsider in these stories takes on heightened imaginative significance. In 'Boroughdale of Boroughdale', Farquart can be seen as a kind of precursor to the *fin-de-siècle* aesthete, living a carefree life of a painter with occasional glimpses of a lonely and tortured soul. His melancholy moods are exacerbated by the absence of his once close friend Boroughdale, connotations which may suggest an ambiguous sexuality. He remains uninterested in women, ignoring the advances of his cousin Miss Holland, and thus can be read as perhaps the clearest example of a gay character in Lawless's fiction. As mentioned above, the narrative establishes him as almost an alternative partner for Boroughdale. Discussing the prospects of Boroughdale's marriage with the heir's father, Farquart wonders 'whether there was or was not any part he was expected to play in the matter'.¹³⁶ He gradually becomes sidelined in the story as Boroughdale enters into 'society', a peripheral figure to the rituals of courtship and marriage that close the tale. This idea of artist as outsider, set apart from normative social relations, is also evident in 'A Renegade'. This earlier tale, like 'A Millionaire's Cousin' adopts the mode of travel as a means for the characters to escape stifling social norms and expectations. In the relations between the two main characters there is a strong sense of the inarticulable, but also of the subjectivity and self-fashioning of the artist – an issue of which Lawless was keenly aware. In this case the narrator is a sensitive, frail, almost effete traveller eager to escape the demands on his health of an English climate, and who finds his calling in becoming a right-hand man to the equally evasive Maclean.

These subtle but tangible lines of desire so often emanating from the artist figure (the narrator in 'A Millionaire's Cousin' is himself an artist and traveller) point towards the queer potential of Lawless's early fiction, in form as well as substance. Holly Furneaux has drawn attention to how the serial form opened up spaces in a text during the nineteenth century, allowing imaginative room for manoeuvre and interpretation that could sometimes work against the heteronormative expectations of the reader (of *Macmillan's Magazine*, in this instance). 'The gaps between instalments', she writes, 'encourage ... counterfactual

¹³⁶ Lawless, 'Boroughdale of Boroughdale I', p. 42.

possibilities [that are] intensified by the serial form'.¹³⁷ Indeed, 'A Millionaire's Cousin' was better received in serial form than in its later novel edition, according to Lawless's biographer.¹³⁸ The first instalment of this story, in January 1885, closes on a scene of male conviviality and domestic bliss in what can be read as an alternative vision of the Victorian domestic interior. Lawless may not have been intentionally inscribing her characters with ulterior motives, but she does heighten the 'emotional and erotic bonds between men and [describes] ways of being that eschew marriage and reproduction' – at least at first.¹³⁹ Lawless, also, was writing at a time when her audience would not necessarily have been unacquainted with representations of homosexual desire. Against a background of notable public scandals, among them the 'Fleshly School' controversy in 1873, and in the same year that Labouchere's Amendment outlawed acts of 'gross indecency' among men, queer male relations were not so much subverted as beginning to be culturally inscribed, albeit in categorically 'deviant' forms.¹⁴⁰ As various critics have shown, the 'consciousness-effects of legal and medical discourses' at the end of the century had an ineradicable influence on the politics of high, middlebrow and mass culture – or what Sedgwick would call the 'homosexual panic' pervading English literary society.¹⁴¹

While certainly it may be a stretch to read all of Lawless's *Macmillan's* stories in this light, there is undeniably an unnamed, unknowable tension between the two characters of 'A Renegade', as indeed there is between a young Borrowdale and his friend Farquart. These sublimated forms of connection and intimacy lend the texts an instability, as their meaning is open to reinterpretation and slippage – not unlike the generative, ambiguous fluidity of Lawless's nature and history writings. Undercutting her own texts was a characteristic of Lawless, and it points to her ambivalence about many of the genres in which she was working. Although the world of genteel English society was one in which she may have felt at home in the early 1880s, her challenge to conventional forms of love and desire made itself felt through characters who never truly fit in with the expectations of that social milieu. In the same way that the protagonists here stand just outside the world of

¹³⁷ Holly Furneaux, 'Mortimer Lightwood; or, Seriality, Counterfactuals, Co-Production and Queer Fantasy', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 2015.21 (2015), no pagination. <https://19.bbk.ac.uk/articles/10.16995/ntn.751/> [Accessed 12 June 2018].

¹³⁸ Hansson, *Emily Lawless*, p. 38.

¹³⁹ Furneaux, *Queer Dickens*, p. 3.

¹⁴⁰ Jason Edwards, 'Introduction. 'Anxious Flirtations': Homoeroticism, Art and Aestheticism in Late Victorian Britain', *Visual Culture in Britain* 8.1 (June 2007), p. 4.

¹⁴¹ See Richard Dellamora, *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), p. 2.

their stories, Lawless's ambivalence towards either these conventional romances or indeed Victorian English values are indicative of her unease in either setting. Ultimately, the reader is left with a sense of the uncertainties and ambiguities (also evident in her tales of Gaelic Ireland or accounts of the natural world) which were fashioned as deliberate responses to the contexts of Victorian society in the late nineteenth century.

Conclusion

Kevin Whelan has articulated some of the manifest complexities of what he has termed 'writing Ireland, reading England' in early nineteenth-century Irish literature. He identifies a 'didactic burden' of representation, 'both epistemologically fraught and aesthetically disruptive' where writers displayed an obsessive focus on elucidating Irish life and character for an 'ignorant and incredulous' British audience.¹⁴² It is with some degree of confidence, then, that we may attest to the progressive refinement of Irish writing in Britain throughout the Victorian age – at least as represented in Emily Lawless's work. Through her attempts at writing Ireland while reading England, then, Lawless more than anyone else draws attention to the hybrid and ambivalent nature of such an enterprise. In the truest sense she was both within and without the various ideological realms and cultural formations embodied in the periodical press. Her class affiliations and social status placed her firmly within that network of Irish correspondents and the exclusive 'star system' so famously endorsed by Knowles's publication, what Laurel Brake labels an 'intellectual and class coherence'.¹⁴³ Yet as a fiction and woman writer she was frequently writing from without – against the grain of the cultural nationalism as espoused by Lady Gregory, and in subtle opposition to the patriarchal institutions of the day. Her periodical writings shed light on many of the dominant ideologies and anxieties circulating in late-imperial Britain, discourses (colonial, scientific or historical) which Lawless worked to undercut with irony.

This split discourse reflects Lawless's own complex affiliations in literary, personal and professional terms. Her use of an Irish cultural currency is juxtaposed here with an (often uncomfortable) recognition of the Irish landscape as a colonised space, and lends itself to the unstable and ambivalent tone of such pieces as 'North Clare' and 'A Bardic Chronicle'. These articles' tangible connection to the author's homeland and history is also complicated by her earlier serialised fiction in *Macmillan's Magazine*, which relied

¹⁴² Kevin Whelan, 'Writing Ireland, Reading England' in Leon Litvack and Glenn Hooper (eds.), *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century: Regional Identity* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), p. 189.

¹⁴³ Brake, *Subjugated Knowledges*, p. 59.

exclusively on settings and themes outside Ireland, and concerned itself with a class alien to the Irish characters of her later historical fiction. However, Lawless's inclusion in an elite spectrum of contributors can help us to comprehend the 'interaction between the social group and the individual in the cultural production of journalism'.¹⁴⁴ Although her thematic concerns refute what she calls the 'lumbering absurdities' of national character, there can be little doubt that her journalistic contributions consolidated her place within an influential public sphere of cosmopolitan Irish intellectuals.¹⁴⁵

To claim Lawless as an exclusively 'Irish' author, then, would be somewhat disingenuous. Her preoccupations, in the tradition of the journal itself, are wide-ranging, informed and reveal a cosmopolitan diversity of styles and outlook. But throughout all these writings she demonstrates a sustained interest in aesthetic authenticity, and one that draws on a tradition of wry Wildean criticism. 'A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery' can be viewed as a kind of manifesto for addressing the challenges, as she sees it, of authorial honesty and literary morals. Like the imaginary monk St Fechin in 'The Builder of the Round Towers', Lawless takes great pains to articulate her ideas and stories within a context accessible to a diverse audience. It is unsurprising, then, that the use, manipulation and ethics of voice are integral to her stories of Gaelic Ireland, upper-class England and observations of modern geography. For Lawless, appreciative of the trends in contemporary historiography – not least those from the Celtic Revivalist quarter – cultural representation was ideal for interrogating issues of language, translation and identity. Through these pieces she negotiates such questions, plays with and subverts forms of 'authentic' and creative authorial practice. She is, moreover, concerned with the very telling of history and the impact of narrativisation, especially in an environment where writing was a claim to absolute authority on a subject. Yet Lawless was rarely overt in these views, preferring to problematise ideas such as racial and historical characterisation within fictional settings as well as her critical and discursive texts, as a means of drawing her readers' attention to it.

While it can be difficult (and perhaps erroneous) to attempt to link these texts under any general headings, certain elements and motifs do recur throughout the range of these contributions. Lawless's style of imaginative observation is crucial to her authorial identity, as evidenced in her keen eye for both social and natural phenomena. She represents what she perceives before her more plainly than those mired in minutiae or distracted by ideological concerns. Similarly, a measure of imaginative observation is demanded of her

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁴⁵ See Lawless, 'A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery', p. 92.

readers to fully understand her pieces, whether fiction or non-fiction. Lawless's elevation of the personal aspect of experience in this sense is undeniably pivotal in her work, from an account of a dredging trip in west Galway to musings on the transient nature of individual memory. It is perhaps indicative of her reluctance to abide by any totalising structures or ideologies that these pieces combine a hint of subversion with intimacy. It particularly informs her relation to the natural topographies of Ireland, that throughout assume a complex, multifaceted role – significantly steering clear of the rural romanticisation that characterised nineteenth-century Revivalist tropes. And although avowedly conservative in her views on sexual equality and reform, we can nonetheless link a certain gendered aesthetic to her position among the prevailingly straight, male-dominated thinking on natural science, antiquity and sexual discourse within the magazine.

How then can we comprehensively group Lawless's diverse and seemingly unconnected set of periodical writings during these years? Even within the fiction her two styles appear to pull in opposite directions: her *Nineteenth Century* tales of Gaelic Ireland are mostly one-off accounts, while *Macmillan's* featured three stories serialised over two or three issues. These earlier stories, often written off as light romances, drew from her experience in genteel English society (albeit with undertones of more sublimated desires, as outlined above) and it was therefore something of a 'radical departure' when her literary interests turned to representations of warriors and peasants of Celtic Ireland in the 1890s. But all of the stories in some way illustrate the hybridity and liminality that has come to typify Lawless's style, either in relation to the stability of historical representation (in the case of the *Nineteenth Century*) or around fixed certainties of desire (as in the *Macmillan's* stories). Taken in conjunction with her nature writings, they portray an author who cannot be understood either in terms of a simplistic regional identity or Victorian constructions of gender and sexuality. Instead, her writing pulls away from normative expectations of either Irish or women's writing while paying lip service to the conventions of each.

A reassessment of Lawless in light of her periodical writings, then, must allow a more sustained focus on the *text* itself. There is an implicit (proto)modernity to this aspect of her work, for as Catherine Smith has noted, her writing 'leaves the reader unable to accept readily the values overtly proposed by the text, and undermines the claims of language to fixed representation and to truth'.¹⁴⁶ Lawless, indeed, had the unique ability to

¹⁴⁶ Catherine Smith, 'Words! Words! Words!': Interrogations of Language and History in Emily Lawless's *With Essex in Ireland* in Elke D'hoker, Raphael Ingelbien and Hedwig Schwall (eds.), *Irish Women Writers: New Critical Perspectives* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011), p. 191.

pose questions to her readers, defamiliarise situations and reverse expectations of normative or thematic continuities. Whether we read this in terms of Ireland's shifting and problematic place in British imperial consciousness, rumbling anxieties about the encroachment of 'dangerous' forms of relations between the sexes, or simply a growing awareness of ecological value, it reminds us that to neglect Lawless's periodical writings would be to miss some of the most important negotiations within and between her many layered affiliations.

Chapter Five

Fortnightly Review: 'A Thoroughly Serious Periodical'

Writing some months after the founding of the *Fortnightly Review* in 1865, George Eliot noted the 'exceptional dignity' of the new publication, describing it as 'a thoroughly serious periodical, intended for the few who will pay a high price'.¹ She had helped establish the *Review* along with G.H. Lewes and the publisher Frederick Chapman, and this serious literary calibre was to be characteristic of both the journal's roster and output in the years ahead. Two years after Eliot, among the early debates over anonymity of articles, the *Fortnightly's* second editor John Morley similarly charged his contributors with the 'momentous task of forming national opinion'.² It followed the vein of predecessors such as the *Westminster Review* and the *Quarterly*, self-consciously charting a reputation within the literary, political and intellectual landscape of late Victorian England. Prior to the hardening of disciplinary specialisms within the academy, such periodicals provided for an educated urban elite who, in aiming to shape public opinion, contributed significantly to the construction and dissemination of knowledge. The periodical's founding spirit – liberal and progressive in most matters – was once again articulated by Morley in 1876, when he envisioned his new reader as the archetypal self-improving Victorian, 'who has curiosity and enlightenment enough to wish to know a little about the great lives and great thoughts, the shining words ... that have marked the journey of man through the ages'.³

During the 1880s and 1890s in particular, the *Fortnightly* still functioned as a nexus for London's intellectual and social luminaries committed to a broadly liberal idea of journalistic expression. It boasted the writings of established literary heavyweights like Oscar Wilde and Max Beerbohm, as well as a significant coterie of new voices in the creative arena. This enlivened literary slant was largely the influence of its editor from 1886 until 1894, the ebullient Frank Harris. The author of several unreliable memoirs and a well-

¹ As quoted in Walter Houghton, 'Introduction to the *Fortnightly Review*', in *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* www.wellesley.chadwyk.com [no pagination]

² John Morley, 'Anonymous Journalism', *Fortnightly Review* 2 (Sep 1867), p. 292.

³ John Morley, 'Macaulay', *Fortnightly Review* 19 (Apr 1876), p. 499.

known philanderer on the London scene, Harris brought a creative energy to the *Review* that kept it among London's most cutting-edge periodicals. He socialised to a striking extent in numerous fashionable circles, and attracted literary contributions to the journal through acquaintances such as Wilde and the painter James McNeill Whistler. His 1915 book *Contemporary Portraits* presents a colourful account of various intellectual figures that inhabited late nineteenth-century cultural life, including Guy de Maupassant, Carlyle and George Meredith – all of whom appeared as either subjects or writers within the *Fortnightly* at Harris's request. Their styles proved formative for an array of artistic impulses during the 1880s and 1890s, from the salon-based *fin-de-siècle* culture that drew inspiration from French writing, to the dramatic realism transforming London theatre. In recounting his experience of these figures, Harris relished the cultural authority such associations brought with them. Wilde, Harris claimed, admitted that he was initially drawn to the Irish editor because of his associations with the French author Balzac. 'Naturally', Harris wrote, 'this creed of an exaggerated individualism appealed peculiarly to the best set in London. It was eminently aristocratic'.⁴ This spoke to the post-anonymity aspect of literary reviews, where, much like W.E. Henley's *The New Review*, an elevated reputation within the literary marketplace was courted by contributors and journals alike.

During Harris's tenure, then, the *Fortnightly Review* could be said to operate within what Margaret Beetham has termed the 'closed system' of periodical production, in this case a self-referential, circulating company of distinguished contributors.⁵ As with the *Nineteenth Century*, replies and debates across multiple issues were common and lent a degree of continuity to the range of intellectual discourse within its pages. The elite periodical in the late nineteenth century, exemplified by Harris's *Fortnightly*, functioned both as a top-down enterprise *and* as a collaborative vehicle, allowing the interconnectivity of many of the individuals involved in its production to shape its overall output.⁶ In other words, the celebrity status of Harris, already well established as a successful editor of the *Saturday Review*, was used to augment the fading profile of the *Fortnightly* both in terms of social networking and cultural prestige. As with Oscar Wilde's editorship of the *Women's World* magazine around the same time, the techniques that Harris utilised included

⁴ Frank Harris, *Contemporary Portraits* (London: M Kennerley, 1915), pp. 115-116.

⁵ Margaret Beetham, 'Towards a Theory of the Periodical as a Publishing Genre', in Laurel Brake, Aled Jones and Lionel Madden (eds.), *Investigating Victorian Journalism* (London: Macmillan, 1990), p. 25.

⁶ Alexis Easley, 'Introduction to the Special Issue: Victorian Networks and the Periodical Press', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 44.2 (Summer 2011), p. 112.

recruiting a new generation, promoting a new type of contributor and modernising the journal's identity in respect of its literary output.⁷

This framework may be helpful in assessing the influence of a relatively large network of Irish writers whose political and cultural essays were visible throughout the *Fortnightly* and indeed the periodical press in the 1880s and '90s. Foremost among them were Frank Harris (born to an impoverished background in county Galway, but whose nationality is rarely if ever remarked upon), and his subeditor at the *Fortnightly*, John Verschoyle. The two met in London in the early 1880s and became the driving force in the journal's reinvigoration in the years ahead – although contemporary sources claim most of the less glamorous editorial workload was adopted by the industrious Verschoyle as Harris threw dinners for politicians, leaders and London's intelligentsia.⁸ Harris had worked his way to a relatively influential position through stints editing the *Saturday Review* and *Evening News*, and established himself at the centre of distinguished coteries that included many of London's most famous Irish émigrés. Neither Harris nor Verschoyle, of course, can be seen to represent any distinct Irish literary movement or influence in London at the time. But their positions illustrate how responsive they were to the currents in literary and political culture, an awareness that was reflected through other Irish contributions in the *Fortnightly* – most notably Moore, Hannah Lynch, Stephen Gwynn and Standish O'Grady.

In many ways this ties in with Pascale Casanova's reading of the literary shifts in late-nineteenth century Ireland between the centre and periphery. Her seminal work, *World Republic of Letters*, argues for an interpretation of pre-Revival Irish writing as aesthetically and creatively impoverished, a literary provincialism that continually looked to London in the absence of a real 'tradition' in Dublin.⁹ While persuasive and in many parts true, Casanova's argument ignores the formative influence of many Irish writers and critics on a wider stage, and how national identity, though not always overt, indelibly informed their perspective. In her bid to demonstrate the ground-breaking influence of exiled literary 'rebels' such as Yeats, Joyce and Beckett, Casanova, as Joe Cleary has remarked, 'uncritically endorse[s] a fetishisation of the literary-intellectual émigré' of the early twentieth century.¹⁰ But however compromised Casanova's paradigm is (not least in regard

⁷ Josephine M. Guy and Ian Small, *Oscar Wilde's Profession: Writing and the Culture Industry in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 38.

⁸ Esther Rhoads Houghton, 'John Verschoyle and the *Fortnightly Review*', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 1.3 (Nov 1968), p. 19.

⁹ Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M.B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2004), p. 314.

¹⁰ Joe Cleary, 'The World Literary System: Atlas and Epitaph', *Field Day Review* 2 (2006), p. 208.

to material aspects of publication), it can be useful in illustrating the continued attraction of the metropolitan centre for Irish writers. What is perhaps surprising with regard to the writers examined here is that Paris features just as strongly as London in their critical imaginations. Casanova's conception of a world literary system structured around the French capital is mirrored throughout the numerous *Fortnightly* articles that deal with French literature and thought. Many of the Irish writers featured (George Moore and Hannah Lynch in particular) networked with a trans-European elite and prided themselves on their grasp of Parisian salon culture. Seeing Irish literary production in a European context, then, enables us to widen the critical sphere of enquiry beyond the tired reiteration of the London-province dichotomy. We may usefully interrogate the idea that, in one critic's formulation, 'Casanova's method reveals an implicit internationalism within even the most ardently nationalist texts—as well as, conversely, an implicit nationalism in the most cosmopolitan of texts'.¹¹ This study of Irish writers deploys a transnational frame of reference to expand the possible perspectives on their literary journalism, considering both audience and writer as essential to the project.

This chapter deals with two distinct sets of Irish contributions to the *Fortnightly Review* in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. A key factor of the Irish cohort in these years was their eminent position as reviewers and critics of contemporary literary taste. Of those publishing in the journal throughout the late 1880s and 90s, relatively few did not submit articles on the latest novels or developments in poetry and the London stage. This section will consider how George Moore, Hannah Lynch and Stephen Gwynn used their writings on literature and the arts to establish their names within the *Fortnightly*. Moore, particularly, was involved in shaping discourses that reverberated beyond the journal's pages, most notably the debates over censorship and the state of modern theatre, but also efforts to bring the French and English literary movements closer together. This European cultural awareness was reflected in articles by Lynch, who lived and wrote from France for much of her life. Her contributions focus on various French writers and provide a perspective informed by New Woman sentiment as much as national or cultural affinities. In these efforts at carving out a space within literary culture, the chapter will consider how French material is used to overstep a provincial identity that the two writers were at pains to avoid. Writing more towards the close of the century, meanwhile, Stephen Gwynn directed his creative energies on the emerging Irish literary scene in Dublin and London. But his

¹¹ Michael Malouf, 'Problems with Paradigms: Irish Comparativism and Casanova's *World Republic of Letters*', *New Hibernia Review* 17:1 (Spring 2013), p. 52.

critical sensibilities were as cosmopolitan as both Lynch and Moore, and helped furnish the *Fortnightly* with its distinctively modern, internationalist outlook in the field of literary journalism.

There existed, however, more nuanced aspects to this outlook than merely cultural innovation. As Nicholas Allen notes, the Irish intellectual awakening of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries took economic, political and social as well as literary forms.¹² Politics and journalism became closely entwined for many Irish public figures during these years, and the second section of this chapter will consider the manifestations of Irish political and social thought throughout the journal. In the final two decades of the nineteenth century, Horace Plunkett and Standish O'Grady provided two of the most influential voices on matters pertaining to the Irish situation. Engaging with broader aspects of representation as well as with details of policy and legislation, they articulate a vision of social progress based on cross-class cohesion. Like much of the rhetoric surrounding Irish issues, however, the bulk of their contributions point forward, charting a course for an attainable Irish future within the British Empire. This Unionism is counterbalanced by other political writers, most notably the Irish MP Justin McCarthy. His contributions, though fewer in number, illustrate some of the most polemicised political affairs of the 1890s. In a series entitled 'What Mr Gladstone Ought to Do' in 1893, the question of Irish Home Rule receives a high-profile analysis from McCarthy and others. It places Irish politics at the heart of the journal's commitment to an open platform of discussion and debate. It also helps to point up the variations of political opinion that formed the rubric of broad Liberal ideology which the *Fortnightly* espoused. Much like Moore, Gwynn and Lynch, throughout their contributions Plunkett, O'Grady and McCarthy not only display a responsiveness to the ideological culture of the day, but arguably helped to mould its public image in the publishing world of London and beyond.

Ireland and France: A Critical Connection

The articulation of Irish critical voices in the *Fortnightly Review* was, by the 1890s, a well-established phenomenon. Oscar Wilde and George Bernard Shaw – two of the best known if most ambivalently 'Irish' writers in London – contributed several high-profile articles under Harris's tenure that attracted contemporary attention and helped augment both the journal's and authors' celebrity status. Wilde's 1889 piece 'Pen, Pencil and Poison', with

¹² Nicholas Allen, *George Russell (Æ) and the New Ireland, 1905–30* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), p. 9.

its ‘playful destabilisation of the ideas of sincerity and authenticity’, gained enough notice at the time to play a role in its author’s subsequent disgrace.¹³ The journal was also the medium for his invective against the press in 1891, ‘The Soul of Man under Socialism’, a piece personally commissioned by Harris. These articles, although they may have established Wilde’s name in the highbrow world of letters, also marked his success as a professional journalist. Similarly, Shaw’s articles on Fabian politics some years later are frequently quoted as touchstones of social reform and contemporary debate, but also demonstrate an awareness of public taste in the periodical market.¹⁴ Both writers had built up a journalistic reputation as reviewers and critics across publications like the *Pall Mall Gazette* and *Spectator*, commercial and financially-motivated work that is inextricable from their later ‘serious’ literary output. Indeed, as Josephine Guy and Ian Small have argued, the skills that Shaw and Wilde deployed in the *Fortnightly* were indebted to ‘an apprenticeship in journalism [which was] an important schooling for an understanding of taste’.¹⁵ This ability to manoeuvre between ‘popular’ and ‘high’ forms of periodical publishing is an overlooked aspect of both of these authors’ careers – as is their manoeuvring between an Irish and British identity for most of their literary lives.

Shaw and Wilde were, however, joined by a range of Irish émigrés who acted as an unexplored yet substantial force within the critical press. The rest of this chapter focuses on these figures in more detail than Wilde and Shaw (whose periodical writings are dealt with in more detail in previous chapters), in order to establish their presence and authority within the periodical market. The *Fortnightly* became an important publishing outlet for Hannah Lynch, Stephen Gwynn and George Moore, whose aesthetic sensibilities were, in turn, formed by the generic conditions under which they wrote. Gwynn published widely in the weekly and monthly periodical market, Lynch arguably achieved as much of her success as a journalist than as a novelist, and Moore’s prolific and frequently provocative articles earned him a reputation as the intellectual firebrand of the era. Capitalising upon the late Victorian appetite for a reactive literary culture, their output mirrors the shifts and currents of artistic taste (in, for example, the new French appetite for naturalism). Moore, most especially, was aware of the power of media to ignite public opinion. His disparaging statements on the English theatre in 1888 and his continued polemics against the censorship of circulating libraries were proof of this, as were provocative pronouncements against

¹³ Lawrence Danson, *Wilde’s Intentions: The Artist in his Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 87.

¹⁴ Robert F. Haggard, *The Persistence of Victorian Liberalism: The Politics of Social Reform in Britain, 1870-1900* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 95.

¹⁵ Guy and Small, *Oscar Wilde’s Professions*, p. 45.

Gladstonian moralism in literary culture. In a letter to Harris in 1925 he wrote that ‘in the old days you used to tell me that a slating review was the best of all advertisements, and you used to ask me to slate you rather than leave you unmentioned’.¹⁶ Controversy, Moore understood, was one of the fastest routes to the public’s awareness. His journalistic reviews, along with Lynch’s and Gwynn’s, are therefore important means in understanding the ways in which critical authority manifested itself in the *Fortnightly*.

Much like the range of his periodical writings, Moore’s social identity was versatile and multifaceted. When he left Ireland in the 1870s (becoming in the process an absentee landlord), Irish culture held little appeal for his artistic ambitions. Even after his involvement with Gaelic Revival theatre around the turn of the century and his return to Ireland ‘in the unacknowledged role of the nation’s messiah’, he remained an equivocal adherent to national affiliation.¹⁷ Paris, not Dublin or London, had provided the formative influence for his fictional experiments in the 1870s and 1880s, though he kept a keen eye on the English literary market (among others, through his brother Augustus who edited *The Hawk* magazine). The articles in the *Fortnightly Review* certainly bear witness to his intellectual debt to Zola, Flaubert, Balzac and others. Here, as with most of his literary enterprises, Moore was a strident author with a clear sense of purpose. In this case it was to introduce to the English reading public the greatness of new naturalist and impressionist movements emerging on the continent. This militant attitude was aptly suited to a periodical culture that patronised the ‘great men’ within the most prestigious journals, echoing the elite salon etiquette of the *fin-de-siècle* years. Moore struck out his own line, one that Adrian Frazier has termed the ‘Parisian Irish’ line, within the *Fortnightly*.¹⁸ His eight articles in the closing decade of the century represent the arts from a distinctly international perspective. The 1889 article, ‘Some of Balzac’s Minor Pieces’ perfectly encapsulates this cosmopolitanism, in the wide-ranging references to stalwarts of the English and French canons. Balzac, he writes, deserves a place beside the constellation of Shakespeare, Milton, Dante and Goethe. Moore credits him with ‘creat[ing] the French novel’ in a form far higher than ‘Thackeray’s simperings’ or ‘George Eliot’s pedantry’.¹⁹ It is a sharp criticism of the deficiencies he sees within English literary culture, the ‘devious

¹⁶ As quoted in Anon, *Moore versus Harris: An Intimate Correspondence* (Detroit: Priv. Published, 1921), p. 12. <https://archive.org/stream/mooreversusharri00moorrich#page/12/search/unmentioned> [Accessed 2 July 2017].

¹⁷ Margaretta D’Arcy, ‘The Metamorphosis of George Moore’, in Conor Montague and Adrian Frazier (eds.), *George Moore: Dublin, Paris, Hollywood* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2012), p. 39.

¹⁸ Adrian Frazier, *George Moore, 1852-1933* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 200.

¹⁹ George Moore, ‘Some of Balzac’s Minor Pieces’, *Fortnightly Review* 46 (Oct 1889), p. 501.

coverts of the soul unexplored by English writers' that pushed him and other rebellious litterateurs to France in search of inspiration.²⁰

Balzac, Frazier points out, exerted a personal as well as creative pull on Moore's sensibilities – strengthening Moore's sense of the writer as an antithetical figure and his ability to view cultures in comparison.²¹ The same could be said for Turgenev, the subject of Moore's *Fortnightly* article in 1888 (also later reprinted in his 1891 collection *Impressions and Opinions*). The Russian author was one of the most important influences on Moore's development of the short story and the article stands as a significant piece of critical work, drawing on diverse international influences. In it he lays out a blueprint for an essentially naturalist approach to fiction, although he dismisses the term itself as intellectually void and misleading. Instead, he presents a considered argument for differentiating between the 'fact' school of writing and the 'thought' school, or in other words the 'physiological school and the school of adventure'.²² Turgenev, he writes, belonged to the latter, and as with Zola some years earlier, Moore clearly saw in Turgenev a model for his own work. He weighs in against supposed objectivity in fictional work, highlighting that 'in reading them [the short stories], the *litterateur* is conscious of something absolutely new ... in form as in matter'.²³ This originality was the constant object of Moore's writings. In articles such as this we are able to chart the changing sensibilities and creative influences that propelled him towards literary 'newness' throughout his writing career. By the late 1880s it is clear that Zola had ceased to exert the same pull over Moore's imagination, and beside the Russian he pales to a 'recorder of mere facts'.²⁴ We can also see a strain similar to that of 'Balzac's Minor Pieces' and its denigration of the contemporary literary scene in England: 'that [story] told by Turgueneff is a *chef-d'oeuvre*, and is as superior to our ordinary magazine short stories as a ballad by Villon is to a ballad by me'.²⁵ Reflecting the tone of his *New Review* pieces, Moore was consciously drawing a line under literary value by placing himself alongside Turgenev and in opposition to the 'ordinary magazine short stories'.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 491.

²¹ Adrian Frazier, 'The Fin-de-Siècle Meets French Realism: Moore, Balzac and the Peculiarity of Writers', in Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn, *George Moore: Influence and Collaboration* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2014), p. 31.

²² George Moore, 'Turgueneff', *Fortnightly Review* 43 (Feb 1888), p. 238.

²³ Ibid., p. 247.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 238. In the same piece he also dismisses Tolstoy with the breezy remark that 'I have not read [Tolstoy], but he is only Gaboriau with psychological sauce, and that of an inferior kind', p. 239.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 239.

But much as Moore may lean towards French and Russian muses in these pieces, Ireland is not a silent presence either. Frazier notes that the writer's fellow-feeling for Turgenev stems from similar backgrounds as landowning aristocracy; like Moore, 'Turgeneff knew the serf as the gentleman knows the serf, he knew the gentleman as the gentleman knows the gentleman, and he looked on and judged both as a scholar and a philosopher.'²⁶ Turgenev's characters also resound for Moore with echoes of Ireland, and when writing of the protagonist Bazaroff, proclaims 'Who among the many who have thought of turning the troubles of Ireland to literary account has not thought of an Irish Bazaroff[?]'.²⁷ Similar connections recur throughout his piece on Balzac, with references to Captain Boycott, Michael Davitt and the plight of peasant tenants during the land struggles. This recourse to the context of Ireland's political and social issues prefigures his later involvement with the Revival movement, and acts to remind his readers of the discourses that informed his cultural identity. His mediation of Irish matters through French material was again apparent in a *Freeman's Journal* article on 'Balzac and the Land League' in 1886. In this, he saw a prefiguring of the Irish Land War in Balzac's novel *Les Paysans*, including boycotts, agrarian violence, and large-scale land redistribution.²⁸ Placing Ireland on a stage alongside a model of European peasant revolt, it was, like 'Some of Balzac's Minor Pieces', indicative of Moore's attempts to draw Irish experiences within the sphere of French social realism.

Nor was it entirely without precedent in Moore's literary oeuvre. At the same time as the author was busy proclaiming the merits of new French writing for an English audience, he was also involved in depicting his homeland of Ireland for a French readership. His essay collection *Parnell and his Island* was published in 1886, originally as a series of six instalments for the French magazine *Le Figaro*, and in 1887 released as *Terre d'Irlande*. Later that same year the London publishers Swann, Sonnenschein published a (heavily edited) English-language edition. The essays presented a portrait of Ireland during the land crises of the late 1880s (not a particularly positive one), as a response to the lively interest which these events had elicited in France.²⁹ They also display similar themes and settings as his 1886 novel *A Drama in Muslin*, including Moore's complicated personal feelings about his country – prompted perhaps by the troubles he was

²⁶ Ibid., p. 240; Frazier, *George Moore*, p. 167.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 245.

²⁸ Frazier, 'The Fin-de-Siecle Meets French Realism', p. 29.

²⁹ Carla King, 'Introduction' in George Moore, *Parnell and his Island*, ed. by Carla King (Dublin: UCD Press, 2004), xii.

facing on his own estate in county Mayo where tenant grievances ran high during the 1880s. The urge to explain, represent, malign and defend, then, were just some of the contradictory impulses from a writer who at the time could be described as ‘schizophrenic of citizenship ... a self-proclaimed Irishman-turned-Frenchman-turned-Englishman’.³⁰ These essays, in turn, formed an element in his web of transnational literary affiliations and influences, and may even have inspired Zola, who wrote to Moore that the pieces ‘pleased me immensely and I think they will have a real success ... Why not write immediately a novel on Ireland?’³¹ But they warranted only scorn from his nationalist countrymen, who saw the collection as anathema to the project of literary self-autonomy and even in 1916 were still denouncing him for ‘exhibiting his country’s sores for the coppers of the Paris press’.³²

These attractions to French material and ongoing cognisance of the Paris press were key facets of Moore’s transnational identity within the periodical genre. The late 1880s and 1890s were certainly a pivotal time in his intellectual development, marking a concerted effort to associate himself with a range of European literati. Various critics have noted how the attraction to France was ‘emblematic of Moore’s determination to outgrow the limitation of his original Irish milieu and mark out his own singular, cosmopolitan identity’.³³ Journal and magazine articles, of which he published over 250 during these years, were ideal in affording the writer an immediate cultural resonance in the public sphere. But this intersection of literary identities was not just characteristic of Moore as a *Fortnightly* contributor. Hannah Lynch also offers interesting parallels in this respect. She was an Irish-born novelist and author of ‘Autobiography of a Child’, the acclaimed story first published in *Blackwoods* in 1899. Like Moore, she regarded Paris and London as her adopted homes and associated with an intellectual elite between the two cities. This European mobility is visible throughout her journalistic output, where a peripatetic lifestyle that saw her move between Ireland, London, France, Spain and Greece gave her an arguably wider transnational perspective than Moore. Travel writing thus became the subject of much of her journalism and informed the narrative voices of her fiction – and,

³⁰ Elizabeth Grubgeld, *George Moore and the Autogenous Self: The Autobiography and Fiction* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994), p. 2.

³¹ As quoted in King, ‘Introduction’, xi.

³² Susan L. Mitchell, *George Moore* (London: Maunsel, 1916), p. 68.

³³ ‘Introduction’ to Christine Huguot and Fabienne Dabrigéon-Garcier (eds.), *George Moore: Across Borders* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013), p. 9.

within the *Fortnightly*, offered her a niche that would likely have appealed to the international audiences of the journal.³⁴

Yet this fluidity of identity should not be mistaken for slippage; as her biographers note, Lynch vigorously resisted the idea that France somehow offered a template for, or had the measure of Ireland.³⁵ Instead, what is noticeable with both authors is a hierarchy of cultural centres that places Paris above London (with Dublin, it seems, conspicuously absent). This may, however, have been disguising the two cities' literary intimacy: as Atkinson has observed, 'relations between Paris and London involved the fluid exchange of reviewers as well as ideas and articles [where] editors often travelled abroad to make contacts and encouraged their contributors to do the same'.³⁶ In the November 1889 issue of the *Fortnightly* George Moore launched an attack on contemporary English drama and theatre-goers, opening with the statement that in London, 'no first-rate man of letters now writes for the stage'.³⁷ His continuous denigration of English tastes is placed in contrast to articles praising the elite artistic sensibilities of Parisian painters (in 'Meissonier and the Salon Julian', July 1890), and the superior style of its authors. Lynch followed similar tropes in her pieces, using French writers as measures of literary value due to their appreciation of modernity. 'Read any modern novel dealing with modern London society', she writes in the *Fortnightly* in 1897, 'and you will feel the shock of contrast [with French writing] a severe one'.³⁸ It is a clear illustration of what Joe Cleary has called, in respect of Casanova's paradigms, the continued ability of Paris to consecrate world literary reputations.³⁹ This bias towards France granted them a literary legitimacy at a time when national self-expression was limited in the English press. And yet neither Moore nor Lynch were necessarily writing *against* England in these articles, despite their cutting asides. They rather saw in French culture the sophistication of literature's nineteenth-century greats, an allure that was missing from their English counterparts.

In London's *Fortnightly*, Lynch found a niche similar to Moore's as a respected reviewer of contemporary French literature, publishing at least one piece a year from 1896.

³⁴ The *Fortnightly* had conspicuously courted an international, cosmopolitan reputation from its outset, when it had been deliberately modelled on the Parisian title *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

³⁵ Faith Binckes and Kathryn Laing, 'From *Wild Irish Girl* to 'Parisianised Foreigner': Hannah Lynch in France', in Eamon Maher and Eugene O'Brien (eds.), *War of the Words: Literary Rebellion in France and Ireland* (Rennes: Tir, 2010), p. 56.

³⁶ Juliette Atkinson, 'Continental Currents: Paris and London' in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 236.

³⁷ George Moore, 'Our Dramatists and their Literature', *Fortnightly Review* 46 (Nov 1889), p. 620.

³⁸ Hannah Lynch, 'M. Paul Hervieu', *Fortnightly Review*, 60 (Oct 1896), p. 477.

³⁹ Cleary, 'World Literary System', p. 201.

Like the latter she presents a knowledgeable understanding of the world of French letters, and, to an extent, her place within it. An 1896 article on M. Paul Hervieu opens with the observation that in France ‘letters have now become a mere career, like politics or trade’.⁴⁰ Her responsiveness to current and changing mores is evident throughout, although her lament for ‘the days when salons and grand manners ruled the intelligent world of France’ may have been slightly premature.⁴¹ The piece is therefore a comment on the literary fashions of the day and forces that impacted on her own writing. She describes Hervieu’s style as ‘intellectual dandyism’, and traces its evolution from the ‘dead level of naturalism’.⁴² The article, while aware of its time, also gestures forward to a kind of proto-modernism in pointing out that ‘the essential thing today is to be new at any price’.⁴³ Lynch is also careful to contextualise the ‘intrinsic Frenchness’ of Hervieu for a more international audience. She plays up his Anglo-centric literary allusions and counts him, wittily, as ‘an accomplished member of that fashionable circle who send their shirts to be made up in London’.⁴⁴ But we can sense a pull of different cultures here that Lynch invariably found herself negotiating in her *Fortnightly* writings. Her outsider status as neither French nor English was often creatively powerful – enabling her to authoritatively critique both – but sometimes imbues the writing with tension. Thus her allusions to late Victorian anxieties regarding the moral tone of modern French literature are posited not only to provide light-hearted mocking, but to negotiate the complex range of attitudes towards French literature in the English public eye.

In the case of Zola, she takes a somewhat more hard-line position. Echoing Moore’s article some years previous on ‘La Debacle’, her 1900 piece called ‘*Fécondité* versus the *Kreutzer Sonata*’ attacks the ‘powerful and unpleasing novels’ of Zola.⁴⁵ Her journalistic bite is on display here, as she notes:

In writing of M. Zola’s last book it is hardly necessary to say anything of the style, for the reason that that which does not exist cannot command attention. [*Fécondité*]

⁴⁰ Lynch, ‘M. Paul Hervieu’, p. 472.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 477, 473.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 473.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 475.

⁴⁵ Hannah Lynch, ‘*Fécondité* versus the *Kreutzer Sonata*’, *Fortnightly Review* 67 (Jan 1900), p. 69.

startles ... by its wealth of incongruities, recklessness of imagination ... and an ever-surprising poverty of soul.⁴⁶

Lynch was no less ambitious than Moore in passing judgements on these giants of European literature. The subtitle of the article is 'Zola versus Tolstoi', and concludes with an unequivocal verdict on the superior claims of Tolstoi's novel. But alongside these comparisons of the merits of high culture, she was an equally keen observer of the lot of an author. In October 1897 she published what could be termed a 'human-interest' article on the love-letters of Guy de Maupassant. In it she writes with insight and wit on the published correspondence between the French author and his mistress, displaying an appreciation of the literary value of non-fiction writings. Frenchmen, she quips, 'are not to be judged by their fiction' – and nor was Lynch keen to be judged solely by hers, as evidenced by these highbrow prose essays.⁴⁷ The article, then, calls into question the ways in which authors are remembered, and the variables of nation and gender that inevitably impact on their literary legacy.

It was an issue of which Lynch was highly aware. Personal experience informed her journalism, and the *Fortnightly Review* became a platform for her life-long interest and authoritative comments on France. But it was not her only interest as regards national traditions. As Maria Frawley has noted, 'that so much of the travel writing of the period was written by women suggests that publishing houses and editors of periodicals were willing and eager to capitalise on the ostensibly different perspective women were able to bring to literature about the wider world'.⁴⁸ And certainly the implications of gender were never far from Lynch's writing. It could be argued that they assume a heightened significance in a periodical format, where her literary criticism allows a direct insight into the Parisian networks of influence to which she belonged. Within reviews her feminist sensibilities are frequently overt, and she is alive to the problematic representations by the (predominantly) male authors under review. Her mockery of the masculine literary fantasies of Zola emerges forcefully from the tone of '*Fécondité* versus the *Kreutzer Sonata*'. She criticises his portrayal of 'women's sexual servitude to men', continuing, 'M. Zola would have every woman married at seventeen, and the mother of no less than twelve or fourteen children. That is his panacea for every ill upon earth. Incessant maternity for

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Hannah Lynch, 'The Love-Letters of Guy de Maupassant', *Fortnightly Review* 62 (Oct 1897), p. 571.

⁴⁸ Maria Frawley, *A Wider Range: Travel Writing by Women in Victorian England* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994), p. 28.

woman; unceasing labour for man.’⁴⁹ Irony often serves her commitment to issues of gender and marriage; and in quoting Hervieu there is more than a sense of personal bitterness: ‘Single women are not accepted. In the defile of high-life woman does not exist, should not be presented, except paired with a husband’.⁵⁰ It is a striking contrast to Moore’s often casually sexist remarks that permeated his *Fortnightly* oeuvre, particularly his contempt for female literary taste: like his struggles with censorship, he rails against the moral dictates to ‘write nothing that young ladies may not openly discuss in their drawing rooms’.⁵¹

The cultural milieu in *fin-de-siècle* Paris, however, was one with a sizeable female contingent. Writing of French literary women of the period in 1897, Lynch commented that ‘these women [authors] have the air of action, of workers, and nearly all maintain their own interests in newspapers and reviews with remarkable good sense and practical view’.⁵² A flourishing salon culture in the city facilitated much of their, and Lynch’s, professional development. Literary networks such as these, moreover, were as least as important for George Moore as for Lynch. In Paris he quite deliberately cultivated a circle of acquaintances across the worlds of art, literature and theatre. Guy de Maupassant and Alphonse Daudet, for instance, were not only fruitful points of contact in French society but furnished him with material for articles.⁵³ In a striking example of how these informal critical networks reflected the structural relations of the *Fortnightly* itself, both Maupassant and Daudet occur as subjects of Hannah Lynch’s contributions: as part of ‘Some Recent French Literature (No. III): the Love-Letters of Guy de Maupassant’ in October 1897, and ‘Alphonse Daudet’ in June 1898. Access to these multifaceted networks was both enabling, in terms of consolidating and expanding literary contacts, but at times also a continued necessity. Lynch was a journalist in ways that other elite contributors were often not: she relied upon frequent publication to earn a wage, and recurrent health problems meant that she had literally to write for her life.⁵⁴ Periodical contributions such as her ‘Paris Letter’ in the *Academy*, then, were not just a supplement to her novelistic output, but vital to maintaining a visibility in the press on both sides of the channel.

⁴⁹ Lynch, ‘Fécondité versus the ‘*Kreutzer Sonata*’, p. 71.

⁵⁰ Lynch, ‘M. Paul Hervieu’, p. 481-2.

⁵¹ Moore, ‘Some of Balzac’s Minor Pieces’, p. 498.

⁵² Hannah Lynch, ‘Paris Letter, *Academy* 8 May 1897, p. 501.

⁵³ See Moore, ‘Meissonier and the Salon Julian’, *Fortnightly Review* 50 (July 1890).

⁵⁴ Binckes and Laing, ‘From *Wild Irish Girl* to ‘Parisianised Foreigner’, p. 42.

London, naturally, had similar coteries dedicated to the innovation and circulation of ideas. Bloomsbury, hosting perhaps the most famous circles at the time, drew together Wilde, Whistler, Moore, Harris and Edmund Gosse – an aesthetic set particularly influenced by French literature, as well as sustaining much of the *Fortnightly*'s literary reputation.⁵⁵ These English channels of influence are perhaps more suitable when examining Stephen Gwynn, a fellow Irish contributor to the *Fortnightly* who saw himself as 'willingly a Londoner'.⁵⁶ The cosmopolitan identity and outlook shared among literary reviewers from Ireland was a hallmark of their writings, and yet is frequently passed over with Gwynn. His prolific output post-1900, development of a distinctive form of Irish constitutional nationalism and an involvement in the early Irish Literary Theatre have all tended to place him exclusively within the paradigms of twentieth-century Irish cultural and political studies.⁵⁷ But earlier experiences of London's literary circles speak of an alternative way of viewing his considerable mass of writings. Significantly, the publishing industry of the time provided him with both a means of employment and exposure to a broad range of international literature. As an advisor to Macmillan's he played a central role in shaping the publishing house's output, an experience that presumably sharpened his critical acumen. It was a mutually productive relationship, as Gwynn became a regular contributor to the firm's eponymous monthly review while introducing a number of successful authors onto the publisher's payroll.⁵⁸

Gwynn's status as *Fortnightly* reviewer was somewhat different to Lynch's and Moore's, at least in terms of the range of literary traditions they drew upon and contributed to. Their unmarried, mobile lifestyles were also ones not open to Gwynn, a working father of five. But he nevertheless partook of a vibrant cultural scene in late-nineteenth century London, successfully integrating himself into journalism, and demonstrated a learned grasp of contemporary fiction writing in the *Fortnightly Review*. His memoirs, moreover, reveal just how crucial shared cultural networks could be for an aspiring author's career. Writing of the *Fortnightly*'s editor from 1894, W.L. Courtney, Gwynn describes how 'I had only known him by sight at Oxford (generally rowing in a veteran's eight) but he examined me for one of my schools, and on the strength of this, I asked him to let me write about

⁵⁵ Ana Perejo Vadillo, 'Immaterial Poetics: Mary F. Robinson and the Fin-de-Siècle Poem', in Joseph Bristow (ed.), *The Fin-de-Siècle Poem: English Literary Culture and the 1890s* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2005), p. 238.

⁵⁶ Stephen Gwynn, *Experiences of a Literary Man* (London: T. Butterworth Ltd, 1926), p. 11.

⁵⁷ See for instance John Wilson Foster, *Irish Novels 1890-1940: New Bearings in Culture and Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

⁵⁸ These included Stephen Phillips and Mabel Dearmer (rumoured to be his mistress at the time).

Stevenson'.⁵⁹ Robert Louis Stevenson became the subject of his first two pieces for the journal, in 1894 and 1898. The articles offer lengthy critical analyses of the author's most famous works, establishing Gwynn as a literary force in his own right. Like Lynch and Moore, the convention of name-checking a list of renowned Victorian authors is evident in the articles, with Stevenson placed in comparison with 'the unchallenged great ones, Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray'.⁶⁰ This mode of contextualisation works to lend a certain weighted authority to their analysis. It also engages the writer in the process of defining what it means to be an artist. In this case, the lure of French exoticism for Stevenson is juxtaposed with high Victorian ideals:

“to be a good artist in life, and to deserve well of your neighbour,” is a high enough ideal, if you mean by an artist what Mr Stevenson does: that is, a man who goes about his work pleasantly, because he likes it, and does it for the work's sake, not to get rich; and who always sets his standard a little way above what his utmost efforts can attain to. That is the connecting point between his didactic philosophy of art and his theory of morals.⁶¹

These comments reflect a concern with authorship, particularly (as with Lynch), the idea of a legacy. Gwynn points out Stevenson's 'conception of the scope which his own work as a novelist might receive' and indicates how the process of inspiration and writing rests on the inherited traditions of literary culture, both national and international.⁶² Not unlike Moore and Lynch, there is also an engagement with the work of criticism itself within these articles. In both pieces he outlines the secondary status of the critic's work to that of the artist – that is, 'to make something “out of your own head”'.⁶³ It is sentiment that was probably close to his heart, for Gwynn's career stood testament to his biographer's conclusion that he offered much more as an essayist and critic than as a creative force.⁶⁴ Gwynn was certainly an active presence on the London press scene beyond the *Fortnightly*: alongside these essays he published some twenty-five articles and periodical reviews in

⁵⁹ Gwynn, *Experiences of a Literary Man*, p. 176.

⁶⁰ Stephen Gwynn, 'Mr Robert Louis Stevenson: A Critical Study', *Fortnightly Review* 56 (Dec 1894), p. 777.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 782.

⁶² Stephen Gwynn, 'The Posthumous Works of Robert Louis Stevenson', *Fortnightly Review* 63 (Apr 1898), p. 562.

⁶³ Gwynn, 'Mr Robert Louis Stevenson', p. 786.

⁶⁴ Colin Reid, *The Lost Ireland of Stephen Gwynn: Irish Constitutional Nationalism and Cultural Politics, 1864-1950* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p. 40.

Macmillan's Magazine and the *Cornhill* during the 1890s. Journalism became for him a means of demonstrating both critical authority and, in the years after 1900, a political vision that started to embrace the nationalist potential in Irish writing.

But in these articles Gwynn was already complicating the idea of exile in relation to Stevenson's work. In particular, he was one of the few critics to forward a reading that went beyond a romantic or mythologising view of exile, acknowledging instead the 'importance of [Stevenson's] pacific fiction, in terms both of the new subject matter being placed before English readers and of the new narrative style Stevenson was developing'.⁶⁵ This pursuit of and commitment to novelty in terms of literary style (apart from being a central concern of the periodical, which depended upon a constant renewal of interest from readers) was common to Moore and Lynch as well as Gwynn, who in their writings also helped to critically shift a view of the exile away from sentimental and nostalgic conceptions of the Irish writer abroad. It is notable that in all of their articles for the *Fortnightly*, the 'new' is located outside Britain or Ireland. These authors, in different ways, were therefore transnational in the fundamental sense of breaking with nation-bound readings of literary culture, and their output within the journal opened up a mobile community of both writers and readers speaking across temporal and geographical boundaries. If Robert Louis Stevenson's work was characterised, in Gwynn's eyes, by a sense of 'unhomeliness', the literary interactions of these three authors illustrated the opposite: an alternative sense of affiliation and familiarity in a trans-European cultural milieu.

By the end of the decade, however, new critical perspectives were coming into play among the Irish *Fortnightly* contributors. In February 1900 George Moore was drawing parallels between the decline of Empire and the stagnation of artistic developments in England, stating that 'Empire, like autumn, is splendid, but silent woods are sad ... it will never come again; art [also] knows no sweet returning'.⁶⁶ This was as much a comment on his own sense of literary (and therefore financial) foreboding as it was an astute reading of unfolding political events. But perhaps most strikingly apparent in these Irish writings was the turn towards Ireland as a cultural homeland and subject of art. Two articles from Moore and Gwynn at the turn of the century epitomised the growing influence of the Revival, and in particular the Irish Literary Theatre, in the world of London journalism: Moore's 'A Preface to *The Bending of the Bough*' (1900), and 'The Irish Literary Theatre and its

⁶⁵ Roslyn Jolly, 'Introduction' to Robert Louis Stevenson, *South Sea Tales*, ed. by Roslyn Jolly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), xxxi.

⁶⁶ George Moore, 'A Preface to *The Bending of the Bough*', *Fortnightly Review* 67 (Feb 1900), p. 318.

Affinities' (1901) by Gwynn. In this latter article (and further pieces in December 1902 and February 1905) Gwynn found himself, in effect, the *Fortnightly* commentator on the activities of the Irish Literary Theatre. Charting the rise of Yeats's and Moore's dramatic enterprise in the context of the Gaelic League and the Irish language revival, Gwynn proclaims Yeats's play *Diarmuid and Grania* a success but notes the public response that 'Mr Moore and Mr Yeats had gone to Irish legend to find in epic tradition the plot of an average French novel'.⁶⁷ (It would not have been lost on Gwynn that the 'French novel', and its connotations of moral indecency, had been held up by Moore as paragon of progress within the pages of the *Fortnightly Review* some years earlier.) This, then, was a subtle shifting of positions wherein Moore, the erstwhile highbrow theatre reviewer, became the subject of some of the journal's most prominent drama criticism – as reported on by a fellow Irish contributor.

Moore, for his part, liked to see himself as a prophet of such literary developments (especially if they were likely to provoke), and to this end announces in his 1900 article that 'England seems to us to have reached the age of manhood, and age at which a nation ceases to produce art, for art belongs to the youth of a nation as empire belongs to its manhood, if it attains to manhood.'⁶⁸ The article is a remarkable, forceful piece of rhetoric that appears to herald a break from his previous critical directions and reviews. It presents a sustained defence of the Irish Literary Theatre, asserting the right of Ireland – more precisely Dublin – to an indigenous literary culture, and sets out Moore's mature aesthetic position in national terms; namely, finding a home for art in 'another small nation, one which has not yet achieved its destiny'.⁶⁹ Moore's preface, like the play itself, was a gesture towards what Frazier calls 'the possible representability of Irish life' after the turn of the century.⁷⁰ It was a view that seemed unthinkable, or at least remained unarticulated, within the critical reviews of the previous decade. The same is true for Gwynn, whose 1901 piece is involved in a process of reclaiming a heritage for Irish writers, turning its gaze from English Victorian authors to narratives of Ireland's past.⁷¹ Again, it is an attitude that emerges from growing discomfort with – or at least awareness of – the systems of Empire, particularly in

⁶⁷ Stephen Gwynn, 'The Irish Literary Theatre and its Affinities', *Fortnightly Review* 76 (Dec 1901), p. 1055.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 317.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 319.

⁷⁰ Frazier, *George Moore*, p. 287.

⁷¹ Stephen Gwynn, 'A Specimen of Medieval Irish Poetry', *Fortnightly Review* 68 (March 1901), pp. 520-526.

the wake of the Boer War.⁷² Gwynn wrote some years later that this conflict ‘taught me definitely that I was an Irishman first; and being an Irishman in my sense meant having an outlook other than the Englishman’s’.⁷³ Britain’s involvement in South Africa, as Mathews has shown, was ‘pivotal in that it not only brought the nationalist separatist movement into a coherent group ... but also strengthened the political relevance of the Irish literary movement with the production of *The Bending of the Bough*’.⁷⁴ For Moore personally it engendered a revulsion (one that went beyond even that of his Irish Literary Theatre peers Yeats and Gregory) that eventually led to his withdrawal from the London literary scene, and much like Alice Stopford Green, pushed him towards a realisation of Britain as a place of ‘shameful and vulgar materialism’.⁷⁵ Moore and Gwynn’s journalistic output in the *Fortnightly* post-1900 was thus emblematic both of hardened personal affinities amid the changing cultural and political currents of Irish and British intellectual discourse.

Taken as a whole, the contributions of these literary reviewers in the *Fortnightly Review* provide a unique perspective on the fluctuations of a certain brand of Irish literary identity during the late nineteenth century. The adoption of various national traditions appears almost as a trademark of the three writers, where the wider scope of London’s press scene helped impart a degree of critical authority. Moore, Lynch and Gwynn’s general resistance to categorisation underpins their fascination with Paris, a city cosmopolitan enough to inspire without stifling, to point forward while respecting tradition. Yet in responding to another’s culture and identity, Binckes and Laing argue, one is ‘inevitably saying something equally telling about one’s own’.⁷⁶ In Moore’s case this was undisguised; as an Irishman, ‘all aspects of my native country are violently disagreeable to me ... [but] with Frenchmen I am conscious of a sense of nearness’.⁷⁷ It is a sentiment mirrored by Lynch throughout her *Fortnightly* writings. She took refuge in the intellectual milieu of French life, sensing perhaps the blinkering effect of nationalist rhetoric associated with her Revival contemporaries. Her writings here certainly reinforce Foster’s analysis, that ‘the Europeanised Lynch’s field of view was far wider than Irish nationalism’s’ – as indeed was

⁷² See the discussions of Alice Stopford Green in Chapter Three and the Conclusion for more detail on how the Boer War impacted Irish (nationalist) life in London.

⁷³ As quoted in Reid, *Stephen Gwynn*, p. 43.

⁷⁴ Mathews, *Revival*, p. 14. As quoted in D’Arcy, ‘The Metamorphosis of George Moore’, p. 39.

⁷⁵ As quoted in P.J. Mathews, ‘Stirring up Disloyalty: The Boer War, the Irish Literary Theatre and the Emergence of a New Separatism’, *Irish University Review* 33.1 (Summer, 2003), p. 106.

⁷⁶ Binckes and Laing, ‘From *Wild Irish Girl* to ‘Parisianised Foreigner’, p. 53.

⁷⁷ Moore, *Confessions of a Young Man* (London: William Heinemann, 1917), p. 95.

Gwynn's.⁷⁸ Engaging in the politics of literary self-definition for these three writers was, ultimately, an act of national ambivalence. In sidestepping the provincialism so frequently equated with Irish voices in the Victorian press, Moore, Lynch and Gwynn brought a transnational awareness to the pages of the *Fortnightly* that spoke to a more outward-looking perspective of Irish letters in the 1880s and 1890s.

Politics and Co-Operation in the *Fortnightly Review*

This cosmopolitan literary scene was, of course, complemented by a visible (and volatile) Irish political presence in Westminster at the end of the nineteenth century. Near the start of Somerset Maugham's semi-autobiographical novel *Of Human Bondage*, for instance, the progressive headmaster Mr Perkins asks his class of schoolboys 'if they knew anything about the agrarian troubles in Ireland'. Eschewing the traditional lessons on Latin grammar and English river names (to the horror of his fellow teachers), it is soon revealed that 'the new head had a mania for general information'.⁷⁹ The novel was published in 1915 but reflects on the author's childhood in the latter decades of Victorian England. This 'mania for general information', and the fact that contemporary Irish affairs form an integral part of the schoolboys' grasp of it, is therefore a telling episode in the cultural production of the time. Ireland's agrarian state during the 1880s and 1890s was a constant presence within British media and political discussion. Although partly overshadowed by the Parnellite split in the Irish Parliamentary Party in 1891, for many of these years the Irish question within British politics came to be synonymous with the 'land' question. Assemblages in the vein of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society (IAOS) not only garnered significant numbers of members and support, but edged their way into the public consciousness in both England and Ireland. Successive British governments, including Gladstone's Liberal-Irish Party alliance, concerned themselves with assuaging political and social dissent through various agricultural policies, however marginal their effect. Nevertheless, as detailed in previous chapters, the debates that took place around issues such as Co-Operation and the Financial Relations Commission in the press were lively and often heated. In 1894 an anonymous contributor to the *Fortnightly Review* concluded that 'agriculture sorely needs advice and assistance of some sort ... the paternal government of Dublin must step in with

⁷⁸ Foster, *Irish Novels*, p. 278.

⁷⁹ W. Somerset Maugham, *Of Human Bondage* (London: Vintage, 2000 [1915]), p. 68.

some helpful plan for the formation of local bodies to take the place of a rich and wisely generous over-landlord'.⁸⁰

These Irish social concerns existed within a British public discourse that was fraught with matters of division, cooperation and nationalism. After the fall of Parnell, the Irish Party in Westminster had split into those who believed in continued alliance with the Liberals (including Justin McCarthy), and those who maintained an uncompromising Parnellite stance. Irish Unionist interests, meanwhile, encompassed a disparate array of tenants, landlords and a minority of non-political cooperationists. It is on this latter group that this section focuses, drawing together political writings by Horace Plunkett and Standish O'Grady, and juxtaposing them with the views of McCarthy – which all appeared within the *Fortnightly*. The ideas contained within these articles marked a significant era in moderate Irish politics, a faith in cooperative strategies that envisioned a way out of economic and parliamentary stagnation. They also owed a debt to the legacy of Gladstone's attempts at Irish conciliation in the 1880s. Following the statesman's initiatives, Plunkett and O'Grady sought to engage with a broad, cross-class section of society through existing constitutional apparatus and drawing on the diverse forces of unionism, liberalism, democracy and European conservatism.⁸¹ Nor were they unaware of the Irish cultural nationalism gaining traction in London literary circles – Plunkett knowingly courted the Literary Revival through contact with Yeats, who addressed the IAOS annual conference in 1897, and Lady Gregory, in a *Nineteenth Century* article, explicitly paid tribute to the co-operative principles of Plunkett.⁸²

The Irish Co-operative Movement forms the backbone to any examination of these periodical writings. Established by the landowning Horace Plunkett (a cousin and close friend of Emily Lawless), it rose from inauspicious beginnings in Co Waterford in 1889 to become one of the leading forces for land and agricultural reform anywhere in the United Kingdom of the late nineteenth century. Of the many historiographical disputes about the movement's influence and success, one aspect seems broadly accepted: that Plunkett had an extraordinary aptitude and vigour for seeing the movement through to its greatest potential. Largely due to his campaigning, the push for a more equitable system of land management

⁸⁰ Anon, 'The Ireland of Tomorrow', *Fortnightly Review* 55 (Jan 1894), pp. 13-14.

⁸¹ N.C. Fleming and Alan O'Day, 'Accommodation, Conciliation and Cooperation: A Gladstonian Legacy', in D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day, *Gladstone and Ireland: Politics, Religion and Nationality in the Victorian Age* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 237.

⁸² Allen, *George Russell and the New Ireland*, p. 27. See Chapter Four for further discussion of Gregory's article.

attracted support far beyond his immediate Unionist circle. The Jesuit priest Fr Thomas Finlay, for instance, threw his weight behind the philosophy of co-operation and helped unite some of the more ideologically opposed elements of the movement. In 1894 it was consolidated nationally under the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society (IAOS), and its journal the *Irish Homestead* began publishing a year later. Politically Plunkett was an interesting and at times ambivalent figure. F.S.L. Lyons reads his involvement in social reform as essentially a benign form of Unionism, economic rather than political, but ultimately with the aim of keeping Ireland and her farmers on an equal footing with their British partners.⁸³ Others have seen it in a different light, emphasising how the modernising vision of the movement was entirely and purposefully divorced from the political machinations of the day.⁸⁴ However one may read this, there is little doubt about the importance of publicity (especially in the press) for the ideological battles that the Co-operative Movement had to fight.

In this respect Standish O'Grady was at least as an important figure as Plunkett in articulating the ideals of co-operation to a wider audience. Best known today for folkloric writings that inspired the early Revivalists, O'Grady, like his compatriot George Russell (or Æ) straddled the worlds of political and cultural influence. In Michael McAteer's analysis, the whole Revival trope of the sentimentalised peasant 'bears witness to the influence exercised by O'Grady through his adaptation of Victorian political discourse to late nineteenth-century Ireland'.⁸⁵ Furthermore, his ideals of social cohesion and knowledge of the press were underappreciated elements of the co-operative movement's success. Like Plunkett, O'Grady came from a Unionist background but developed theories of political and social reform that diverged from the partisan politics of Westminster. Despite the ostensibly conservative nature of his views – namely mobilising the Anglo-Irish gentry in defence of their country's culture and heritage – O'Grady was a believer in the radical potential of such an approach.⁸⁶ He understood the significance of arousing public opinion in favour of a cause, and interrogated his own and others' conceptions of historical narratives throughout his career (as has been shown in the previous chapter on *The New Review*).

⁸³ F.S.L. Lyons, *Ireland Since the Famine* (London: Fontana, 1963), p. 208.

⁸⁴ See Billy Gray, 'Close-Cropped Grass: Hubert Butler's Perspective on Community, Nationalism and a Globalised Ireland', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* 35.1 (Spring 2009), pp. 63-67.

⁸⁵ Michael McAteer, *Standish O'Grady, AE and Yeats: History, Politics, Culture* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2002), p. 107.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

The *Fortnightly Review* provides a snapshot of these interests and objectives. Horace Plunkett's 1894 article on 'Ireland Today and Ireland Tomorrow' is a forceful declaration of his cause, expressed within the context of both British and European counterparts. Significantly, it was published in the same year that the IAOS was founded, displaying an awareness of the importance of press coverage in instigating large-scale movements. Plunkett does not play down the ambition of the article either, stating at the outset that 'it is my main purpose to propound a definite programme of social and industrial improvement'.⁸⁷ He goes into detail about the state of the railways, the rates and arrangements of labourers' agricultural benefits and, most vigorously, the plans for co-operation. Plunkett may have led the movement through the force of his personality, but in this piece he asserts his credentials as a member of the Congested Districts Board with invaluable experience in the industry. The article could also be said to be aware of its periodicity – it opens with the author's rebuttal of previous anonymous articles (entitled 'The Ireland of Today' in November 1893 and 'The Ireland of Tomorrow' in January 1894) and highlights his engagement with a broader discussion within the journal. This is significant not only for illustrating Plunkett's involvement with the journalistic craft, but also in providing him with an argumentative stance which he thrived upon throughout his career. He was an avowed opponent of both the Home Rule and larger nationalist causes which he viewed as stifling and 'exclusive' (stating here that it 'would exercise a censorship over all principles and actions, political, social and economic'), but despite standing as a unionist candidate in 1896 he did not shy away from dissenting views, attracting considerable bile over his co-operative stance from some unionist quarters.⁸⁸

There is, however, a strong note of optimism, to the point of propaganda, in these articles. Plunkett launches a defence of the Irish national character, describing how 'there is fine stuff in those Donegal folk ... the hope of the future' and railing against the alleged 'degeneracy' of Ireland as propounded by the former contributor.⁸⁹ Although 'anxious to avoid' any discussion of high politics, he calls on certain national sentiments in order to further his arguments. It is a technique mirrored in Standish O'Grady's article of 1897, entitled 'Ireland: The New Irish Movement'. Like Plunkett, he is advocating a cause that relies upon a mass movement of the Irish people towards a degree of autonomy. Also like Plunkett, he utilises high rhetoric in order to press his point; 'Ireland', he tells us, 'awakens

⁸⁷ Horace Plunkett, 'Ireland of Today and Ireland of Tomorrow', *Fortnightly Review* 55 (Mar 1894), p. 277.

⁸⁸ Trevor West, *Horace Plunkett: Co-Operation and Politics, an Irish Biography* (Gerrards Cross, Bucks: Colin Smythe, 1986), p. 49.

⁸⁹ Plunkett, 'Ireland of Today and Ireland of Tomorrow', p. 293.

from her phantom-haunted slumber, and, still half-dazed, stumbles to her feet'.⁹⁰ Both articles have no difficulty conflating the intricate economic details with romantic ideals of the 'nation'. But O'Grady's objective is somewhat different, perhaps reflecting his closer connection to the cultural politics of the Revival. He envisages a state of harmony between the aristocratic, land-owning classes and the land-tilling labourers. As various commentators have noted, it is essentially a feudal relationship, predicated upon and 'appealing to a traditional sense of loyalty'.⁹¹ If the interests of these historically antagonistic classes could be 'combined' under an awakened public spirit, O'Grady sees the threat of Home Rule nullified. More so than Plunkett, this article displays an awareness of Ireland within a broader framework of Englishness and English attitudes. He criticises the 'irresponsible scribes of the anti-Irish press' (in what may be a gesture towards growing misgivings about the movement from Westminster), and negotiates what he sees as the difference between English and Irish Unionism: 'we uphold it, primarily for Irish purposes, secondarily for Imperial, and not for purely English purposes at all'.⁹²

This is significant in the context of the political climate of 1896-7. In February of that year the British Government's Financial Relations Commission released a report detailing Ireland and Britain's relative contribution to the maintenance of the Empire, and concluded that Ireland had been overtaxed by nearly two million pounds per annum. It led to a nationwide outcry, and was one of the few times in the latter part of the century where landlords and tenants were united in their demands for fairer treatment. For O'Grady, the report promised an unparalleled opportunity. He perceived a sense of momentum and power in the county meetings that sprang up in the wake of the report. His book *All-Ireland* of the following year took up the question again at length, acting as a rallying cry to restore Irish nationhood to its proper place within the British Empire. Influenced by the political writings of Carlyle, the tract spoke to an inspiring ideal of heroic action, displaying a sense of mission common to British intellectuals of the late nineteenth century.⁹³ As it turned out, in fact, in the interim between the 1897 article and 1898 book this movement had lost much of its steam, with divisions opening up along traditional political lines and a collapse of consensus over what to demand of Britain in reparation.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Standish O'Grady, 'Ireland: The New Irish Movement', *Fortnightly Review* 61 (Feb 1897), p. 175.

⁹¹ McAteer, *Standish O'Grady*, p. 86.

⁹² O'Grady, 'Ireland', p. 290.

⁹³ Allen, *George Russell and the New Ireland*, p. 20.

⁹⁴ Philip L. Marcus, *Standish O'Grady* (Lewisburg: Bucknell U.P., 1970), p. 71.

In the *Fortnightly Review*, however, O’Grady’s writings point beyond the contemporary Irish situation. His persuasive rhetorical flourishes act as a reminder of his literary aspirations, and his use of the word ‘heroic’ in relation to the Irish aristocracy is particularly significant in light of the associations it held for the author’s folkloric work.⁹⁵ Indeed, with his Revivalist connections O’Grady may have been actively attempting to energise Plunkett’s somewhat dry fiscal outlines of the co-operative aspirations. Some years later he wrote that ‘I do think that a certain conscious idealisation of the movement is desirable even towards its material success. You know the Emersonian phrase, “Hitch your wagons to a star?”’.⁹⁶ In 1885 he published an article on ‘Carlyle as a Political Teacher’, which helps to contextualise the early phases of his social and political thinking. The mid-nineteenth century political historian was an undoubted and lasting influence on O’Grady, whose social commentary draws much from Carlyle’s ideas. This *Fortnightly* article analyses the purpose of the state and government, where ‘modern political speculation seems to have reached a point at which no further advance is possible.’⁹⁷ The questions of laissez-faire economics, English poor law and threats to nation-building were all ones that concerned Carlyle. Here, O’Grady posits them in relation to an Irish context and specifically that of ‘landlordism’. We can discern a notable difference between this and his later article, however; that ‘the terrible and abysmal land question’ of 1885 is transformed by 1897 into a cause for optimism is just one pointer towards the development of O’Grady’s ideology. As one biographer has observed, the writer was no stranger to changes of outlook and demonstrated an extraordinary capacity for adapting his fundamental political principles to the rapidly changing conditions of the period.⁹⁸

The periodical press thus played a vital part in the ways in which both O’Grady and Plunkett articulated their political outlook. Their involvement in newspaper publishing bookended the lifespan of the Co-Operative Movement, from the foundation of its mouthpiece *Irish Homestead* in 1894 to the later vociferous campaigns against it by John Dillon and the *Freeman’s Journal* at the close of the century. The *Homestead*, under the editorial brief of George Russell, aimed to expand the economic principles of sharing into the broader realms of cultural and spiritual life.⁹⁹ It was a relatively successful propaganda

⁹⁵ Ibid. See Chapter One for a wider discussion of O’Grady’s fictional and folkloric endeavours in the British press.

⁹⁶ As quoted in Margaret Digby, *Horace Plunkett: An Anglo-American Irishman* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949), p. 165.

⁹⁷ Standish O’Grady, ‘Carlyle as a Political Teacher’, *Fortnightly Review* 38 (Oct 1885), p. 516.

⁹⁸ McAteer, *Standish O’Grady*, p. 86.

⁹⁹ Gray, ‘Close-Cropped Grass’, p. 64.

exercise, much like O’Grady’s own publishing and editorial ventures in the late 1890s. He bought and edited the *Kilkenny Weekly Moderator* and in 1900 founded the *All-Ireland Review*, both featuring many early Revival writings. But the context of the Irish periodical press was notably different to that of its London intellectual counterpart. Disputes similar to those between the *Freeman’s Journal* and the *Homestead* were certainly waged, but the lofty, often much lengthier articles in the prestigious English reviews demanded a different tone. By the time of their *Fortnightly* contributions Plunkett and O’Grady were both experienced journalists and were no doubt alive to these questions of tone and audience. Their writings here reflect a sustained engagement with the industry; indeed, Plunkett’s article arises as a direct riposte to previous pieces articulating a British imperial view of the Irish situation. Within the articles themselves, moreover, both writers adopt a reflective, often critical stance regarding the output of the Victorian press. O’Grady is dismissive about all levels of British journalism, lambasting ‘the men who knew nothing about the subject and cared to know nothing, and only desired to fill up their column with readable and plausible and anti-Irish matter’, as well as those ‘divers British statesmen writing and declaiming about [Ireland’s] wrongs with great eloquence and apparent conviction’.¹⁰⁰

Alongside Plunkett and O’Grady, however, there were other Irish voices to be discerned within the pages of the *Fortnightly* in defence of their country. The alternative side of the Irish question, from a more overtly political stance, was represented by the MP and leader of the Irish Party Justin McCarthy. In February 1893 he contributed a section to a multi-authored article entitled ‘What Mr Gladstone Ought to do’. His attitude and arguments – chiefly that strong leadership was necessary from Gladstone’s government to see the introduction of Home Rule – differ considerably from those of Plunkett and O’Grady. For one, McCarthy was based in London and deeply involved in parliamentary life, with all its ‘essential weakness and corruption’ that O’Grady so despised.¹⁰¹ McCarthy also confines himself to explicitly addressing the Home Rule question, as opposed to the larger national implications thrown up by the land issue. The date of publication, February 1893, assumes a further significance in light of the post-Parnell political landscape, and directly preceding the second Home Rule bill of the following month. McCarthy is aware of the considerable political clout his party wielded in Westminster at the time, stating that in the event of a Tory government, ‘assume that they would find it hard to live with us, how

¹⁰⁰ O’Grady, ‘Ireland: The New Irish Movement’, p. 174, 176.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p.175.

could they possibly live without us?’¹⁰² The latent threat of the Irish party is referred to throughout the article by other contributors, but McCarthy presents the most forceful articulation of the ‘Irish position’. Using the historical narrative of Home Rule to back up his claims, he tones down any overt claims to nationalist sentiment, concluding that, ultimately, ‘the business of the hour is to bring England and Ireland together – to make Ireland feel that she is a willing partner in a great Imperial system.’¹⁰³

In this way the article points up some interesting facets of English-Irish relations. McCarthy appears as part of a cohort addressing the prime minister from within a journal of the British intellectual establishment. He refers to Gladstone as ‘the apostle of Home Rule for Ireland’ and assumes an advisory role as regards policy decisions.¹⁰⁴ It is clear that not only did McCarthy partake of these elite networks, he felt comfortable in the environs of Westminster where, according to one source, his views and company were widely appreciated.¹⁰⁵ The series of pieces which make up the 1893 article are similarly interesting as cushioning material for the Irish politician’s views. The authors include Liberal MP J. Fletcher Moulton, the prolific writer and reformer Sidney Webb, a noted journalist and editor in Henry Massingham, and George Bernard Shaw. It is Shaw who provides the most radical and outrightly cynical commentary, declaiming Gladstone as ‘an artist, an unrivalled platform artist’ and stating that it is

pleasant, all this for the Irish party, the “masters of the situation” who, ten years too late with their virtuous resolution to support Labour in Parliament, and only half sincere in it even now, will most likely have the Irish Question settled over their heads, for the mere sake of getting rid of it, by private arrangement between Sir William Harcourt and Mr Chamberlain.¹⁰⁶

More sincere and optimistic views appear in Webb’s article, where success on the Home Rule question is indelibly tied up with the progress towards social equality. Except for Massingham’s contribution, all of the writers here see Home Rule as the single most pressing issue for Gladstone’s Liberal government. It is notable, therefore, that despite

¹⁰² Justin McCarthy, ‘What Mr Gladstone Ought to do’, *Fortnightly Review* 53 (Feb 1893), p. 268.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 270.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

¹⁰⁵ Michael Bodkin, *Recollections of an Irish Judge: Press, Bar and Parliament* (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1914), p. 241.

¹⁰⁶ George Bernard Shaw, ‘What Mr Gladstone Ought to do’, *Fortnightly Review* 53 (Feb 1893), p. 279.

high-profile coverage of the issue, McCarthy was one of the only Irish names to contribute to this particular discussion – and certainly one of the few nationalist voices to be invited.

In more general terms, then, how responsive was the *Fortnightly Review* to the Irish question? Did it reflect or impact on the circulation of political values regarding Ireland in the periodical press? In respect to the latter, the journal, of course, can't be taken as any kind of representative authority, but it is interesting in revealing certain patterns of publication. The question of politics, perhaps surprisingly, appears overshadowed in these years by concerns relating to land and social reform – Plunkett and O'Grady's contributions outnumbering those by McCarthy and Shaw. The selection of articles discussed here are some of the only ones written by Irish commentators, but they are complemented by a wealth of other observations from across the political and intellectual spheres of late Victorian London. The value placed on enlightened and educated views of the Irish situation is apparent, with both T.H.S. Escott (the former *Fortnightly* editor) and the historian Edward Freeman among those addressing it.¹⁰⁷ Indeed the Irish Question comprises a large proportion of discussions on politics in general within the journal. The *Fortnightly* often carried more than one article on Ireland within the same issue, such as the series on 'What Mr Gladstone Ought To Do', or the February 1897 issue featuring two successive articles entitled 'Ireland (No. I) and (No. II)'. The perceived substantive nature of the material ensured it received a prominent position within the magazine (as indeed within broader political discourse at the time). Both the March 1894 and September 1889 issues opened with Plunkett and Freeman articles about Ireland, illustrating the intellectual currency that such Irish writers and subjects were bringing to the London press circuits by the closing decades of the century.

For a periodical originally dedicated to largely liberal thought, however, it is difficult to discern any overarching commitment to the Liberal ideology – at least in its narrow political sense – in the Irish material of the 1880s and '90s. The critic Ann Parry has written a revealing study of the biases and political leanings of periodicals during times of parliamentary pressure around the Home Rule bills. She sees a noticeably Unionist flavour to the *Fortnightly* during the years 1886 (when the journal 'actively proselytised for its [Unionist] cause') and 1891.¹⁰⁸ To what extent this is due to editorial policy is harder to

¹⁰⁷ E.A. Freeman, 'Parallels to Irish Home Rule', *Fortnightly Review* 52 (Sep 1889), pp. 293-298; T.H.S. Escott, 'The Radical Programme (No. VII): Local Government and Ireland', *Fortnightly Review* 44 (July 1885), pp. 1-16.

¹⁰⁸ Ann Parry, 'The Home Rule Crisis and the 'Liberal' Periodicals 1886-1895: Three Case Studies', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 22.1 (Spring 1989), p. 23.

define, although Frank Harris did provide a strong statement with his article in the July 1886 issue. Only one month after taking up the position at the helm of the journal, he proclaims that the Conservative line is the only conceivable course of action for Ireland, and that ‘the ties which bind Great Britain to her colonies and dependencies should be drawn closer, and should on no account be relaxed.’¹⁰⁹ His assertion that the ‘Celtic population’ is incapable of maintaining any control over its country is however in stark contrast to the closing words of the previous editor, T.H. S. Escott, one year earlier. Here, Escott argues that ‘under the domination of an alien race ... the continuance of such a system is unjust to Ireland, useless to England, and dangerous to both’.¹¹⁰ But these are the only editorial opinions published during the 1880s and ’90s. More influential, as Parry points out, are the impressions made by the different contexts of presentation of articles.¹¹¹ Thus the combined weight and effect of pieces such as McCarthy’s in 1893, where three of the five contributors actively support Home Rule, may have counterbalanced some of the Unionist articles scattered throughout the *Fortnightly* during these years.

It is also worth considering how some of the more multi-faceted dimensions working beneath the surface of the journal shaped the representation of Irish matter within it. Within and without the *Fortnightly Review* the Irish political writers of these years relied upon and participated in networks of periodical influence. Both personal and professional connections (such as those assembled by Frank Harris as editor) were crucial in facilitating the movement and dissemination of information in the late nineteenth century. We can see this framework reflected in the structure of the periodical itself, most clearly perhaps in the Gladstonian ‘symposium’ of February 1893 that included McCarthy, Shaw and Sidney Webb. But these networks of influence also point beyond their immediate periodical context. Both Harris and his Irish sub-editor, John Verschoyle, actively cultivated a circle of prized writers that were valued for their engaging conversation and views – much the same reason that Justin McCarthy enjoyed a positive reputation and wide circle of acquaintances within the House of Commons.¹¹² Similarly, the success or otherwise of the Co-Operative Movement’s ventures often depended on Plunkett’s ability to exploit networks with a high visibility in the public sphere. As stated above, he may have largely

¹⁰⁹ Frank Harris, ‘The Irish Crisis (No. I): Natural Laws and the Home Rule Problem’, *Fortnightly Review* 40 (July 1886), p. 101.

¹¹⁰ Escott, ‘Local Government and Ireland’, p. 8.

¹¹¹ Parry, ‘The Home Rule Crisis and the ‘Liberal’ Periodicals’, p. 20.

¹¹² James McConnel, ‘The Irish Parliamentary Party in Victorian and Edwardian London’, in Peter Gray (ed.), *Victoria’s Ireland? Irishness and Britishness, 1837-1901* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), p. 39.

failed to ‘hitch his wagons’ to the Celtic Revivalists, but, alongside George Russell and O’Grady, the periodical market of both Britain and Ireland offered a more fruitful enterprise for consolidating a public presence.

In many ways we can tie these often-diverse sets of writings within the *Fortnightly* into a broader framework of ideological history. One strand of recent scholarship on nineteenth-century Britain has started to focus on the movements of thought and public opinion as a basis for reinterpreting some of the most significant events of the era. The study of opinion-formers is essential to this, as is their contribution and access to flows of information within the public sphere. Within this, G.K. Peatling has examined the ideological context of British attitudes to Ireland across a number of fields. His studies are important in pointing out the crucial role of European influence, not only to the literary purveyors of the *Fortnightly*, but to a more general conception of British-Irish relations in political discourse. During the first Home Rule crisis of 1886, for instance, the historian Edward Freeman (already mentioned as a distinguished *Fortnightly* contributor on Irish affairs) counselled Gladstone’s advisors on appropriate European examples, leading the Prime Minister to conclude that the ‘civilised world’ was sympathetic to his Home Rule schemes.¹¹³ In a somewhat different vein, Jennifer Ridden has written about the ‘attempts undertaken by members of the Irish liberal Protestant elite to define and mould a liberal and pluralistic Empire as an entity in which Irishness could co-exist rather than conflict with an imperial Britishness’.¹¹⁴ Both of these views are relevant to the Irish political and social commentary within the *Fortnightly Review*. O’Grady, in particular, concerns himself with writing Ireland and the Irish experience into a larger framework of the British body politic. He represents the educated, metropolitan, often Protestant voice that characterises much of the Irish submissions to the periodical press at the time – and, through the influence of Carlyle, holds a firm grounding in the history of ideas himself. Even McCarthy, the middle-class bastion of moderate nationalism, benefited from the platform offered by the British press. Not only did he live and write from London for much of his life, but earned much of his living through contributing leaders to the *Daily News*, writing ‘pot-boilers’ for the

¹¹³ G.K. Peatling, “‘Continental Crossings’: European Influences on British Public Opinion and Irish Politics, 1848-2002”, *History of European Ideas* 27 (2001), p. 374.

¹¹⁴ Jennifer Ridden, ‘Britishness as an Imperial and Diasporic Identity: Irish Elite Perspectives, c.1820–1870s’, in Gray (ed.), *Victoria’s Ireland*, p. 11.

British urban market and engaging in a transnational exchange of political and cultural discourses through the elite press.¹¹⁵

The worlds of literary and political endeavour, then, at least in the *Fortnightly*, were not so far apart. P.J. Mathews, in perhaps the most rounded assessment of the Revival era of Irish cultural production (which inevitably forms the backdrop to any study of these years), states that ‘what is most striking about this period is not that literary activity *replaced* politics as Yeats implied, or that political activity was more effective than literary work as [R.F.] Foster argues, but that it was *accompanied* by a great deal of ‘innovative’ political activity’.¹¹⁶ Included in such ‘innovations’ could be periodical essays such as these, largely understudied weapons in an emerging arsenal of publicity around the new nationalist movements. What these political writings demonstrate, furthermore, is that Irish nationalism pre-1900 was not a single, cohesive or coercive ideology. For instance, many of the key figures here – Justin McCarthy and Standish O’Grady to name only two – were aligned to various forms of ‘nationalism’ (McCarthy as a Home Rule MP, O’Grady through his involvement with cultural nationalist organisations). What is more, the work of Mathews, R.F. Foster, Eugenio Biagini and others are increasingly making it clear that ideological positions, particularly in relation to Irish nationalism, in this period were much more fluid and diverse than a simple nationalist/unionist binary can capture.¹¹⁷ Tom Nairn has emphasised the ‘essential ambiguity’ of nationalism, a ‘modern Janus’ that incorporates the paradoxes of modernisation alongside the cultural appropriation of ‘backwardness’.¹¹⁸ We can see this in the demands of O’Grady and the early Gaelic Revivalists for a ‘discovery’ of an Irish past via increasingly sophisticated political and publishing strategies. The *Fortnightly Review* (like the *Nineteenth Century* and *The New Review*) in this respect became an arena where competing and overlapping conceptions of national identities could be fashioned, legitimised and disputed – Plunkett and O’Grady mirroring the efforts of

¹¹⁵ Eugene Doyle, *Justin McCarthy* (Dundalk: Published for the Historical Association of Ireland by Dundalgan Press, 1996), p. 56. It was a costly lifestyle, however, and his material circumstances are revealing in the challenges they posed for the Irish author – particularly in 1882, when he wrote to his friend John Pope Hennessy asking for a loan of two hundred pounds. Letter from Justin McCarthy to John Pope Hennessy, 4 July 1882. Hennessy papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS.Brit.Emp.s.409, 4/219 f.13.

¹¹⁶ P.J. Mathews, *Revival: The Abbey Theatre, Sinn Féin, the Gaelic League and the Co-Operative Movement* (Cork: Cork University Press/Field Day, 2003), p. 6.

¹¹⁷ See Mathews, *Revival*; R.F. Foster, *Paddy and Mr Punch: Connections in English and Irish History* (London: A. Lane, 2003); Eugenio F. Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism 1876-1906* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

¹¹⁸ Tom Nairn, *Faces of Nationalism: Janus Revisited* (London: Verso, 1997), p. 71.

Yeats and Lady Gregory in other periodicals to ‘regenerate their own intellectual terms of reference’.¹¹⁹

In this sense there may be room for connecting the literary and political writings of the Irish cohort in the *Fortnightly*. Both sets of writers are involved in promulgating a discourse, whether in George Moore’s goal to introduce naturalism to the English reading public or Standish O’Grady’s wish to assert the ‘heroism’ of the Irish landed gentry. As one study has put it, the late Victorians did not necessarily regard literariness and polemic as mutually exclusive, and frequently moved between the two in the same piece.¹²⁰

McCarthy’s career as politician, journalist and author is testament to this ‘generic promiscuity’, as are both Moore’s and O’Grady’s publishing careers, detailed elsewhere in this thesis.¹²¹ Indeed O’Grady published both imaginative and critical histories of Ireland, and in many ways his writings are inseparable from his political ideas, (most forcefully exemplified in his 1882 book *The Crisis in Ireland*). But much of this adaptability may be down to a question of circumstances. Despite the prestigious nature of the *Fortnightly Review*, many of the Irish writers featured within it depended upon a wide spread of journalistic and other income to support costly London lifestyles. Their visibility across all sectors of the newspaper and periodical press is testament to this financial imperative as much as any higher ideals. McCarthy’s pot-boilers, Hannah Lynch’s weekly columns and O’Grady’s newspaper ownership all add up to a wider conception of the Irish journalist than is generally appreciated. In the years before Irish literary and political culture took a marked shift toward articulating essentialist identities, the *Fortnightly*’s varied output stands testament to a more nuanced conception of how Ireland could be represented.¹²²

And in other ways the cultural and political writers of the journal were ideologically connected. European influences recur in various guises over the course of two decades and act as a link between many of these contributions. The literary authors looked to Europe time and again for inspiration, reflecting the continued influence of the Romantic Movement and French culture more generally. But so did the social reformers of nineteenth-century Ireland. Scattered throughout O’Grady’s and Plunkett’s articles are numerous references to European examples of agricultural co-operation, often painted as a way out of the Irish dilemma. These writers were aware too that they stood within a broader

¹¹⁹ Mathews, *Revival*, pp. 23, 8.

¹²⁰ Sandra Kemp, Charlotte Mitchell and David Trotter (eds.), ‘Introduction’ to *The Oxford Companion to Edwardian Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), xvii.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Fleming and O’Day, ‘Accommodation, Conciliation and Cooperation’, p. 244.

continental tradition of cultural and social progress, in turn defining and renegotiating ideas of literary and political self-identity that took inspiration from similar movements across the continent.¹²³ For agricultural and social reformers, as much as their literary counterparts, co-operation across boundaries offered the prospect of a radically new vision for Ireland in its imaginative and political guises. The impact of ideas and networks that extended beyond the shores of Britain or Ireland was an important, yet barely acknowledged, force of social change. It was Stephen Gwynn who offered perhaps the best way out of the dichotomies between England and Ireland, writer and agitator, when, after a career that encompassed both, he concluded that ‘history is concerned with the development of civilisation, and the civilisation to which Ireland belongs is that of Europe, not the British Isles’.¹²⁴ The literary landscape of the *Fortnightly Review*, then, a place of concentrated intellectual sociability, reflected and reinforced this complex web of relationships that stretched between London, Ireland and Europe.

¹²³ Peatling, ““Continental Crossings””, pp. 372-5.

¹²⁴ Stephen Gwynn, *The History of Ireland* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1923), p. 1.

Conclusion

‘An Ireland Busier and Broader’?

The Irish novelist Jane Barlow, who published much of her short fiction and poetry in London during the last decade of the century, wrote to a friend in 1898 that she had recently heard from Shan Bullock of ‘a conspiracy against me and some other Irish authors, among a set of London critics. No doubt people often imagine such things, but I do think there has been a certain animus in many of the reviews of late.’¹ She was referring to a noticeable cooling among the British public towards a sector of Irish luminaries in the wake of outspoken support for the Boers in South Africa (and indeed the Diamond Jubilee riots in Dublin the previous year, organised specifically to foment anti-English sentiment). It was, furthermore, a feeling that crystallised around the gradual movement of Irish cultural and national life in the years after 1900 towards a perceived resistance to British values and rule, and the attendant artistic self-fashioning of a generation headed up by Yeats, Lady Gregory, J.M. Synge and Maud Gonne. A timely intersection of their literary reformulations, political anxieties over the Boer war and the more piecemeal, if no less significant, waning of Irish constitutional efficacy in Westminster signalled a shift in the Irish intellectual consciousness away from a previous comfortable accommodation within British society. The years following the outbreak of hostilities in South Africa saw the prominent Irish nationalist MP Michael Davitt resign his seat in parliament in protest as well as Yeats’s decision to move the fledgling Irish Literary Theatre from London to Dublin; ‘the deliberately ideological withdrawal from the imperial capital parallel[ing] Davitt’s withdrawal from the imperial capital’.² Thus, the displacements and dichotomies – between Ireland and England, nationalism and cosmopolitanism – that the Irish Revival

¹ Jane Barlow to Sarah Purser, 28 November 1898, NLI MS 8186 (10). As quoted in Jane Mahony, ‘Irish Writers and their London Publishers, c. 1884-1922’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2016), p. 131.

² Margaretta D’Arcy, ‘The Metamorphosis of George Moore’ in Conor Montague and Adrian Frazier (eds.), *George Moore: Dublin, Paris, Hollywood* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2012), p. 40.

initiative sought to advance became, in these years at the turn of the century, the defining character of Irish political, cultural and social life.³

But this much-quoted narrative risks precluding the fertility and diversity of Irish writing in England in the final decades of the nineteenth century. As this thesis has argued, the foundation of the Revival's literary project was in many ways inextricable from the publishing context and cultural sensibilities of 1890s London, whose periodical market in particular fostered the commercial and aesthetic impulses of a generation of Irish authors. These journals, moreover, illustrate how the Irish in turn took a central part in, and to various degrees shaped and represented, the intellectual culture of late Victorian Britain. Contrary to the prevailing assumption at the time that the Irish expatriate community was confined to the fields of hack journalism and second-rate representations of tired stereotypes, these writers instead expressed a complex and deeply-felt exploration of what they saw as the critical issues pertaining to Ireland, Britain and the rest of the world. The breadth of both the issues deemed pressing and of the spectrum of approaches taken by Irish authors is a powerful reminder that there was always more to being an Irish writer than writing about Irishness; that the issue of national identity was not perhaps as defining a feature as some later twentieth-century readings would have it. Indeed it was the delicate manoeuvrings of writers such as Sarah Grand, Emily Lawless and E.L. Godkin in adopting, resisting or interrogating (or in some cases all three) dominant narratives that offers us the broadest view of what Irish writing comprised in these years.⁴

If we are to view Irish writers as key players in the political, literary and journalistic arenas of late Victorian society, then the periodical press was an important framework for providing 'clear intellectual standards' that signalled a distinct readership – educated, elite and politically literate – and a shared set of principles around the tenets of liberal discourse.⁵ Julia Stapleton's incisive analysis of the late-nineteenth century intelligentsia points to the markers of the successful periodical journalist as one with wide learning, 'a requirement that was maintained even in the early stages of specialisation', and a belief in the 'ideal of general culture which alone made specialist fields of inquiry intelligible'.⁶

³ Eve Patten, 'Ireland's 'Two Cultures' Debate: Victorian Science and the Literary Revival', *Irish University Review* 33.1 (Spring 2003), p. 3.

⁴ Lyn Pykett, 'Re-Viewing Women Writers of the *Fin de Siècle*: Recent Critical Trends' in Adrienne E. Gavin and Carolyn W. de la L. Oulton (eds.), *Writing Women of the Fin de Siècle: Authors of Change* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 18.

⁵ Julia Stapleton, *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities in Britain Since 1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 23.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 18.

Despite the avowed diversity of voices and political stances in these reviews, moreover, she identifies a common sense of purpose that underpins both their position and that of the intellectual more generally in the social hierarchy of Britain at the time. A homogeneity of class values, background, personal and professional ties and an unstinting commitment to liberalism in its broadest sense characterised these Irish writers as much as any others in the periodical press, a unity ‘maintained in the face of sharp differences over such controversial issues as democracy, religion and the extension of the state, both in relation to national society and to Britain’s empire overseas’.⁷

This unstated but tangible harmony of interests is one of the major reasons for connecting the periodical work of the disparate array of writers considered here. Not only do (for example) Mahaffy, Yeats and Grand – widely different in many senses – occupy a similar position in relation to their periodical audience, but in contributing to these reviews they implicitly acknowledge and sustain the conventions of an intellectual culture as a civilising and enlightening ideal.⁸ In this sense, Irish writers sought to establish themselves as public thinkers and opinion formers, their articles specifically engineered to influence the currents of debate at the most elite levels. Whether this was overt in its intention (as with the political contributions of Justin McCarthy, Horace Plunkett or William Lecky) or more subtle (as with Emily Lawless and her complex play on representations of Irish history), there is a continuous sense of the elevated intellectual and social position that these periodicals afforded the Irish writer. Furthermore, journals and reviews incorporated Irish authors into the sphere of nineteenth-century political discussion, at a time when politics was not the exclusive domain of those sitting in Westminster. Rather, as Stapleton has pointed out, ‘the sustained amorphousness of academic political science in turn generated a broad interest in political debate’, something that can be discerned throughout highbrow journalism in the 1880s and 1890s. Alice Stopford Green, Charlotte Grace O’Brien and William Lecky, for instance, all expanded the boundaries of a British political consciousness, propelled by a (quintessentially Victorian) sense of public agency and education as disseminated through the press. For women, especially, the relative immediacy offered by the platform of monthly journals meant that they could use their writing as a challenge to preconceived notions about female involvement in the public sphere and the wider paradigms of political discourse.

⁷ Ibid., p. 21.

⁸ Ibid.

At the same time, however, the periodical press bore witness to the articulation of distinctly ‘Irish’ concerns. Among the many versions of Irishness at play during the 1880s and 1890s – culturally inscribed, politically motivated or historically constructed – the complexities of this particular regional and national identity were writ large across the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*, *Fortnightly Review* and *The New Review*. The political ideology of Irish nationalism, especially, was debated and reformulated through high-profile articles by McCarthy, Lecky and Gladstone, while nationalism in its broadest sense intersected with British imperial sentiment in a variety of different ways. The Boer War, for example, may have ‘unleashed a new dynamic within Irish separatist politics’ and spurred Alice Stopford Green into sharp declamation of Britain’s humanitarian abuses in South Africa, but lesser-known and less obvious entanglements with empire were also expressed by the transnational writings of E.L. Godkin and John Pope Hennessy.⁹ This is not to mention, too, the somewhat murkier acts of editorial ‘commissioning, selection, arrangement and presentation of material ... for commercial and ideological purposes’, something which undoubtedly coloured the reception of Irish political material within the journals.¹⁰ The imaginative figuration of Irish regional concerns for a British audience was also central to the writings of figures like Lecky and Yeats, or to the way in which Standish O’Grady made ‘broad intellectual trends in the British Isles relevant to regional concerns in Ireland’.¹¹ Unionism, indeed, was as powerful a cultural force in the period as nationalism, as seen in its endeavours to tie Ireland closer to her metropolitan neighbour in the face of widespread national and imperial soul-searching. ‘If Irish difference was what really worried – sometimes antagonised – Britain’, Glenn Hooper has written, ‘then a satisfactory provision of knowledge was regarded as a stabilising element in the relations between these states’.¹²

Alongside politics, periodical criticism was essential to this project and emerges as perhaps the most pervasive concern for an Irish milieu in London. George Moore, George Bernard Shaw, J.P. Mahaffy, Justin McCarthy and Hannah Lynch all forged their critical

⁹ P.J. Mathews, ‘Stirring up Disloyalty: The Boer War, the Irish Literary Theatre and the Emergence of a New Separatism’, *Irish University Review* 33.1 (Spring 2003), p. 99.

¹⁰ Fionnuala Dillane, ‘Researching a Periodical Genre: Classifications, Codes and Relational Terms’ in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), p. 78.

¹¹ Michael McAteer, ‘Ireland and the Hour’: Paternalism and Nationality in Standish James O’Grady’s *Toryism and the Tory Democracy* in Leon Litvack and Glenn Hooper (eds.), *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century: Regional Identity* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), p. 199.

¹² Glenn Hooper. ‘The Pursuit of Signs: Searching for Ireland after the Union’ in Leon Litvack and Glenn Hooper (eds.), *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century: Regional Identity* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), p. 217.

acumen at the vanguard of literary and press reviewing in the 1880s, and brought this heightened cultural awareness to bear upon some of the most topical issues of the day in the pages of *The New Review* and *Fortnightly Review*. Their critical writing, furthermore, took place within a publishing atmosphere fraught with questions of public taste, artistic morality and the contested nature of literary endeavour itself, with Moore and Shaw's invectives about London theatre echoing Mahaffy's later concerns over restraints on a cosmopolitan freedom of expression. Tracing these debates over the course of their authors' press careers, one can discern the growth, persistence and eclipse of the various literary forms and movements with which Irish writers aligned themselves. The New Journalism's encroaching influence in the 1890s, as embodied in T.P. O'Connor's articles, and that of New Woman writing as seen in Sarah Grand's stories, had strikingly similar roots in London's periodical culture (and attracted similar levels of both admiration and disdain from press commentators), but their cultural trajectories had diverged wildly by the end of the century. New Journalism, especially, highlighted the fractious interface between literature and journalism and the increasing efforts to separate and define the two, even at the precise moment when the demands of the marketplace were blurring the distinction between the 'high' and 'commercial' journalist (T.P. O'Connor and Oscar Wilde, for example, epitomised two ends of this spectrum, and yet both wrote prolifically for the popular *and* highbrow press).¹³

Thus, as this thesis has shown, the *plural* nature of Irish literary ambition and output in the later years of the century was mapped comprehensively on to the periodical press. With Wilde, as with Shaw, Mahaffy, Lecky and indeed Lawless, the poet, popular dramatist, journalist and translator of Egyptian literature 'continued to co-exist, albeit under some pressure, alongside the reviewer'.¹⁴ Irish writers, creative as well as critical, were therefore intimately involved in discussions and negotiations around literary, cultural and journalistic standards, contributing to 'the ongoing struggle to determine literary value'.¹⁵ As Laurel Brake has put it, in relation to the wider field of literary publishing,

¹³ Alongside this it must be noted, however, that the demands of the marketplace were also creating ever more difference between the high and commercial journals. By the turn of the century each had a distinct readership, ideology and aesthetic, and the reading public had been broken down into a series of class- and other identity-based markets to be catered to. See below for more detail on these changes in readership and types of periodical.

¹⁴ Josephine M. Guy and Ian Small, *Oscar Wilde's Profession: Writing and the Culture Industry in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 37.

¹⁵ Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

the discourses and writers of journalism and English Literature in the 1880s and 1890s shared a desire and a necessity to nurture distinctions in order to establish themselves, but ... the alleged and longstanding ‘conflict’ between journalism and literature in the latter part of the century in Britain is largely a function of the rhetoric of discursive communities rather than working practice.¹⁶

It is certainly the case that these Irish writers’ self-conscious engagement with the field of high culture often meant conflating – and frequently collapsing – the distance between criticism and creative work. Reflecting Wilde’s jubilant defiance of such limiting divisions in ‘The True Function of Criticism’ in the *Nineteenth Century*, for instance, we can see Emily Lawless’s periodical contributions similarly pushing the boundaries of form and genre (as well as subverting scientific and sexual categorisations). Highbrow reviewing also granted Hannah Lynch and Stephen Gwynn the opportunity to assert their artistic voices alongside critical analyses within the *Fortnightly Review*, a careful formulation of literary value that prioritised the reputation of the author as well as sustaining that of the journal.

But if the combined efforts of these periodical writers drew the critical and literary worlds closer together, they also had the effect of harnessing Irish letters to the broader spheres of British, European and American thought. In particular, Moore and Lynch’s attraction to contemporary Parisian artistic movements (and their attendant salon culture of the *fin de siècle*) provided some of the most significant material on new French literature for a *Fortnightly Review* audience. If writing on Zola and Daudet was a labour of love for these two authors (who spent much of the 1870s residing in France), it was also a calculated commercial decision, as Frank Harris’s journal was one of the most receptive to new and provocative literary trends – from both Ireland and France. A transnational frame of reference was also a boon for Irish writers in the *Nineteenth Century*, whose cultivation of a transatlantic and colonial network of contributors and readers demonstrated the wide reach of periodical journalism by the close of the century. The interaction of writers like E.L. Godkin and John Pope Hennessy with discourses of British liberalism and imperialism from across the commonwealth spoke not only to the transnational foundations of such a discourse, but of Irish writers’ integral role in structuring and sustaining it.

¹⁶ Laurel Brake, ‘Culture Wars? Arnold’s *Essays in Criticism* and the Rise of Journalism 1865-1895’ in Dinah Birch and Mark Llewellyn (eds.), *Conflict and Difference in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 209.

If, however, Irish writers in these periodicals were intimately bound up in and speaking to a coherent intellectual community of late Victorian Britain, they were also involved in challenging and resisting the conventions of the era. Women writers, especially, ‘working in a range of genres, constructed a different, more ‘inclusive’ form of aestheticism that ‘endorsed nature as well as art ... bourgeois culture along with cosmopolitan bohemianism ... and alternative sexualities in the context of historical and scientific study’’.¹⁷ We can see this played out most patently in the writings of Emily Lawless, but it can also apply to the different subversive impulses of Sarah Grand and Charlotte Grace O’Brien. Elite journalism offered a rhetorical space for the re-interrogation of social and gendered norms, whether that was the culturally disruptive New Woman fiction of Grand, or the intriguingly ambiguous desires at work in Lawless’s *Macmillan’s* stories. Writing themselves into a culture that had traditionally patronised the *man of letters*, these women trod a complex and shifting line between expressing a distinctive female literary identity and establishing themselves alongside male authorities in the scientific and political spheres. In this way the resonance of Alice Stopford Green’s and Charlotte Grace O’Brien’s articles on social justice may be read as a rejoinder to a highly patriarchal political establishment, assiduously working from within to expand this limiting paradigm.

Of course, periodicals – like their communities of contributors and readers – can be conceptualised as social as well as intellectual formations. The material and ideological proximity of writers tied them into a structure that was often replicated on a social level – in this case the clubs, salons and political groupings of nineteenth-century London. Editors in this picture occupied a prime position as facilitators, on whose social networking skills the success of their journal often rested. Frank Harris, William Henley and James Knowles were all well-known, even ubiquitous, figures on the intellectual circuits of the 1880s and 90s, adept at ‘not only assembl[ing] but ... unit[ing] for years on end the best brains in England’.¹⁸ Harris, for example, was a close friend of Wilde and Shaw since his days at the *Saturday Review*, and ‘summoned’ them around him at the *Fortnightly* in part to bolster his claim to ‘man of letters’ status.¹⁹ Similarly, the ‘Regatta’ cultivated by Henley became the founding cohort for *The New Review*, modelled perhaps on Knowles’s previous successful branching from chair of the Metaphysical Society to periodical impresario at the *Nineteenth*

¹⁷ Pykett, ‘Re-Viewing Women Writers of the *Fin de Siècle*’, p. 23.

¹⁸ Stapleton, *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities*, p. 23.

¹⁹ Michael Holroyd, *Bernard Shaw, Vol. 1: 1856-1898 - “The Search for Love”* (London: Chatto & Windus 1988), p. 184.

Century. These circles of self-perpetuating elites offered both opportunities and challenges to the Irish writer. The web of connections that underpin the writings studied here (like those between Lawless and Plunkett, Hennessy and McCarthy, Lecky and Green and Lawless, and O'Grady, Yeats, Gregory and Moore) speak to the mass of London-Irish metropolitan networks that demand a much fuller examination than can be afforded in the present project. For its part, this thesis has used the framework of individual journals and authors to uncover just some of the ideological, literary and political connections (and disputes) that drew Irish writers together: there are many others (radical, Fenian and socialist, for example) that deserve excavation.

Limits of space have also meant somewhat artificial temporal limits. As mentioned in the introduction, 1900 marks the end-point of this thesis, but many Irish literary networks continued to flourish in British periodicals – albeit in rather more subsumed forms.²⁰ The journals considered here continued in what was to become terminal decline (although the *Nineteenth Century* rectified its somewhat short-sighted name by becoming the *Nineteenth Century and After* in 1901, and eventually, the *Twentieth Century*), falling prey to the pressures and fragmentation of twentieth-century modernism that caused sea-changes in the publishing markets. Mass culture and mass readerships – allusions to which were already creeping into higher journalism by the later years of the nineteenth century²¹ – ultimately came to dominate the forms the press took in the early years of the twentieth, whether that was tabloid sensationalism (effectively New Journalism taken to its logical end) or as an oppositional force for early modernist writers. The mid-Victorian literary consensus, which had clung on to no small degree of prestige in the monthly highbrow journals of the 1880s and 1890s, largely dissolved in the face of early twentieth-century challenges to its hegemonic ideal.²² Trends which had been brewing just beneath the surface of the writings included here, namely, anxieties about threats by the ‘common’ reader to traditional literary culture as brought up by Moore, Shaw and Mahaffy, became manifest in the years after 1900.

As Guy and Small have noted, the ‘common’ in early-twentieth century Britain came to signify a much larger social group (as well as a broader constellation of

²⁰ For further information, see Tom Herron (ed.), *Irish Writing London, vol. 1: Revival to the Second World War* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

²¹ See Kelly J. Mays, ‘The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals’, in John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (eds.), *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 165-194.

²² Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines vol. 3: The Victorian and Edwardian age, 1837-1913* (London: Greenwood P., 1983), xxii.

occupations and tastes) than before, and ‘for that elite, which had been accustomed to a monopoly on cultural power and taste, the concept of the common reader began to acquire powerfully negative overtones’.²³ But the traditional narrative that English modernism grew as a ‘reactive formation’ to the development of the mass media around the turn of the century has properly been challenged, with the work of Kate Campbell illustrating how ‘high cultural practitioners ... were imbricated in changes associated with mass culture and modern journalism’.²⁴ Indeed the slippage between rhetorical discourses of ‘high’ and ‘low’ (or the ‘negative coding of late-century journalistic developments in terms of ‘trivia’ and ‘trash’ in the press’²⁵) was discernible as far back as the late 1880s, when both T.P. O’Connor and Shaw worked to disrupt assumptions about the ‘proper’ format and placing of types of journalism – O’Connor’s appearances in *The New Review*, for instance, or Shaw’s continued patronage of weekly magazine reviews. The periodical publishing market of the Edwardian years was also much more responsive and diverse than the well-worn trope of an inevitable march towards high modernism would have us believe. Sullivan notes how the critical weeklies in many ways took the place of the monthly journals, with titles such as the *New Statesman* and *National Observer* still ‘capable of exerting a centripetal force upon the literary community ... [and] embod[ying] the urge to bring politics and culture closer together, against the quietist or escapist temptations of aestheticism’.²⁶

Much like all cultural shifts, then, there was continuity as well as change as a new century dawned on the periodical publishing press. Of course, Irish writers were still active in the early twentieth-century British press (as well as many other cultural arenas), and still astute observers of ‘the simultaneous conviction and anxiety of [the] age’.²⁷ But the Irish Revivalists and modernists (Yeats, Beckett, Synge and Joyce, as a roll call of the Irish canon might look), as with many literary pathbreakers, were indebted to the generation that preceded them. Yeats’s early contributions to these literary periodicals have shown that the importance of press contributions cannot be overstated: indeed, it is in the very *plurality* of these overlooked writings that we can most convincingly locate a vibrant late Victorian

²³ Guy and Small, *Oscar Wilde’s Profession*, p. 41.

²⁴ Kate Campbell, ‘Journalistic Discourses and Constructions of Modern Knowledge’ in Laurel Brake, Bill Bell and David Finkelstein (eds.), *Nineteenth-Century Media and the Construction of Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 41. Stefan Collini and Julia Stapleton have also, in different ways, pointed to how narratives of specialisation in intellectual culture can be complicated by the persistence of certain forms of periodicals in the period.

²⁵ Campbell, ‘Journalistic Discourses and Constructions of Modern Knowledge’, p. 41.

²⁶ Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines*, xxiii.

²⁷ Eamonn Carroll, ‘Crashing The “Edwardian Garden Party”: Collapsing Discourses in William Hope Hodgson’s *Carnacki the Ghost-Finder*’ (unpublished MPhil dissertation, Trinity College Dublin, 2015), p. 7.

intellectual inheritance for Irish writing. As Foster has pointed out, in relation to the wider fiction of the nineteenth century, we encounter in these writings ‘an Ireland busier and broader than the Ireland we see in Revival literature ... a universe of discourse far more populous in matter and heterogeneous in point of view’ than scholars have thus far acknowledged.²⁸ These Irish litterateurs – journalists in many senses, although they would have regarded themselves as above the cultural connotations that word entailed – not only partook in but enriched the texture of British letters between 1880 and 1900. By constructing a discursive space in the literary periodicals of this era, their contributions reveal a transnational network of Irish writing alive to the fascinating diversity and potential of the late nineteenth century.

²⁸ John Wilson Foster, *Irish Novels, 1890 -1940: New Bearings in Culture and Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 19.

Bibliography

MANUSCRIPT MATERIALS

Alice Stopford Green Papers, National Library of Ireland
John Pope Hennessy Papers, Bodleian Library Oxford
James Knowles Papers, City of Westminster Archives
Emily Lawless Papers, Marsh's Library, Dublin
W.E.H. Lecky Papers, Library of Trinity College Dublin
Justin McCarthy Diaries, National Library of Ireland
Charlotte Grace O'Brien Papers, National Library of Ireland
Standish O'Grady Collection, Library of Trinity College Dublin
George Bernard Shaw Papers, British Library
Horace Plunkett Papers, National Library of Ireland
Macmillan's [Publishers] Archive, British Library

PRIMARY SOURCES

Journal and Newspaper Articles

[Anon], 'Special Announcement', *Saturday Review*, 25 March 1865, p. 362
_____, 'Prospectus', *Saturday Review*, 25 May 1889, p. 652
_____, *Athenaeum*, 8 June 1889, p. 728
_____, *Star*, 23 April 1894, p.1
_____, 'Mr Lecky and Ninety-Eight', *Freeman's Journal*, 23 Aug 1898, p. 4
_____, *The Nation*, 3 Aug 1882, p. 96
_____, 'Mr Gladstone on Mr Lecky', *The Saturday Review*, 4 June 1887, p. 786
_____, 'Mr Lecky on Home Rule', *Evening Herald*, 25 July 1893, p. 1
_____, 'The Ireland of Tomorrow', *Fortnightly Review* 55 (Jan 1894), pp. 1-18
Archer, William, 'Theatrical Note', *World*, 25 April 1894, p. 63

- Arnold, Matthew, 'Up to Easter', *Nineteenth Century* 21 (May 1887), pp. 629-643
- _____, 'The Literary Influence of Academies', *Cornhill Magazine* 10 (Aug 1864), pp. 154-172
- Carlisle, Harvey, 'Man's Place in Nature', *Nineteenth Century* 10 (Jul 1881), pp. 142-160
- Carpenter, Walter Benjamin, 'The Deep Sea and its Contents', *Nineteenth Century* 7 (Apr 1880), pp. 593-618
- Cooper, Lina Orman, 'The Humours of Ter-na-nÓg', *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Aug 1899), pp. 282-288
- Cullinan, Max, 'Trinity College Dublin', *Fortnightly Review* 14 (Oct 1870), pp. 429-441
- Davitt, Michael, 'The Report on the Parnell Commission', *Nineteenth Century* 27 (Mar 1890), pp. 357-383
- _____, 'Ireland: Retiring the Landlord Garrison', *Nineteenth Century* 27 (May 1890), pp. 779-794
- _____, 'Impressions of the Canadian Northwest', *Nineteenth Century* 31 (Apr 1892), pp. 631-647
- _____, 'The Evicted Tenants Problem', *Nineteenth Century* 35 (Apr 1894), pp. 560-573
- Dicey, Edward, 'Is Central Africa Worth Having?', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Sep 1890), pp. 488-500
- Duff, M.E. Grant, 'After Six Years', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Jul 1887), pp. 1-30
- _____, 'The Case Against Home Rule (VI): From an Imperial Point of View', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 21 July 1893, p. 1
- Eccles, Charlotte O'Connor, 'The Experiences of a Woman Journalist', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 153 (Jun 1893), pp. 830-838
- Escott, T.H.S., 'The Radical Programme (No. VII): Local Government and Ireland', *Fortnightly Review* 44 (Jul 1885), pp. 1-16
- Ferguson, Samuel, 'Betham's Etruria Celtica', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 57 (Apr 1845), pp. 474-488

- Freeman, E.A., 'Recent Works on the Buildings of Rome', *Macmillan's Magazine* 30 (Jun 1874), pp. 89-103
- _____, 'Parallels to Irish Home Rule', *Fortnightly Review* 52 (Sep 1889), pp. 293-298
- Frewen, Walter, 'Protection and the Empire' *Nineteenth Century* 33 (Jun 1893), pp. 1062-1074
- Froude, James Anthony, 'Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 8 (Sep 1880), pp. 341-69
- Gladstone, Herbert John, 'A First Visit to India', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Jul 1887), pp. 133-48
- Gladstone, W.E., 'Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (June 1887), pp. 919-936
- _____, 'Ingram's *History of the Irish Union*', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Oct 1887), pp. 445-469
- _____, 'Mr Lecky and Political Morality', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Aug 1887), pp. 279-284
- Grand, Sarah, 'The Tree of Knowledge', *The New Review* 10 (Jun 1894), pp. 675-690
- _____, 'The Undefinable: A Fantasia [Part I]', *The New Review* 11 (Sep 1894), pp. 320-330
- _____, 'The Undefinable: A Fantasia [Part II]', *The New Review* 11 (Oct 1894), pp. 433-442
- Godkin, E.L., 'An American View of Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 12 (Aug 1882), pp. 175-192
- _____, 'American Opinion on the Irish Question', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Aug 1887), pp. 285-292
- _____, 'American Home Rule', *Nineteenth Century* 19 (Jun 1886), pp. 793-806
- _____, 'An American View of Popular Government', *Nineteenth Century* 19 (Feb 1886), pp. 177-190
- Green, Alice Stopford, 'Women's Place in the World of Letters', *Nineteenth Century* 41 (Jun 1897), pp. 964-974
- _____, 'English and Dutch in the Past', *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Dec 1899), pp. 891-904
- _____, 'Growing Bureaucracy and the Parliamentary Debate', *Nineteenth Century* 47 (May 1900), pp. 839-846

- _____, 'A Visit to the Boer Prisoners at St. Helena', *Nineteenth Century* 48 (Dec 1900), pp. 972-983
- _____, 'Our Boer Prisoners: A Suggested Object-Lesson', *Nineteenth Century* 49 (May 1901), pp. 755-771
- Grove, Archibald, 'Special Announcement', *The New Review* 10 (Jan 1894), pp. 127-128
- Gwynn, Stephen, 'Mr Robert Louis Stevenson: A Critical Study', *Fortnightly Review* 56 (Dec 1894), pp. 776-792
- _____, 'The Posthumous Works of Robert Louis Stevenson', *Fortnightly Review* 69 (Apr 1898), pp. 561-575
- _____, 'The Autumn's Books', *Fortnightly Review* 74 (Dec 1900), pp. 1028-1038
- _____, 'A Specimen of Medieval Irish Poetry', *Fortnightly Review* 68 (Mar 1901), pp. 520-526
- _____, 'The Irish Literary Theatre and its Affinities', *Fortnightly Review* 76 (Dec 1901), pp. 1050-1062
- Harris, Frank, 'The Irish Crisis (No. I): Natural Laws and the Home Rule Problem', *Fortnightly Review* 40 (Jul 1886), pp. 98-104
- Harrison, Frederic, 'A Pompeii for the Twenty-Ninth Century', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Sep 1890), pp. 381-391
- Hennessy, John Pope, 'Sir Walter Raleigh in Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 10 (Nov 1881), pp. 600-682
- _____, 'What do the Irish Read?', *Nineteenth Century* 15 (Jun 1884), pp. 920-932
- _____, 'Lord Beaconsfield's Irish Policy', *Nineteenth Century* 23 (Oct 1884), pp. 663-680
- _____, 'The Chinese in Australia', *Nineteenth Century* 16 (Apr 1888), pp. 617-619
- _____, 'The African Bubble', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Jul 1890), pp. 1-4
- _____, 'Is Central Africa Worth Having', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Sep 1890), pp. 478-487
- Hopkins, Tighe, 'Anonymity?', *The New Review* 1 (Nov 1889), pp. 512-531
- _____, 'Anonymity? II', *The New Review* 2 (Mar 1890), pp. 265-276

- Huxley, T.H., 'The Interpreters of Genesis and the Interpreters of Nature', *Nineteenth Century* 18 (Dec 1885), pp. 849-860
- Ingram, Thomas Dunbar, 'Mr Gladstone and the Irish Union: A Reply', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Dec 1887), pp. 766-790
- Jebb, Richard Cleaverhouse, 'In Defence of Classical Study', *New Review* 9 (Nov 1893), pp. 495-501
- Johnston, Henry Hamilton, 'The Value of Africa: A Reply to Sir John Pope Hennessy', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Aug 1890), pp. 169-175
- Knowles, James, 'The Lessons of the War: A Proposed Association', *Nineteenth Century* 48 (July 1900), pp. 173-183
- Lawless, Emily, 'A Dredging Ground', *Nineteenth Century* 10 (Jul 1881), pp. 131-141
- _____, 'Iar-Connaught: A Sketch', *Cornhill Magazine* 45 (Mar 1882), pp. 319-333
- _____, 'A Renegade [I]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 49 (Mar 1884), pp. 350-562
- _____, 'A Renegade [II]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 49 (Apr 1884), pp. 444-459
- _____, 'Borroughdale of Borroughdale [I]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 51 (Nov 1884), pp. 38-56
- _____, 'Borroughdale of Borroughdale [II]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 51 (Dec 1884), pp. 134-149
- _____, 'A Millionaire's Cousin [I]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 51 (Jan 1885), pp. 215-230
- _____, 'A Millionaire's Cousin [II]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 51 (Feb 1885), pp. 295-309
- _____, 'A Millionaire's Cousin [III]', *Macmillan's Magazine* 51 (Mar 1885), pp. 375-391
- _____, 'How Art Kavanagh fought Richard the King', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Sep 1890), pp. 355-368
- _____, 'Irish Chronicles: Gerald the Great [part I]', *Nineteenth Century* 29 (Nov 1890), pp. 733-749
- _____, 'Fragments of Irish Chronicles: Gerald the Great [part II]', *Nineteenth Century* 29 (Mar 1891), pp. 429-444

- _____, 'A Bardic Chronicle', *Nineteenth Century* 30 (Oct 1891), pp. 643-657
- _____, 'The Builder of the Round Towers: A Chronicle of the Eighth Century', *Nineteenth Century* 37 (Mar 1895), pp. 421-434
- _____, 'A Note on the Ethics of Literary Forgery', *Nineteenth Century* 41 (Jan 1897), pp. 84-95
- _____, 'Florentine Gardens in March', *Nineteenth Century* 45 (Feb 1899), pp. 327-335
- _____, 'North Clare – Leaves from a Diary', *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Oct 1899), pp. 603-612
- _____, 'Of the Personal Element in History', *Nineteenth Century* 50 (Nov 1901), pp. 790-798
- Lecky, W.E.H., 'Mr Froude's English in Ireland', *Macmillan's Magazine* 30 (Jun 1874), pp. 166-184
- _____, 'The History of the Evangelical Movement', *Nineteenth Century* 6 (Aug 1879), pp. 280-292
- _____, 'A 'Nationalist' Parliament', *Nineteenth Century* 19 (Apr 1886), pp. 636-644
- _____, 'Mr Gladstone and the Income Tax', *Nineteenth Century* 22 (Jul 1887), pp. 52-54
- _____, 'Noticeable Books I: With Essex in Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Aug 1890), pp. 236-238
- _____, 'Carlyle's Message to his Age', *Contemporary Review* 60 (Oct 1891), pp. 521-528
- _____, 'The Political Outlook', *Fortnightly Review* 58 (Aug 1892), pp. 243-246
- _____, 'Some Aspects of Home Rule', *Contemporary Review* 63 (May 1893), pp. 626-638
- _____, 'The Case against Home Rule: From an Historical Point of View', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 24 July 1893, p. 1
- _____, 'The Advertisement Nuisance', *New Review* 9 (Nov 1893), pp. 466-468
- _____, 'The Canadian Copyright Act', *Contemporary Review* 67 (April 1895), pp. 477-489
- _____, 'Queen Victoria as a Moral Force', *Pall Mall Magazine* 23 (Apr 1901), pp. 505-512
- Lilly, W.S., 'The New Spirit in History', *Nineteenth Century* 38 (Oct 1895), pp. 619-633

- Lynch, Hannah, 'M. Paul Hervieu', *Fortnightly Review* 60 (Oct 1896), pp. 472-482
- _____, 'Paris Letter', *Academy*, 8 May 1897, p. 501
- _____, 'Some Recent French Literature: The Love-Letters of Guy de Maupassant', *Fortnightly Review* 62 (Oct 1897), pp. 751-582
- _____, 'Alphonse Daudet', *Fortnightly Review* 69 (Jun 1898), pp. 943-956
- _____, 'Fécondité versus the *Kreutzer Sonata*', *Fortnightly Review* 73 (Jan 1900), pp. 69-78
- MacDonagh, Michael, 'In the Bye-Ways of Rural Ireland I', *Nineteenth Century* 48 (Jul 1900), pp. 75-88
- _____, 'In the Bye-Ways of Rural Ireland II', *Nineteenth Century* 48 (Aug 1900), pp. 298-314
- MacNeill, J.G. Swift, 'Hibernia Irredenta (I): Mr Lecky and Irish Affairs', *Fortnightly Review* 65 (Jan 1896), pp. 18-27
- Mahaffy, John Pentland, 'Signs of the Times: Sham Education', *Nineteenth Century* 33 (Jan 1893), pp. 19-35
- _____, 'The Future of Education', *Nineteenth Century* 34 (Aug 1893), pp. 212-229
- _____, 'Further Gleanings from the Papryri', *New Review* 9 (Nov 1893), pp. 526-535
- _____, 'Recent Archaeology', *Nineteenth Century* 35 (May 1894), pp. 845-862
- _____, 'The Proposed Nile Reservoir', *Nineteenth Century* 35 (Jun 1894), pp. 1013-1018
- _____, 'The Present Position of Egyptology', *Nineteenth Century* 36 (Aug 1894), pp. 268-278
- _____, 'Provincial Patriotism', *Nineteenth Century* 37 (Jun 1895), pp. 1027-1035
- _____, 'The Modern Babel', *Nineteenth Century* 40 (Nov 1896), pp. 782-796
- _____, 'About Alexandria', *Nineteenth Century* 41 (Mar 1897), pp. 437-445
- _____, 'Modern Education', *Nineteenth Century* 42 (Nov 1897), pp. 703-718

- _____, 'How to Circumvent 'Cramming' in Irish Secondary Education', *Nineteenth Century* 44 (Nov 1898), pp. 867-880
- _____, 'The Recent Fuss about the Irish Language', *Nineteenth Century* 46 (Aug 1899), pp. 213-222
- Maudsley, Henry, 'Sex in Mind and in Education', *Fortnightly Review* 21 (Apr 1874), pp. 466-483
- McCarthy, Justin, 'Mr Lecky's Last Volumes', *Contemporary Review* 58 (Nov 1890), pp. 673-679
- _____, 'Parties and Programmes in the New Parliament: I. – The Nationalists', *The New Review* 7 (Aug 1892), pp. 129-135
- _____, 'The New Departure in Ireland: Success or Failure?', *The New Review* 7 (Nov 1892), pp. 533-538
- _____, 'What Mr Gladstone Ought to do', *Fortnightly Review* 53 (Feb 1893), pp. 267-270
- _____, 'Ireland and the Government', *The New Review* 11 (Oct 1894), pp. 333-339
- McCarthy, Justin Huntly, 'Books and Plays', *The New Review* 4 (Apr 1891), pp. 379-384
- Moore, George, 'Turgueneff', *Fortnightly Review* 43 (Feb 1888), pp. 237-251
- _____, 'Some of Balzac's Minor Pieces', *Fortnightly Review* 46 (Oct 1889), pp. 491-504
- _____, 'Our Dramatists and their Literature', *Fortnightly Review* 46 (Nov 1889), pp. 620-632
- _____, 'Meissonier and the Salon Julian', *Fortnightly Review* 50 (Jul 1890), pp. 44-55
- _____, 'The Dramatic Censorship', *The New Review* 3 (Oct 1890), pp. 354-362
- _____, 'La Débâcle', *Fortnightly Review* 58 (Aug 1892), pp. 204-210
- _____, 'Our Academicians and their Associates', *The New Review* 8 (Jun 1893), pp. 665-674
- _____, 'A Preface to *The Bending of the Bough*', *Fortnightly Review* 67 (Feb 1900), pp. 317-324
- Morley, John, 'Anonymous Journalism', *Fortnightly Review* 2 (Sep 1867), pp. 287-292

- _____, 'Irish Policy in the Eighteenth Century', *Fortnightly Review* 11 (Feb 1872), pp. 196-203
- _____, 'Macaulay', *Fortnightly Review* 19 (Apr 1876), pp. 494-513
- _____, 'Valedictory', *Fortnightly Review* 38 (Oct 1882), pp. 511-521
- O'Brien, Charlotte Grace, 'The Irish 'Poor Man'', *Nineteenth Century* 8 (Dec 1880), pp. 876-887
- _____, 'Eighty Years', *Nineteenth Century* 9 (Mar 1881), pp. 397-414
- _____, 'The Emigrant in New York', *Nineteenth Century* 16 (Oct 1884), pp. 530-549
- O'Brien, Richard Barry, 'Three Attempts to Rule Ireland Justly', *Nineteenth Century* 19 (Apr 1886), pp. 620-635
- _____, 'Mr Lecky on Home Rule', *Freeman's Journal*, 26 April 1886, pp. 5-6
- O'Connor, T.P., 'The New Journalism', *The New Review* 1 (Oct 1889), pp. 423-434
- O'Grady, Standish, 'Carlyle as a Political Teacher', *Fortnightly Review* 38 (Oct 1885), pp. 516-530
- _____, 'In the Gates of the North [Part I]: Queen Meave', *The New Review* 14 (Jan 1896), pp. 93-102
- _____, 'In the Gates of the North [Part II]: At the Ford', *The New Review* 14 (Feb 1896), pp. 202-214
- _____, 'In the Gates of the North [Part III]: Conclusion', *The New Review* 15 (Aug 1896), pp. 226-241
- _____, 'The New Irish Movement', *The New Review* 15 (Dec 1896), pp. 666-676
- _____, 'The New United Ireland', *The New Review* 16 (Feb 1897), pp. 129-142
- _____, 'Ireland: The New Irish Movement', *Fortnightly Review* 61 (Feb 1897), pp. 170-179
- _____, 'Imagination in History', *The New Review* 17 (Dec 1897), pp. 657-665
- Plunkett, Horace, 'Co-Operative Stores for Ireland', *Nineteenth Century* 24 (Sep 1888), pp. 410-418

- _____, 'Ireland of Today and Ireland of Tomorrow', *Fortnightly Review* 55 (Mar 1894), pp. 277-293
- Shaw, George Bernard, 'The Socialist Ideal II: Politics', *The New Review* 4 (Jan 1891), pp. 9-18
- _____, 'A Dramatic Realist to his Critics', *The New Review* 11 (Jul 1894), pp. 56-73
- [____], 'Down with the Censorship', *Saturday Review*, 2 March 1895, p. 14
- _____, 'What Mr Gladstone Ought to do', *Fortnightly Review* 53 (Feb 1893), pp. 276-280
- Sinnett, A.P., 'Behind the Scenes of Nature', *Nineteenth Century* 36 (Aug 1894), pp. 211-221
- Wilde, Oscar, 'Mr Froude's Blue Book', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 13 April 1889, p. 3
- _____, 'Mr Mahaffy's New Book' [unsigned review], *Pall Mall Gazette*, 9 Nov 1887, p. 3
- _____, 'The True Function and Value of Criticism', *Nineteenth Century* 28 (Jul 1890), pp. 123-147
- Yeats, W.B., 'The Vision of O'Sullivan the Red', *The New Review* 14 (Apr 1896), pp. 404-407
- _____, 'The Death of O'Sullivan the Red', *The New Review* 15 (Dec 1896), pp. 677-681
- _____, 'The Tribes of the Danu', *The New Review* 17 (Nov 1897), pp. 549-563
- _____, Review of 'Irish National Literature II: Contemporary Prose Writers', *The Bookman* (Aug 1895), p. 4

PRIMARY SOURCES

Other Material

- Godkin, E.L., *Reflections and Comments, 1865-1895* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895)
- Lawless, Emily, *Grania: The Story of an Island* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1892)
- _____, *Traits and Confidences* (London: Garland, 1979 [1897])
- _____, *A Garden Diary, September 1899 – September 1900* (London: Methuen, 1901)

- Mahaffy, J.P., *A Survey of Greek Civilisation* (London: Macmillan, 1897)
- Maugham, W. Somerset, *Of Human Bondage* (London: Vintage, 2000 [1915])
- Moore, George, *Confessions of a Young Man* (London: William Heinemann, 1917)
- Gwynn, Stephen, *Charlotte Grace O'Brien: Selections from Her Writings and Correspondence with a Memoir* (Dublin: Maunsel and Co., 1909)
- _____, *The History of Ireland* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1923)
- _____, *Experiences of a Literary Man* (London: T. Butterworth Ltd, 1926)
- Harris, Frank, *Contemporary Portraits* (London: M. Kennerley, 1915)
- Lecky, Elizabeth van Dedem, *A Memoir of the Right Hon. William Edward Hartpole Lecky: Member of the French Institute and of the British Academy, by his wife* (London: Longman's, 1909)
- Lecky, W.E.H., *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (London: Longman's, 1865)
- _____, *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* (New York: Charles Braziller, 1955 [1869])
- _____, *Historical and Political Essays* (London: Longman's, 1910)
- _____, *Democracy and Liberty*, (London: Longman's, 1896)
- McCarthy, Justin, *Reminiscences*, vol. I (London: Chatto and Windus, 1899)
- Morley, John, *Recollections*, vol. I (London: Macmillan, 1917)
- Tynan, Katharine, *The Middle Years* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916)
- Yeats, W.B., *Autobiographies*, ed. William H. O'Donnell and Douglas N. Archibald (New York: Scribner, 1999)
- _____, 'Beautiful Lofty Things' in *The Collected Poems of W.B. Yeats* (London: Macmillan, 1965), p. 348

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Acton, John, *Lectures on Modern History* (London: Macmillan, 1906)
- Adams, E.B., *Bernard Shaw and the Aesthetes* (Cleveland: Ohio State University Press, 1971)
- Allen, Nicholas, *George Russell (Æ) and the New Ireland, 1905–30* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003)
- Anderson, Casper, *British Engineers and Africa, 1875–1914* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011)
- Anderson, James and O’Dowd, Liam, ‘Imperialism and Nationalism: The Home Rule Struggle and Border Creation in Ireland, 1885–1925’, *Political Geography* 28.8 (Nov 2007), pp. 934–950
- [Anon.], *Moore versus Harris: An Intimate Correspondence* (Detroit: Priv. Published, 1921), p. 12.
<https://archive.org/stream/mooreversusharri00moorrich#page/12/search/unmentioned> [Accessed 2 July 2017]
- Artese, Brian, *Testimony on Trial: Conrad, James, and the Contest for Modernism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012)
- Atkins, K.A., ‘Towards a Critical Edition of the Short Fiction of Sarah Grand’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of the West of England, 2014)
- Atkinson, Juliette, ‘Continental Currents: Paris and London’ in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 224–244
- Auchmuty, James Johnston, *Lecky: A Biographical and Critical Essay* (New York: Longman’s, Green & co, 1945)
- Beaupre, Myles, ‘“What are the Philippines going to do to us?” E. L. Godkin on Democracy, Empire and Anti-Imperialism’, *Journal of American Studies* 46.3 (Aug 2012), pp. 711–727
- Beetham, Margaret, ‘Towards a Theory of the Periodical as a Publishing Genre’, in Laurel Brake, Aled Jones and Lionel Madden (eds.), *Investigating Victorian Journalism* (London: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 19–32
- _____, ‘Open and Closed: the Periodical as a Publishing Genre’, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 22.3 (Fall 1989), pp. 96–100

- Bellanca, Mary Ellen, *Daybooks of Discovery: Nature Diaries in Britain 1770-1870* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007)
- Bew, Paul, *Conflict and Conciliation in Ireland, 1890-1910: Parnellites and Radical Agrarians* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987)
- Biagini, Eugenio F., *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism 1876-1906* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Binckes, Faith and Laing, Kathryn, 'From *Wild Irish Girl* to 'Parisianised Foreigner': Hannah Lynch in France', in Eamon Maher and Eugene O'Brien (eds.), *War of the Words: Literary Rebellion in France and Ireland* (Rennes: Tir, 2010), pp. 41-58
- _____, 'A Vagabond's Scrutiny: Hannah Lynch in Europe' in Elke D'Hoker, Raphaël Ingelbien and Hedwig Schwall (eds.), *Irish Women Writers: New Critical Perspectives* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2011), pp. 111-132
- Blanshard, Alastair J.L., 'Mahaffy and Wilde: A Study in Provocation', in Kathleen Riley, Alastair J. L. Blanshard, and Iarla Manny (eds.), *Oscar Wilde and Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 19-36
- Boardman, Kay, "'Charting the Golden Stream": Recent Work on Victorian Periodicals', *Victorian Studies* 48.3 (Spring 2006), pp. 505-517
- Bodkin, Michael, *Recollections of an Irish Judge: Press, Bar and Parliament* (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1914)
- Bonnell, Marilyn, 'Sarah Grand and the Critical Establishment: Art for [Wo]man's Sake', *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, 14.1 (Jan 1995), pp. 123-48
- Brady, Ciaran, 'Arrested Development: Competing Histories and the Formation of the Irish Historical Profession, 1801 – 1938' in Tibor Frank and Frank Hadler (eds.), *Disputed Territories and Shared Pasts: Overlapping National Histories in Modern Europe* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 275-302
- Brake, Laurel, 'Periodical Formats: The Changing Review' in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 47-65
- _____, 'Culture Wars? Arnold's *Essays in Criticism* and the Rise of Journalism 1865-1895' in Dinah Birch and Mark Llewellyn (eds.), *Conflict and Difference in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 201-212
- _____, *Subjugated Knowledges: Journalism, Gender and Literature in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994)

- _____, and Demoor, Marysa (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (London: The British Library, 2009)
- _____, and Mussell, James, 'Introduction: W. T. Stead: Newspaper Revolutionary', 19: *Interdisciplinary Studies In The Long Nineteenth Century* 16 (2013), pp. 1-7
- Brown, Terence, 'Edward Dowden: Irish Victorian', in Brown (ed.) *Ireland's Literature: Selected Essays* (Mullingar: Lilliput, 1988)
- Bubb, Alexander, *Meeting Without Knowing It: Kipling and Yeats at the Fin de Siècle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)
- Butler, Leslie, *Critical Americans: Victorian Intellectuals and Transatlantic Liberal Reform* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007)
- Cahalan, James M., 'Forging a Tradition: Emily Lawless and the Irish Literary Canon', *Colby Quarterly* 27.1 (1991), pp. 27-39
- Campbell, Kate, 'W. E. Gladstone, W. T. Stead, Matthew Arnold and A New Journalism: Cultural Politics in The 1880s', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 36.1 (2003), pp. 20-40
- _____, 'Journalistic Discourses and Constructions of Modern Knowledge' in Laurel Brake, Bill Bell and David Finkelstein (eds.), *Nineteenth-Century Media and the Construction of Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 40-53
- Carroll, Eamonn, 'Crashing The "Edwardian Garden Party": Collapsing Discourses in William Hope Hodgson's *Carnacki the Ghost-Finder*' (unpublished MPhil dissertation, Trinity College Dublin, 2015)
- Carson, Niall, 'Transnationalism, Ireland and *The Bell*', *Éire-Ireland* 51.1 (Spring 2016), pp. 171-191
- Casanova, Pascale, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M.B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2004)
- Castle, Gregory, 'Nobler Forms: Standish James O'Grady's *History of Ireland* and the Irish Literary Revival' in Lawrence W. McBride (ed.), *Reading Irish Histories: Texts, Contexts and Memory in Modern Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), pp. 156-177
- Chothia, Jean, *English Drama of the Early Modern Period, 1890-1940* (London: Longman's, 1996)

- Clavin, Patricia, 'Introduction: Defining Transnationalism', *Contemporary European History* 14.4 (Nov 2005), pp. 421-439
- Cleary, Joe, 'The World Literary System: Atlas and Epitaph', *Field Day Review* 2 (2006), pp. 197-219
- Collini, Stefan, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- _____, *English Pasts: Essays in Culture and History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- _____, Winch, Donald and Burrow, John, *That Noble Science of Politics: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)
- Comerford, R.V., 'Introduction: Ireland, 1870-1921' in W.E. Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland Volume VI: Ireland under the Union II, 1870-1921* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), i-liv
- _____, 'The Parnell Era, 1883-91', in W.E. Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland Volume VI: Ireland under the Union II, 1870-1921* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 53-80
- Cosgrove, Richard A., 'A Usable Past: History and the Politics of Identity in Late-Victorian England', *Parliamentary History* 27.1 (Mar 2008), pp. 30-42
- Crosby, Christina, *The Ends of History: Victorians and 'the Woman Question'* (New York: Routledge, 1991)
- Cullen, Fintan and Foster, R.F., *'Conquering England': Ireland in Victorian London* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2005)
- Curtis, L.P., *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England* (New York: New York University Press, 1968)
- Daly, Mary E. and Hoppen, K. Theodore (eds.), *Gladstone: Ireland and Beyond* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011)
- Danson, Lawrence, *Wilde's Intentions: The Artist in his Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)
- D'Arcy, Margaretta, 'The Metamorphosis of George Moore', in Conor Montague and Adrian Frazier (eds.), *George Moore: Dublin, Paris, Hollywood* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2012), pp. 39-52

- Dellamora, Richard, *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990)
- de Nie, Michael, *The Eternal Paddy: Irish Identity and the British Press, 1798–1882* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004)
- d’hoker, Elke, Ingelbien, Raphaël and Schwall, Hedwig (eds.), *Irish Women Writers: New Critical Perspectives* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010)
- d’hoker, Elke and Eggermont, Stephanie, ‘Fin-de-Siècle Women Writers and the Modern Short Story’, *English Literature in Transition 1880-1920* 58.3 (2015), pp. 291-312
- Digby, Margaret, *Horace Plunkett: An Anglo-American Irishman* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949)
- Dillane, Fionnuala, ‘Researching a Periodical Genre: Classifications, Codes and Relational Terms’ in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), pp. 74-90
- _____, ‘Marian Evans the Reviewer’ in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 353-369
- Doyle, Eugene, *Justin McCarthy* (Dundalk: Published for the Historical Association of Ireland by Dundalgan Press, 1996)
- Easley, Alexis, King, Andrew and Morton, John, ‘Introduction’, *Researching the Nineteenth Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), pp. 1-13
- Easley, Alexis, *First-Person Anonymous: Women Writers and Victorian Print Media, 1830–1870* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)
- _____, *Literary Celebrity, Gender, and Victorian Authorship, 1850–1914* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011)
- _____, ‘Introduction to the Special Issue: Victorian Networks and the Periodical Press’, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 44.2 (Summer 2011), pp. 111-114
- Edwards, Heather, ‘The Irish New Woman and Emily Lawless’s *Grania: The Story of an Island: A Congenial Geography*’, *English Literature in Transition* 51:4 (2008), pp. 421-438

- Edwards, Jason, 'Introduction: 'Anxious Flirtations': Homoeroticism, Art and Aestheticism in Late-Victorian Britain', *Visual Culture in Britain* 8.1 (Jun 2007), pp. 1-14
- Eliot, George, *Letters*, ed. by G.S. Haight, 7 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954)
- Farrell, John P., review of A. Dwight Culler, *The Victorian Mirror of History* (1985), *Victorian Studies* 30.3 (Spring 1987), pp. 430-33
- Fleming, N.C., 'Gladstone and the Ulster Question', in D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day (eds.), *Gladstone and Ireland: Politics, Religion and Nationality in the Victorian Age* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 140-61
- _____ and O'Day, Alan, 'Accommodation, Conciliation and Cooperation: A Gladstonian Legacy', in D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day (eds.), *Gladstone and Ireland: Politics, Religion and Nationality in the Victorian Age* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 233-255
- Foley, Michael, 'How Journalism Became a Profession' in Kevin Rafter (ed.), *Irish Journalism Before Independence* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 22-34
- Foster, R.F., *Paddy and Mr Punch: Connections in English and Irish History* (London: Allen Lane, 2003)
- _____, *W. B. Yeats: A Life. Vol. 1, The Apprentice Mage: 1865–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- _____, *The Irish Story: Telling Tales and Making it up in Ireland* (London: Allen Lane, 2001)
- Foster, John Wilson, *Irish Novels, 1890 -1940: New Bearings in Culture and Fiction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- _____, 'Nature and Nation in the Nineteenth Century' in J.W. Foster (ed.), *Nature in Ireland: A Scientific and Cultural History* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1997), pp. 409-439
- Fraser, Hilary, Green, Stephanie and Johnston, Judith, *Gender and the Victorian Periodical* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Frawley, Maria, *A Wider Range: Travel Writing by Women in Victorian England* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994)
- Frazier, Adrian, *George Moore, 1852-1933* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000)

- _____, 'The Fin-de-Siecle Meets French Realism: Moore, Balzac and the Peculiarity of Writers', in Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn (eds.), *George Moore: Influence and Collaboration* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2014), pp. 27-37
- Furneaux, Holly, *Queer Dickens: Erotics, Families, Masculinities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- _____, 'Mortimer Lightwood; or, Seriality, Counterfactuals, Co-Production and Queer Fantasy', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* 21 (2015), no pagination. <https://19.bbk.ac.uk/articles/10.16995/ntn.751/> [Accessed 12 June 2018].
- Galbraith, John S., 'Gordon, Mackinnon and Leopold: The Scramble for Africa, 1876-84' *Victorian Studies* 14.4 (Spring 1971), pp. 369-388
- Gibbons, Luke, *Transformations in Irish Culture* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996)
- Goldstein, Doris S., 'The Professionalization of History in Britain in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries', *Storia della Storiografia* 3 (1983), pp. 3-27
- Gray, Billy, 'Close-Cropped Grass: Hubert Butler's Perspective on Community, Nationalism and a Globalised Ireland', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* 35.1 (Spring 2009), pp. 61-70
- Gray, F. Elizabeth (ed.), *Women in Journalism at the Fin de Siècle: Making a Name for Herself* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)
- Gray, F. Elizabeth and Hessel, Nikki, 'Gender and Journalism: Women and/in the News in the Nineteenth Century', *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies* 10. 2 (2014) <http://www.ncgsjournal.com/issue102/introduction.htm>
- Gross, John, *The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life since 1800* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973)
- Grubgeld, Elizabeth, *George Moore and the Autogenous Self: The Autobiography and Fiction* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994)
- Guy, Josephine M. and Small, Ian, *Oscar Wilde's Profession: Writing and the Culture Industry in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Hagan, Edward A., 'The Aryan Myth: A Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Irish Will to Power' in Tadhg Foley and Seán Ryder (eds.), *Ideology and Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998), pp. 197-205

- Haggard, Robert F., *The Persistence of Victorian Liberalism: The Politics of Social Reform in Britain, 1870-1900* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2001)
- Hampton, Mark, *Visions of the Press in Britain, 1850-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004)
- Hansson, Heidi, *Emily Lawless 1845-1913: Writing the Interspace* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996)
- _____, 'History in/of the Borderlands: Emily Lawless and the Story of Ireland', in Irene Gilsenan Nordin and Elin Holmsten (eds.), *Liminal Borderlands in Irish Literature and Culture* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2009), pp. 51-68
- _____, 'Emily Lawless and Botany as a Foreign Science', *Journal of Literature and Science* 4.1 (2011), pp. 59-73
- _____, 'Kinship: People and Nature in Emily Lawless's Poetry', *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 13.2 (2014), pp. 6-22
- _____, 'Emily Lawless and History as a Story' in Elke d'Hoker and Stephanie Eggermont (eds.), *The Irish Short Story: Tradition and Trends* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2015), pp. 61-81
- Heilmann, Ann, *New Woman Strategies: Sarah Grand, Olive Schreiner, Mona Caird* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004)
- Herron, Thomas, 'Introduction' to John Pope Hennessy, *Sir Walter Raleigh in Ireland*, ed. by Thomas Herron (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2009), i-xxvii
- _____, (ed.), *Irish Writing London, vol. 1: Revival to the Second World War* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014)
- Hirsch, Edward, 'And I Myself Created Hanrahan: Yeats, Folklore and Fiction', *ELH* 48.4 (Jan 1981), pp. 880-893
- Holroyd, Michael, *Bernard Shaw, Vol. 1: 1856-1898 - "The Search for Love"* (London: Chatto & Windus 1988)
- Hooper, Glenn. 'The Pursuit of Signs: Searching for Ireland after the Union' in Leon Litvack and Glenn Hooper (eds.), *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century: Regional Identity* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), p. 215-232
- Houghton, Esther R., 'John Verschoyle and the *Fortnightly Review*', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 3 (1968), pp. 17-21

- Houghton, Walter E. (ed.), *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900*, 5 vols (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972)
- _____, 'Victorian Periodical Literature and the Articulate Classes', *Victorian Studies* 22.4 (June 1979), pp. 389-412
- Howell, Philip and Lambert, David, 'Sir John Pope Hennessy and Colonial Government: Humanitarianism and the Translation of Slavery in the Imperial Network' in David Lambert and Alan Lester (eds.), *Colonial Lives across the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 228-257
- Huguet, Christine and Dabrigeon-Garcier, Fabienne (eds.), *George Moore: Across Borders* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013)
- Hutton, W.H., *Letters of William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 1825-1901* (London: Archibald Constable, 1904)
- Irish, Tomás, 'A Man Called Mahaffy: An Irish Cosmopolitan Confronts Crisis', *Historical Research* 89.246 (Nov 2016), pp. 846-865
- Jackson, Alvin, *Home Rule: an Irish History, 1800-2000* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003)
- Jolly, Roslyn, 'Introduction' to Robert Louis Stevenson, *South Sea Tales*, ed. by Roslyn Jolly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), i-xxxvi
- Jusová, Iveta, 'George Egerton and the Project of British Colonialism', *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 19.1 (Spring 2000), pp. 27-55
- Kelleher, Margaret, '"Wanted an Irish Novelist": The Critical Decline of the Nineteenth-Century Novel' in Jacqueline Belanger (ed.), *The Irish Novel in the Nineteenth Century: Facts and Fictions* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), pp. 187-201
- _____, 'The Anthology and the *Duanaire*', in James H. Murphy (ed.), *The Oxford History of the Irish Book, Volume IV: The Irish Book in English, 1800-1891* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 448-462
- _____, '"An Irish Problem": Bilingual Manoeuvres in the Work of Somerville and Ross' in Anna Pilz and Whitney Standlee (eds.), *Irish Women's Writing 1878-1922: Advancing the Cause of Liberty* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), pp. 121-136

- _____, and O’Leary, Philip, ‘Introduction’ in Margaret Kelleher and Philip O’Leary (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Irish Literature, Volume I: To 1890* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 1-8
- Kemp, Sandra, Mitchell, Charlotte and Trotter, David (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to Edwardian Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Kiberd, Declan and Mathews, P. J., *Handbook of the Irish Revival: An Anthology of Irish Cultural and Political Writings 1891-1922* (Dublin: Abbey Theatre Press, 2015)
- King, Carla, ‘Introduction’ in George Moore, *Parnell and his Island*, ed. by Carla King (Dublin: UCD Press, 2004), x-xxvi
- Kingstone, Helen, ‘Feminism, Nationalism, Separatism? The Case of Alice Stopford Green’, *Journal of Victorian Culture* 19.4 (2014), pp. 442-456
- Klaver, J. M. I., *Geology and Religious Sentiment: The Effect of Geological Discoveries on English Society and Literature between 1829 and 1859* (Leiden: Brill, 1997)
- Lambert, David and Howell, Philip, ‘John Pope Hennessy and the Translation of ‘Slavery’ between late Nineteenth-Century Barbados and Hong Kong’, *History Workshop Journal* 55 (Spring 2003), pp. 1-24
- Lambert, David and Lester, Alan (eds.), *Colonial Lives across the British Empire: Imperial Careerings in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Lambert, David, ‘Reflections on the Concept of Imperial Biographies’, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 40.1 (2014), pp. 22-41
- Ledger, Sally, *The New Woman: Fiction and Feminism at the Fin de Siecle* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997)
- Leerssen, Joep, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996)
- Levine, Phillippa, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Loeber, Rolf and Loeber, Magda, *A Guide to Irish Fiction, 1650-1900* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006)

- Loughlin, James, *Gladstone, Home Rule and the Ulster Question, 1882-93* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1986)
- Ludwigson, Kathryn R., *Edward Dowden* (New York: Twayne, 1973)
- Lyons, F.S.L., *Ireland Since the Famine* (London: Fontana, 1963)
- _____, *Culture and Anarchy in Ireland, 1890-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)
- Macdonagh, M., 'O'Connor, Thomas Power (1848–1929)', rev. Marie-Louise Legg, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn., Jan 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35286> [accessed 13 April 2017]
- Machor, James L., 'Historical Hermeneutics and Antebellum Fiction: Gender, Response Theory, and Interpretive Contexts', in James L. Machor (ed.), *Readers in History: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Contexts of Response* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993), pp. 54-84
- Mahony, Jane, 'Irish Writers and their London Publishers, c. 1884-1922', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2016)
- Malouf, Michael, 'Problems with Paradigms: Irish Comparativism and Casanova's *World Republic of Letters*', *New Hibernia Review*, 17:1 (Spring 2013), p. 48-66
- Marcus, Philip L., *Standish O'Grady* (Lewisburg: Bucknell U.P., 1970)
- Mathews, P.J., 'Stirring up Disloyalty: The Boer War, the Irish Literary Theatre and the Emergence of a New Separatism', *Irish University Review* 33.1 (Spring 2003), pp. 99-116
- _____, *Revival: The Abbey Theatre, Sinn Féin, the Gaelic League and the Co-Operative Movement* (Cork: Cork University Press/Field Day, 2003)
- Matikkala, Mira, *Empire and the Imperial Ambition: Liberty, Englishness and Anti-Imperialism in late-Victorian Britain* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011)
- Mattar, Sinéad Garrigan, 'Folklore', in David Holdeman and Ben Levitas (eds.), *W.B. Yeats in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 247-255
- _____, 'Yeats, Fairies, and the New Animism', *New Literary History* 43.1 (Winter 2012), pp. 137-57
- Maume, Patrick, *The Long Gestation: Irish Nationalist Life, 1891-1918* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1999)

- _____, 'Standish James O'Grady: Between Imperial Romance and Irish Revival', *Éire-Ireland* 39.1 (Spring 2004), pp. 11-35
- _____, 'John Pentland Mahaffy', *Dictionary of Irish Biography*
<http://dib.cambridge.org/quicksearch.do;jsessionid=20A9A8FF52720E629912A62C54D158F5> [Accessed 24 April 2018]
- _____, 'Emily Lawless's *Maelcho* and the Crisis of Imperial Romance', *Éire-Ireland* 41.3 (Fall 2006), pp. 245-266
- Mays, Kelly J., 'The Disease of Reading and Victorian Periodicals', in John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (eds.), *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 165-194
- McAteer, Michael, *Standish O'Grady, Æ and Yeats: History, Politics, Culture* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2002)
- _____, 'Ireland and the Hour': Paternalism and Nationality in Standish James O'Grady's *Toryism and the Tory Democracy*' in Leon Litvack and Glenn Hooper (eds.), *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century: Regional Identity* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), p. 199-214
- McCartney, Donal, *W. E. H. Lecky: Historian and Politician, 1838-1903* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1994)
- McConnel, James, 'The Irish Parliamentary Party in Victorian and Edwardian London', in Peter Gray (ed.), *Victoria's Ireland? Irishness and Britishness, 1837-1901* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), pp. 34-50
- McCormack, W.J., 'Lecky, Mark Twain and Literary History', appendix to Donal McCartney, *W. E. H. Lecky: Historian and Politician, 1838-1903* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1994), pp. 195-207
- McDonald, Peter D., *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- McDowell, R.B., *Alice Stopford Green: A Passionate Historian* (Dublin: A. Figgis, 1967)
- Meaney, Gerardine, 'Aesthetics and Politics, 1890-1960' in Angela Bourke et al. (eds.), *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing, Vol. V: Irish Women's Writing and Traditions* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002), pp. 1069-1101

- _____, 'Decadence, Degeneration and Revolting Aesthetics: The Fiction of Emily Lawless and Katherine Cecil Thurston', *Colby Quarterly* 36.2 (Jun 2000), pp. 157-175
- Metcalf, Priscilla, *James Knowles: Victorian Editor and Architect* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)
- Mill, James, 'Periodical Literature: *Edinburgh Review*', *Westminster Review* 1 (1824), pp. 206-268
- Miller, Renata Kobetts, 'The Cultural Work of Drama Criticism in the Early 1890s', http://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_articles=renata-kobetts-miller-the-cultural-work-of-drama-criticism-in-the-early-1890s [Accessed 18 April 2017]
- Mitchell, Angus, 'Alice Stopford Green and the Origins of African Society', *History Ireland* 14.4 (Jul 2006), pp. 19-24
- Mitchell, Sally, *Frances Power Cobbe: Victorian Feminist, Journalist, Reformer* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004)
- Mitchell, Susan L., *George Moore* (London: Maunsel, 1916)
- Moine, Fabienne, 'Elizabeth Von Arnim's Gardening Memoirs: Cultivating Feminism?', *Cahiers Victoriens et Edouardiens* 77 (Spring 2013) [no pagination]. <https://journals.openedition.org/cve/353> [Accessed 3 August 2018]
- Morash, Christopher, *A History of the Media in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- Morgan, Hiram, review of John Pope Hennessy, Thomas Herron (ed.), *Sir Walter Raleigh in Ireland: Classics of Irish History Series* (2009), *History Ireland*, 17.5 (2009), p. 59
- Mountford, Benjamin, *Britain, China, and Colonial Australia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)
- Mulhall, Daniel, 'Men at War: Nineteenth-Century Irish War Correspondents from the Crimea to China', *History Ireland* 15.2 (Mar 2007), pp. 30-35
- Murphy, Andrew, *Ireland, Reading and Cultural Nationalism, 1790-1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018)
- Murphy, James H., *Irish Novelists & the Victorian Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- _____, 'Canonicity: The Literature of Nineteenth Century Ireland', *New Hibernia Review* 7.2 (Summer 2003), pp. 45-54

- Murphy, Patrick D., *Literature, Nature, and Other: Ecofeminist Critiques* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995)
- Murtagh, Anne, 'The New Review: A Glimpse at the Nineties', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 14.1 (Spring 1981), pp. 11-21
- Nairn, Tom, *Faces of Nationalism: Janus Revisited* (London: Verso, 1997)
- Nash, Sarah, 'What's in a Name? Signature, Criticism and Authority in the *Fortnightly Review*', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 43.1 (Spring 2010), pp. 57-82
- Nolan, Jerry C.M., 'Standish James O'Grady's Cultural Nationalism', *Irish Studies Review* 7.3 (Dec 1999), pp. 347-357
- Novick, Peter, *That Noble Dream: the "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)
- Ó Broin, Leon, *Dublin Castle and the 1916 Rising* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1970)
- O'Ceallaigh Ritschel, Nelson, *Bernard Shaw, W. T. Stead, and the New Journalism: Whitechapel, Parnell, Titanic, and the Great War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017)
- O'Connell, Anne, 'Charlotte Grace O'Brien' in Mary Cullen and Maria Luddy (eds.), *Women, Power and Consciousness in 19th-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Attic Press, 1995), pp. 231-262
- O'Day, Alan, 'Justin McCarthy', *Dictionary of Irish Biography*
<http://dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a5579&searchClicked=clicked&quickadvsearch=yes> [Accessed 25 April 2017]
- Ogden, Rollo, *Life and Letters of Edwin Lawrence Godkin Vol. 1* (London: Macmillan, 1907)
- O'Neill, Ciaran and Delaney, Enda, 'Introduction: Beyond the Nation', *Éire-Ireland* 51.1 (Spring 2016), pp. 7-13
- O'Toole, Tina, *The Irish New Woman* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)
- Ó Tuathaigh, Gearoid, review of Lawrence W. McBride, *Reading Irish Histories: Texts, Contexts And Memory in Modern Ireland* (2003), *Victorian Studies* 48.1 (2005), pp. 167-169

- Outram, Dorinda, 'The History of Natural History: Grand Narrative or Local Lore?' in J.W. Foster (ed.), *Nature in Ireland: A Scientific and Cultural History* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1997), pp. 641-671
- Parry, Ann, 'The Home Rule Crisis and the 'Liberal' Periodicals 1886-1895: Three Case Studies', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 22.1 (1989), pp. 18-30
- Paterson, Adrian, 'On the Pavements Grey': The Suburban Paradises of W.B. Yeats and William Morris', in Tom Herron (ed.), *Irish Writing London Volume I: Revival to the Second World War* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 34-53
- Patten, Eve, 'A "general crowd of small singers": Yeats and Dowden Reassessed', in Warwick Gould and Edna Longley (eds.), *Yeats Annual 12. That Accusing Eye: Yeats and his Irish Readers* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 29-45
- _____, 'With Essex in India? Emily Lawless's Colonial Consciousness', *European Journal of English Studies* 3.3 (1999), pp. 285-297
- _____, 'Ireland's 'Two Cultures' Debate: Victorian Science and the Literary Revival', *Irish University Review* 33.1 (Spring 2003), pp. 1-13
- Paul, Herman, 'The Heroic Study of Records: The Contested Persona of the Archival Historian', *History of the Human Sciences* 26.4 (2013), pp. 67-83
- Pavlakakis, Dean, *British Humanitarianism and the Congo Reform Movement: 1896-1913* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015)
- Peatling, G.K., *British Opinion and Irish Self-Government, 1865-1925: from Unionism to Liberal Commonwealth* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2001)
- _____, '"Continental Crossings": European Influences on British Public Opinion and Irish Politics, 1848-2002', *History of European Ideas* 27.4 (2001), pp. 371-387
- Pethica, James, 'Patronage and Creative Exchange: Yeats, Lady Gregory and the Economy of Indebtedness', in Deirdre Toomey (ed.), *Yeats and Women: Yeats Annual 9* (London: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 168-204
- _____, (ed.), *Lady's Gregory's Diaries 1892-1902* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1996)
- Pilling, Norman, 'Lecky and Dicey: English and Irish Histories', *Eire-Ireland* 16.3 (Autumn 1981), pp. 43-56
- Pilz, Anna and Standlee, Whitney (eds.), *Irish Women's Writing 1878-1922: Advancing the Cause of Liberty* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016)

- Pilz, Anna, 'Lady Gregory's fans: the Irish Protestant Landed Class and Negotiations of Power' in Ciaran O'Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), pp. 185-196
- Poole, Andrea Geddes, *Philanthropy and the Construction of Victorian Women's Citizenship: Lady Frederick Cavendish and Miss Emma Cons* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
- Powell, Kerry, 'New Women, New Plays, and Shaw in the 1890s', in Christopher Innes (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 76-100
- Prettejohn, Elizabeth, 'Leighton: The Aesthete as Academic', in Rafael Cardoso Denis and Colin Trodd (eds.), *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 33-52
- Pykett, Lyn, 'Re-Viewing Women Writers of the *Fin de Siècle*: Recent Critical Trends' in Adrienne E. Gavin and Carolyn W. de la L. Oulton (eds.), *Writing Women of the Fin de Siècle: Authors of Change* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 15-27
- Rappaport, Helen, *Encyclopedia of Women Social Reformers* (Oxford: ABC-CLIO, 2001)
- Reid, Colin, *The Lost Ireland of Stephen Gwynn: Irish Constitutional Nationalism and Cultural Politics, 1864-1950* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011)
- Reznicek, Matthew, *The European Metropolis: Paris and Nineteenth-Century Irish Women Novelists* (Clemson: Clemson University Press, 2017)
- Richards, Robert J., *The Tragic Sense of Life: Ernst Haeckel and the Struggle over Evolutionary Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008)
- Richardson, Angelique, 'The Eugenization of Love: Sarah Grand and the Morality of Genealogy', *Victorian Studies* 42.2 (Jan 1999), pp. 227-255
- Ridden, Jennifer, 'Britishness as an Imperial and Diasporic Identity: Irish Elite Perspectives, c.1820–1870s', in Peter Gray (ed.), *Victoria's Ireland? Irishness and Britishness, 1837-1901* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), pp. 88-105
- Rodgers, Beth, 'Researching the Relationship between Two Periodicals: Representations of George Eliot in the *Girl's Own Paper* and *Atalanta*' in Alexis Easley, Andrew King, and John Morton (eds.), *Researching the Nineteenth Century Periodical Press: Case Studies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), pp. 91-101

- Ross, Kristin C., 'Preparing the Girl for 'The Fight of Life': Female Education and the New Woman in Ella Hepworth Dixon's *The Story of a Modern Woman*', *Women's Writing* 19.1 (Feb 2012), pp. 76-95
- Royle, Stephen A., 'St Helena as a Boer Prisoner of War Camp 1900–2: Information from the Alice Stopford Green Papers', *Journal of Historical Geography* 24.1 (Jan 1998), pp. 53-60
- Rubinstein, Annette T., *The Great Tradition in English Literature: From Shakespeare to Shaw* (New York: Citadel Press, 1953)
- Russell, T.W., *Ireland and the Empire: A Review 1800-1900* (London: G. Richards, 1901)
- Salmon, Richard, '“A Simulacrum of Power”: Intimacy and Abstraction in the Rhetoric of the New Journalism', in Laurel Brake, B. Bell and D. Finkelstein (eds.), *Nineteenth-Century Media and the Construction of Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), pp. 27-39
- Searle, G. R., *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899–1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971)
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosovsky, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992)
- Shannon, Richard, *Gladstone: Heroic Minister, 1865-98* (London: Penguin, 1999)
- Sheehy, Ian, 'Irish Journalists and Litterateurs in Late Victorian London, c.1870-1910' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2003)
- Showalter, Elaine (ed. and introd.), *Daughters of Decadence: Women Writers of the “Fin de Siècle”* (London: Virago, 1993)
- Simek, Lauren, 'Feminist ‘Cant’ and Narrative Selflessness in Sarah Grand’s New Woman Trilogy', *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 67.3 (Jan 2012), pp. 337-365
- Sichel, Edith, 'Emily Lawless', *Nineteenth Century and After* 76 (Jul 1914), pp. 80-100
- Smith, Catherine, '“Words! Words! Words!”: Interrogations of Language and History in Emily Lawless’s *With Essex in Ireland*' in Elke d’Hoker, Raphael Ingelbien and Hedwig Schwall (eds.), *Irish Women Writers: New Critical Perspectives* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011), pp. 187-206
- Smith, Nadia Claire, *A “Manly Study”? Irish Women Historians, 1868 – 1949* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006)

- Stanford, W.B. and McDowell, R.B., *Mahaffy: a Biography of an Anglo-Irishman* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971)
- Standlee, Whitney, *'Power to Observe': Irish Women Novelists in Britain, 1890-1916* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2015)
- Stapleton, Julia, *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities in Britain Since 1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001)
- Steele, Karen and de Nie, Michael, *Ireland and the New Journalism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)
- Stokes, John and Turner, Mark W., 'Oscar Wilde, New Journalist' in Joanne Shattock (ed.), *Journalism and the Periodical Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 370-382
- Sullivan, Alvin, 'Introduction' to Alvin Sullivan (ed.), *British Literary Magazines, vol. 3: The Victorian and Edwardian age, 1837-1913* (London: Greenwood P., 1983), i-xxv
- Thomas, Sue, 'Elizabeth Robins and the *New Review*', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 28.1 (Spring 1995), pp. 63-66
- Thompson, James, *British Political Culture and the Idea of 'Public Opinion', 1867-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)
- Tucker, Amanda and Casey, Moira E. (eds.), *Where Motley is Worn: Transnational Irish Literatures* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2014)
- Tusan, Michelle, 'Humanitarian Journalism: The Career of Lady Isabella Somerset' in F. Elizabeth Gray (ed.), *Women in Journalism at the Fin de Siècle: Making a Name for Herself* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 91-109
- Vadillo, Ana Perejo, 'Immaterial Poetics: Mary F. Robinson and the Fin-de-Siècle Poem', in Joseph Bristow (ed.), *The Fin-de-Siècle Poem: English Literary Culture and the 1890s* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2005), pp. 231-260
- Von Arx, Jeffrey, *Progress and Pessimism: Religion, Politics and History in Late Nineteenth Century Britain* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1985)
- Wald, James, 'Periodicals and Periodicity' in Simon Eliot and Jonathon Rose (eds.), *A Companion to the History of the Book* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), pp. 419-433
- Waldinger, Roger and Fitzgerald, David, 'Transnationalism in Question', *American Journal of Sociology* 109.5 (Mar 2004), pp. 1177-1195

- Wearing, J.P., 'Introduction', *Arms and the Man*
<http://www.dramaonlinelibrary.com/books/arms-and-the-man-iid-115637/do-9781408183205-div-00000006> [Accessed March 19, 2017]
- Weber, Gary, 'Henry Labouchere, "Truth" and the New Journalism of Late Victorian Britain', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 26.1 (Spring, 1993), pp. 36-43
- Welshman, Rebecca, 'Archaeology' in Phillip Mallett (ed.), *Thomas Hardy in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 221-230
- West, Trevor, *Horace Plunkett: Co-Operation and Politics, an Irish Biography* (Gerrards Cross, Bucks: Colin Smythe, 1986)
- Whelan, Kevin, 'Writing Ireland, Reading England' in Leon Litvack and Glenn Hooper (eds.), *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century: Regional Identity* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), pp. 185-198
- _____, 'Between: The Politics of Culture in Friel's *Translations*', *Field Day Review* 6 (2010), pp. 6-27
- Whelehan, Niall (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (New York: Routledge, 2015)
- _____, 'Playing with Scales: Transnational History and Modern Ireland' in Niall Whelehan (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (New York: Routledge, 2015), pp. 7-29
- Worth, George G., *Macmillan's Magazine, 1859-1907: 'No Flippancy or Abuse Allowed'* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003)
- Wolff, Michael, 'Charting the Golden Stream: Thoughts on a Directory of Victorian Periodicals', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 4.3 (Sep 1971), pp. 23-38
- Wyatt, Ann, 'Froude, Lecky, and the 'Humblest Irishman'', *Irish Historical Studies* 19 (Jan 1975), pp. 261-285