

THE PICKERING MASTERS

The Collected Short Stories of George Moore: Gender and Genre

Celibates (1895)

Edited by
Ann Heilmann



ROUTLEDGE




Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

THE PICKERING MASTERS

The Collected Short Stories of George Moore:
Gender and Genre

Volume 1

CONTENTS OF THE EDITION

VOLUME 1

General Introduction
Celibates (1895)
Edited by Ann Heilmann

VOLUME 2

Other Stories (1882–1931)
Edited by Ann Heilmann

VOLUME 3

The Untilled Field (1931)
Edited by Mark Llewellyn

VOLUME 4

A Story-Teller's Holiday (1928)
Edited by Ann Heilmann

VOLUME 5

In Single Strictness (1922)
Edited by Mark Llewellyn
Index

*The Collected Short Stories of George Moore:
Gender and Genre*

General Editors: Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn
Consulting Editor: Adrian Frazier

Volume 1
Celibates (1895)
Edited by Ann Heilmann

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2007 by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited

Published 2016 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © Taylor & Francis 2007
Copyright © Editorial material Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn 2007

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages.
No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or
by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage
or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and
are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

BRITISH LIBRARY CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Moore, George, 1852–1933

The collected short stories of George Moore: gender and genre. – (The
Pickering masters)

I. Title II. Heilmann, Ann III. Llewellyn, Mark, 1979– IV. Frazier, Adrian
Woods

823.8[F]

ISBN-13: 978-1-85196-841-1 (set)

ISBN 13: 978-1-138-75826-1 (hbk)

Typeset by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited

DOI: 10.4324/9781003548096

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	vii
Preface	xi
General Introduction	xv
Introduction	xxxiii
Bibliographic Note on the Text	lxxiii
George Moore, <i>Celibates</i> (1895)	1
‘Mildred Lawson’	5
‘John Norton’	115
‘Agnes Lahens’	167
Contemporary Reception	
[G. B. Shaw], ‘Mr. George Moore’s New Novel’, <i>Pall Mall Gazette</i> (19 July 1887)	205
George Moore, “‘Intensely Virginal” Indeed’, <i>Pall Mall Gazette</i> (21 July 1887)	207
George Moore, Letter to George Bernard Shaw [31 December 1887]	208
[From] ‘Novels of the Week’, <i>Athenaeum</i> (30 July 1887)	209
[From] ‘Novels and Stories’, <i>Saturday Review</i> (13 August 1887)	209
Teodor de Wyzewa, [From] ‘Les Livres’, <i>Revue indépendante</i> (September 1887)	210
Harry Thurston Peck, ‘The Rise of Mr. George Moore’, <i>Bookman</i> (June 1895)	215
Barbara [Arnold Bennett], ‘Book Chat’, <i>Woman</i> (19 June 1895)	218
‘Recent Fiction: “‘Celibates”’, <i>Critic</i> (22 June 1895)	219
‘Celibates’, <i>Bookman</i> (July 1895)	220
‘Short Stories: Celibates’, <i>Athenaeum</i> (13 July 1895)	221
W[illiam] D[ean] Howells, [From] ‘Life and Letters’, <i>Harper’s Weekly</i> (27 July 1895)	222

Frank Danby [Julia Frankau], 'Mr. George Moore's New Novel', <i>Saturday Review</i> (27 July 1895)	226
George Moore, 'Correspondence: Mr. George Moore's New Novel', <i>Saturday Review</i> (3 August 1895)	229
Frank Danby [Julia Frankau], 'Correspondence: "Celibates" and Mr. George Moore', <i>Saturday Review</i> (10 August 1895)	231
[A. Mary F. Robinson?], 'Celibates', <i>The Literary World</i> (10 August 1895)	233
William Morton Payne, [From] 'Recent Fiction', <i>Dial</i> (16 August 1895)	234
Yellow Dwarf [Henry Harland], [From] 'Books', <i>Yellow Book</i> (October 1895)	234
'Book Reviews: Moore's Celibates', <i>Overland Monthly</i> (February 1896)	236
Harry Thurston Peck, [From] 'Mr. George Moore's New Novel', <i>Bookman</i> (August 1898)	237
Max Meyerfeld, [From] 'Charakteristiken', <i>Das literarische Echo</i> (October 1901)	238
James Huneker, [From] 'Three Disagreeable Girls', <i>Forum</i> (1914)	248
Temple Scott, Introduction to George Moore, <i>Celibates</i> (1915)	253
Susan L. Mitchell, [From] <i>George Moore</i> (1916)	255
Stuart P. Sherman, [From] 'The Aesthetic Naturalism of George Moore', <i>On Contemporary Literature</i> (1917)	256
John Freeman, [From] <i>A Portrait of George Moore in a Study of his Work</i> (1922)	257
Madeleine L. Cazamian, [From] <i>Le Roman et les idées en Angleterre</i> (1935)	260
Appendices	
'Mildred Lawson', <i>Lady's Pictorial</i> , 18 February–17 March 1888	265
[From] George Moore, <i>A Mere Accident</i> (1887)	301
[From] George Moore, 'Balzac', <i>Impressions and Opinions</i> (1891)	350
Textual Variants and Proof Corrections	355
Editorial Notes	361

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have helped to make this edition happen. We are grateful in particular to Elizabeth Grubgeld and Adrian Frazier for reigniting Moore scholarship with their authoritative studies and for always being ready with productive advice. The early recovery work of Edwin Gilcher, Robert Langenfeld, Robert Becker, David Eakin, Helmut Gerber and Richard Allen Cave proved invaluable to our project, as did Colin Smythe's determination to keep Moore in print. Mary Pierse, Fabienne Garcier and Christine Huguet have been inspirational in establishing vibrant conference fora for Moore scholars internationally, and have offered indispensable assistance with complex copyright matters and with tracing some of Moore's writings. Robert Becker, Brendan Fleming, Mark Samuels Lasner and many other Moore scholars, Victorianists and turn-of-the-century specialists have generously shared their discoveries, insights and work with us. We are grateful to our colleagues, academic institutions, postdoctoral, research and post/undergraduate students at the Universities of Hull and Liverpool for their support of and interest in our project. A year's research leave awarded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, part-funded by the University of Hull, and proactively supported by colleagues at the start of a new appointment was invaluable in driving this edition forward, and the Departments of English and Humanities and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Hull, and the School of English at Liverpool facilitated our research with liberal travel and conference allowances. Lucie Armitt, Isobel Armstrong, Dinah Birch, James Booth, Laurel Brake, Joseph Bristow, Jessica Cox, Katharine Cockin, Dino Franco Felluga, Fabienne Garcier, Susan Hamilton, Christine Huguet, Robert Langenfeld, Josephine McDonagh, Mary Pierse and John Shapcott enabled us to present our work to peer audiences in the UK, Ireland, France and the USA, and to develop our ideas through the following articles: 'Emma Bovary's Sisters: Infectious Desire and Female Reading Appetites in Mary Braddon and George Moore,' *Victorian Review*, 29:1 (2003), pp. 31–48; 'Female Transvestism, Object Relations and Mourning in George Moore's "Albert Nobbs"', *Women: A Cultural Review*, 14:3 (2003), pp. 248–62; 'What Kitty Knew: George Moore's John Norton, Multiple Personality and the Psychopathology of Late-Victorian Sex Crime,' *Nineteenth-*

Century Literature, 59:3 (December 2004), pp. 372–403; and ‘George Moore and Literary Censorship: The Textual and Sexual History of “John Norton” and “Hugh Monfert”’, *English Literature in Transition*, 50 (2007).

If this edition has benefited enormously from the considerable contributions of individuals eager to assist us in our research, it could not have been written without the substantial and ample support of university and special collections librarians and archivists. Our thanks are therefore due to Mark Samuels Lasner, for drawing our attention to his collection housed at the University of Delaware Library, and for his generosity in allowing us instant access; and to Rebecca Johnson Melvin, Special Collections, University of Delaware Library, and Ryan L. Roth, Library Analyst, University of Delaware Library, for their exceptional professionalism, efficiency and kindness in making material from the Mark Samuels Lasner and the University of Delaware special George Moore collections available to us at short notice. Marilyn Wurzburger, Special (George Moore and Edwin Gilcher) Collections, at the State University of Arizona Library, Arizona, USA, was equally helpful. We are also grateful to Stewart Gillies and Jim Coyle, British Library, Newspapers section, Colindale, for frequent advice, and for granting us electronic access to rare materials; and to Stewart Manifold, St Deiniol’s Library, Hawarden, for translating John Norton’s Latinist quotations. Josie Lister, Imaging Services/Conservation and Collection Care, Bodleian Library, Oxford; Natalie Milne and Martin Killeen, Selbourne Collection, University of Birmingham Library; and Jean Wooler, Document Supply, British Library – variously helped locate and supply material. Above all, Barbara Shaw at the University of Hull deserves our thanks for her indefatigable efforts in tracing even the most obscure of sources.

As the editors we have undertaken every possible effort to trace copyright holders of the materials reproduced in this edition. In some cases this has not been possible. We apologize for any oversight and will be grateful to receive any information about copyright holders not listed below.

Special thanks go to the following libraries, agencies and individuals for their kind permission to reproduce materials:

G. B. Shaw’s ‘Mr. George Moore’s New Novel’, *Pall Mall Gazette* (19 July 1887), is reproduced in Volume 1 with kind permission of the Society of Authors, on behalf of the Bernard Shaw Estate.

George Moore’s letter to George Bernard Shaw of 31 December 1887 is reproduced in Volume 1 with kind permission of Robert Becker, editor of ‘The Letters of George Moore, 1863–1901’ (PhD thesis, University of Reading, 1980).

The extract in Volume 1 from William Dean Howells’s ‘Life and Letters’, *Harper’s Weekly*, 39 (27 July 1895) is reproduced with kind permission of W. D. Howells.

The extract in Volume 1 from Madeleine L. Cazamian's *Le Roman et les idées en Angleterre: L'Anti-intellectualisme et l'esthétisme (1880–1900)* (Paris: Société d'Édition, 1935) is reproduced with kind permission of Madame D'Hoop, Les Belles Lettres, Paris.

Gerald Bullett's 'George Moore: A Cloistered Genius', *John O'London Weekly*, 28 (28 January 1933), is reproduced in Volume 4 with kind permission of Peters, Fraser & Dunlop, London, on behalf of the Estate of Gerald Bullett.

Richard Church's review articles in Volume 4, 'A Facsimile of the Old Masters', *Spectator*, 137 (21 August 1926), and 'Merlin and Vivien', *Spectator* (London), 141 (8 December 1928), are reproduced by permission of Pollinger Limited and the proprietor.

Desmond MacCarthy's [Affable Hawk's] 'Current Literature: Books in General', *New Statesman*, 32 (5 January 1929) is reproduced in Volume 4 with kind permission of D. J. MacCarthy.

George Moore's letters to Arthur Brentano (1916–19) are reproduced in Volume 4 with kind permission of Special Collections, University of Delaware Library, Newark, Delaware, USA.

For permission to use the reviews in Volume 5 we are grateful to Peter Waugh (Alec Waugh, 'George Moore Again Reconsiders', *John O'London's Weekly*, 5 (19 August 1922)); Jennifer Gosse (Edmund Gosse, 'The World of Books: Mr. Moore Among the Celibates', *Sunday Times*, (27 August 1922); Michael Sissons; Peters, Fraser & Dunlop (Humbert Wolfe, 'Celibate Lives', *Observer* (6 February 1927)); The Estate of Beverley Nichols and Eric Glass Ltd (Beverley Nichols, 'The Literary Lounger', *Sketch*, 137 (16 February 1927)); Joseph I. Killorin (Conrad Aiken, 'George Moore (1927)', *A Reviewer's ABC* (London: Meridian Books, 1958)); and Suhrkamp Publishers (Walter Benjamin, 'George Moore: Albert and Hubert, Deutsch von M. Meyerfeld', *Die Literarische Welt*, (18 May 1928)).

Last, but not least, we wish to thank our publisher, Mark Pollard, Julie Wilson, Pickering & Chatto's marketing and editorial staff, our copy editor Penny Rogers, our indexer Hazel Bell, and the reviewers of our original proposal for making this book possible.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

PREFACE

The period of great European short fiction came between 1870 and 1920 – after the revolutions in printing made up-to-the-minute periodicals possible, attractive and cheap, and before competition from movies began. Many large publishing houses like W. H. Tinsley or Scribner's operated a monthly or even weekly magazine in which they ran short stories as well as serials of novels later to be published in volume form. There were also unaffiliated periodicals that offered good prices for short fiction, like *The Universal Review*. Newspapers like *The Daily Chronicle* often featured a daily story. A writer might even have a column in a weekly, as George Moore did in his brother's journal, *The Hawk*, and later in *The Speaker*, which he would fill out with criticism, memoir, political editorials, fiction, or whatever should please him and please readers. A writer could make a living by writing short stories in that period. As novels generally take a considerable time to complete, and one is not on a monthly wage during the composition of a novel, it was in fact a practical necessity to write short stories too.

There are a few brief, evocative letters at the Harry Ransom Humanities Center in Texas from George Moore to E. B. Smith, Assistant Editor of *Today*, which published Moore's 'An Art Student' in its spring 1895 issue. In one letter, writing from his top-floor flat at 8 Kings Bench Walk, the Temple, Moore demands two 'pulls' of the revised proofs of the first chapters, and he wants a cheque for their publication. Evidently, the demand for payment went unanswered, because in another letter, Moore sends the publisher's messenger back with a note that the revised 'copy' will be handed over when the messenger returns with payment. Moore concludes with an inquiry about whether the third chapter had been set up in print, because he wishes to revise on the proofs. The short story in question – really, a novella – became, after a succession of revisions, 'Mildred Lawson' in *Celibates* and 'Henrietta Marr' in *Celibate Lives*. Captured in these brusque exchanges are the hectic creativity of Fleet Street, the mutual distrust of publishers and authors, and the extraordinary trouble to which important writers in that period could put typesetters. Those who could turn out a good tale possessed a certain authority in 1895. Publications like *Today* survived only as long as their featured stories attracted readers. Indeed, copies of the 1895 *Today* are now very difficult to locate, and it is one of the rare comparison texts missing from this comprehensive edition of Moore's short fiction. That it is one of the only ones is a testament to the editors' assiduousness.

Moore by no means focused his writing on the short story form. As editors Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn point out, he wrote fiction, criticism, autobiography, drama, poetry, an operetta, art criticism – Moore would try almost anything once, and then try again if he did not at first succeed. Mainly, however, reputation in the period went with the novel. To write a great novel was to be a great writer, so Moore regularly plunged into one long narrative after another. Obviously, Moore wrote some great novels – *A Drama in Muslin*, *Esther Waters*, *The Brook Kerith* – but his achievement in other forms excelled his achievement in long fiction.

Moore did not practise short fiction off-handedly or only with a view to payment. In Paris he had known Turgenev slightly and de Maupassant better in the 1870s and '80s. He read their works with great care. In fact, Moore's February 1888 article on Turgenev in *The Fortnightly Review* is one of the most important early descriptions in English of the Russian author's achievement. De Maupassant, Turgenev and Chekhov are the three greatest writers of short fiction in the late nineteenth century; Moore absorbed the aesthetic lessons of two of these three, even if Chekhov made little mark upon him. From the French author he picked up the technique of depicting artfully how the ordinariness of an individual's life ironically and yet with pathos undercuts the dream life; they are narratives of humane disillusionment. From the Russian author he acquired a story-teller's lordly and philosophical backward look, full of tenderness for all that has been lost.

Another significant influence on Moore's short fiction may be the work of a French author not well known in English-speaking countries, Paul Alexis. As he was both very good and very little known, his work was especially useful to Moore. He liked to produce English versions of Alexis's best things, feeling free to improve upon them, as his versions were not advertised as translations. Alexis was a sort of second-in-command in Zola's army of naturalists, but much of his best work – done in the mixed form of *feuilleton* – was written for fugitive publications and is not easily available for study and comparison. But Alexis's frank intelligence, arch tone and interweaving of fiction with uncensored reportage left an impression on Moore's writing.

The short stories that Moore wrote, often rapidly and experimentally, for periodicals in the 1880s and '90s sometimes turned up trumps. He liked what he got, and he came back to those stories again and again to perfect them. The real attraction for him became the essence of the form – story, *per se*. Stories to Moore were ways of offering literary criticism, types of autobiography, a mode of doing philosophy, speculative instruments for talking about sexuality and religion and the distribution of wealth in the world; a story in his hands could do anything. He came to see that he had a genius for expressing his view of life with subtlety by means of a narrative. In a fine quotation from the General Introduction to this edition by Mark Llewellyn and Ann Heilmann (brilliantly spotted out of all Moore's multitudinous comments on narrative), he expresses his delight at the discovery of the power of simple narrative in the stories of Turgenev:

From the first line the narrative rushes forth; there is no hesitation, there is no stop, nor is the reader warned of what is going to happen. This is not necessary, for so perfectly are the events chosen that they follow without jostling or discord, and as each comes into the reader's mind he is surprised at once by its naturalness and unexpectedness. The illusion is complete; it is just, as the phrase goes, like life itself. And what is still more marvellous perhaps is that a mere narrative, I will say a bare narrative, should possess the same intellectual charms as the psychological novel.

Moore himself learned to create a 'mere narrative', a 'bare narrative' that had the 'intellectual charms' of 'a psychological novel'. The way it was done – by Flaubert, Turgenev, de Maupassant and later by Moore – was by use of *free indirect discourse*, or, as it is called in French, *style indirect libre* (by the way, Moore knew Turgenev through French translation, not through Russian, and only much later through English).

Simply put, in direct discourse, one might say, *Moore said, 'What on earth can I write this week?' In indirect discourse, the same sense would become Moore wondered what he should write that week. And in free indirect discourse, this becomes, Moore was stumped. What on earth could he write for his weekly article?* The advantage of free indirect discourse is that it allows the narrator to move backwards and forwards in time in the course of telling the story, and in and out of the character's consciousness and speech, without interruption of the narrative line. The narrator takes on the tones of the character's mentalities without analytically, by means of punctuation and mode, separating himself from the characters. Moore carried this technique to a peak of excellence in English. He brings it very close to the somewhat more radical technique of 'stream of consciousness'.

For the better understanding of European modernism, late Victorian and early modern English literature, and the emergence of Irish modernism (Moore is a key influence on Joyce), it is a great thing that Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn have put together this comprehensive edition of the short fiction of George Moore. It must be added that there is also here a great deal still capable of giving pleasure to contemporary readers.

As the editors explain in their introductions – with authority, elegance and accuracy – Moore presents one of the most complex bibliographical problems of any modern author. He rewrote everything. He changed things in the proofs, and after an edition was published he began new versions, demanding of his publishers new editions, and, such was his importance in his own period, he generally got them – so multiple variants exist for every title. Opinions were divided in Moore's own time as to whether his changes were always improvements. Regardless of the answer to that interesting and troublesome question, it is clear that sometimes those revisions resulted in effectively not two or more variants of one story, but two or more different stories. 'Mildred Lawson' as it appears in the 1888 *Lady's Pictorial* and the 1895 *Celibates* and 'Henrietta Marr' from the 1927 *Celibate Lives* are examples of such an interesting proliferation of narrative interpretation. For details on such matters,

trust the editors. Their introductions take one carefully through the issues raised by Moore's practice of revision.

The editors' introductions to these volumes constitute a significant step forward in Moore criticism. Together, they make up a short book in themselves. They go well beyond commentary on textual variants or background on Moore's work; often they introduce new slants on how to understand his work. The editors develop psychological approaches to Moore's work and approaches through the history of modern sexualities that are both new and important. As their readings are directly tied to the printings of key texts that prior to this publication were hard to obtain and compare, the editors' interpretations will be of great interest to those who care about modern literature in English. They have mastered a tremendously complicated body of work, Moore's writings, and the massive amount of scholarship about it, and made a significant addition to that scholarship.

Adrian Frazier
English Department
National University of Ireland, Galway
9 February 2007

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Of all literary qualities the creation of ideas is the most fugitive ... Therefore, let those who have taken firsts at Oxford devote their trite souls to preparing an edition from which everything resembling an idea shall be excluded.¹

Any editor of George Moore's work has to contend with the thought of Moore's posthumous amusement at the endeavour to go one better on this extraordinarily assiduous and indefatigable editor of his own work. '[E]ven if all that your industry could discover from ancient files of newspapers were published', Moore told Horace Liveright, the New York publisher of the Carra edition, on being asked to supply 'a long list of short stories and articles', 'a great deal would still remain uncollected'.² As the editors of *The Collected Short Stories of George Moore* we hope to have addressed our formidable task in a way which might have reconciled even Moore himself to the idea of a scholarly edition.

George Moore (1852–1933) was one of the most influential and versatile writers and journalists of the turn of the century and played a crucial role in shaping debates about the literary, artistic and cultural developments of the day. Bridging movements as disparate as naturalism, symbolism and literary Wagnerism, his work is also significant for its concern with emerging psychoanalytical thought of his time. Much of his writing constituted an ongoing experiment in crossing boundaries, generically, thematically, psychologically and conceptually: between autobiography and fiction; Irish, English and French/European authorial subjectivities and masks; gendered and sexed identities; and in relation to processes of writing and continuing revision. Despite his significant impact on *fin-de-siècle* culture and literature, Moore's writings are not readily available. An upsurge in critical interest in the 1970s and 1980s led to the reprinting of some of his short stories and novels, as well as to editions of his letters and seminal bibliographies;³ many of these texts are now out of print again. The limited availability of his works means that Moore does not feature as much as he could, or should, on the university curriculum and the market for Victorian and early twentieth-century literature.⁴

This critical edition builds upon recent scholarly interest in Moore's work⁵ and makes available his to date neglected short-story collections. Moore's stories deal with issues as diverse as *fin-de-siècle* aestheticism, Irish folklore, gender relations and

conflicts, explorations of female and male hysteria, 'new' and 'old' sexualities, the bearing of the past on the present, and the art of story telling. This edition aims to shed new light on the way in which Moore engaged with these issues, in addition to providing an exploration of how he sought continually to improve his texts through an intense and sustained process of rewriting. This is the first edition to bring together all of Moore's published volumes of short stories and place them into an interrelated, intertextual and intellectual context.

Life

George Augustus Moore was born on 24 February 1852 to George Henry Moore (1810–70) and Mary Blake Moore (1830–95) at Moore Hall in County Mayo, Ireland.⁶ Following an unhappy education at the Roman Catholic school of St Mary's College, Oscott (just outside Birmingham) between the ages of 14 and 16, brought to an end by Moore's all-too-willing early departure, and more congenial times spent at home on the family's estates and in exploring Lough Carra, Moore decided in 1868 upon a career as an artist, against the wishes of his father who insisted he pursue a career in the military. At his father's death in 1870 Moore inherited both the family's Irish lands and the right to decide his own future. In his twenty-first year, 1873, he handed his day-to-day responsibilities as a landlord to his mother's brother and moved to Paris. Living a Bohemian life in Parisian studios, and more importantly cafés such as the Nouvelle Athènes, Moore made the connections with artists and writers which would influence his entire writing life. Initially financially secure thanks to the income from his inheritance, Moore met a largely older generation of literary and artistic figures such as Alphonse Daudet (1840–97), Edgar Degas (1834–1917), Stéphane Mallarmé (1842–98), Edouard Manet (1832–83), Claude Monet (1840–1926), Camille Pissarro (1830–1903), Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841–1919), Ivan Turgenev (1818–83) and Emile Zola (1840–1902). He soon came to realize that he lacked sufficient talent for painting and turned to literature instead. Amongst his first outputs as a writer were two volumes of verse influenced by Charles Baudelaire (1821–67) and Algernon Charles Swinburne (1837–1909), *Flowers of Passion* (1877) and *Pagan Poems* (1881), and with them Moore began his 'lifelong habit of pursuing perfection'⁷ in his rewriting of poems published in the first collection in the second.

1879 is the year in which Moore truly became a writer, and it was through necessity. Increasing friction between the landowners and their tenants in Ireland reduced Moore's income from his inherited estates, hastening his return to London with the intention to make a profession out of journalism and fiction writing. Influenced by his exposure to French literary culture, Moore's determination to bring Zola's Naturalism to the English novel resulted in *A Modern Lover* (1883), banned for its 'explicit' portrayal of the protagonist's sexual encounters, and *A Mummer's Wife* in 1885. The reception of his first novels, particularly on the part of the circulating libraries and their proprietors W. H. Smith and Charles Edward Mudie, prompted

Moore's dissatisfaction with late-Victorian conditions of literary production, the English novel generally and its reading public. His pamphlet *Literature at Nurse; or, Circulating Morals* (1885) attacked the illiberal nature of the monopoly over taste held by men such as Mudie and helped to raise the young Moore's public profile.⁸ The subsequent imprisonment of Henry Vizetelly, the publisher of Moore's first four novels and also of the English translations of Zola in which Moore played a part, demonstrated the dangers of literary experimentation and innovation.⁹

Moore's production levels throughout his career were always impressive. There were novels¹⁰ – *A Drama in Muslin* (1886), *A Mere Accident* (1887), *Spring Days* (1888), *Mike Fletcher* (1889), *Vain Fortune* (1891), *Esther Waters* (1894), *Evelyn Innes* (1898), *Sister Teresa* (1901), *The Lake* (1905), *The Brook Kerith* (1916), *Aphrodite in Aulis* (1930); essays and reviews – *Parnell and His Island* (1887), *Impressions and Opinions* (1891), *Modern Painting* (1893); 'autobiographies' – *Confessions of a Young Man* (1888), *Memoirs of My Dead Life* (1906), the *Hail and Farewell* trilogy (*Ave* (1911), *Salve* (1912), *Vale* (1914)), *Avowals* (1919), *Conversations in Ebury Street* (1924) and the posthumously published *A Communication to My Friends* (1933); and collaborative plays written with Bernard Lopez,¹¹ Pearl Craigie ('John Oliver Hobbes'),¹² Edward Martyn¹³ and W. B. Yeats.¹⁴ His involvement with the various movements of the period 1880–1910 – Realism, Naturalism, Wagnerism, Impressionism, the Irish Literary Revival – demonstrated that Moore could recreate himself in response to pivotal cultural developments. During his years in Dublin (1901–11), for example, he reinvented himself as a key figure in the movement to establish the Irish Literary Theatre (in partnership with Yeats and Lady Gregory) and collaborated with Yeats on *Diarmuid and Grania* in 1901.¹⁵ Tensions, however, always remained, driven by Moore's artistic and intellectual credo of unconditional authenticity which resisted any attempt for permanent co-option to cultural or political causes at the expense of his individuality or belief in the absolute freedom of the human mind: a freedom which of necessity was threatened by institutionalized religion. Thus 1903, the year which saw the publication of his enormously influential Irish short-story collection *The Untilled Field*, also had him renounce, in a letter to the *Irish Times*, the Catholicism which had been a burden to him since his childhood: a double act with which Moore affirmed his commitment to Ireland even as he attacked its religious values.

From the early years of the twentieth century, and particularly following his move back from Ireland to London in 1911, Moore's writing life, always devoted to the perfection of the narrative, was dominated by his revision of his earlier works and by his increasing concern with writing memoirs and (semi-fictionalized) autobiographies. Dedicated to the dissection of his own life, and notorious for the razor-sharp scrutiny of those whom he encountered, Moore spared no one in pursuit of his art, be it his fellow writers or the various women with whom he had relationships.¹⁶ Several of his early novels were released in 'new' versions as Moore returned to his youthful texts in order to correct his perception of their inadequacies: thus *A Modern Lover* (1883) became *Lewis Seymour and Some Women* (1917), and *A Drama in*

Muslin (1886) was made over as *Muslin* (1915). He was in the process of redrafting his memories of his first ventures into art and literature for *A Communication to My Friends* when he was overtaken by the kidney disease uremia in London in 1933.¹⁷ But nowhere is this desire to rewrite and achieve the perfect telling of the tale more evident than in Moore's short stories.

The Art of Telling Tales

One of the most famous images of Moore, and the one that adorns the cover of his most recent biography, was painted by Edouard Manet in 1879. According to Manet, *Portrait of George Moore* 'was finished in a single sitting, but [Moore] didn't see it that way. He came back and annoyed me by asking for a change here, something different there. I won't change a thing in his portrait. Is it my fault if Moore looks like a squashed egg yolk and if his face is all lopsided?'¹⁸ The belief in the imperative of 'retouching' the portrait, of refining the picture in order to make it more authentic and at the same time add to its aesthetic appeal is both integral and analogous to Moore's artistic practice. No 'single sitting' for him – instead, continual revision and the attendant process of re-visioning and reflecting on the creative process are the hallmark of his work.

Of the three principal themes which determine George Moore's writings and often appear in conjunction with each other – Irishness,¹⁹ Catholicism²⁰ and art – art was without doubt the most central: 'Nothing really matters to me but art,'²¹ he wrote in his *Confessions*, a statement he would reiterate in various configurations until the end of his life. Moore's writings reflect on three central concerns in relation to art. First, the art and act of writing: this is reflected in his experiments with autobiography as fiction as much as in his stylistic experimentations with the art movements of the time. As he himself remarked in typically satirical style, 'Naturalism I wore round my neck, Romanticism was pinned over the heart, Symbolism I carried like a toy revolver in my waistcoat pocket, to be used on an emergency.'²² Second, the figure of the artist is an essential feature of Moore's fiction: from Lewis Seymour, a renegade realist painter and playboy artist in his first novel, *A Modern Lover*, to Hubert Price, a failed playwright trapped by women in *Vain Fortune*; from Ulick Dean, a Celtic mystic and composer modelled on Yeats in *Evelyn Innes* to the Irish 'vagrant'²³ storyteller Alec Trusselby in *A Story-Teller's Holiday* (1918/1928), Moore's novels map developments in turn-of-the-century art – poetry, painting, drama, music, fiction, art criticism – through the aspirations, failures and general fortunes of his artist protagonists. Third, Moore reviewed and renewed the aesthetic and stylistic conception of his works and constantly revised his writings. Most of his texts exist in two, three, sometimes even four or more different versions. In his preface to the third edition of *Vain Fortune*, he admitted to being a 'victim to the disease of rewriting.'²⁴ His memoirs in *Hail and Farewell* offer a psychological context for the compulsion to revise. Moore recalled his incredulity at the public acclaim of *Esther Waters*, attributing his artistic self-doubts to his fundamental lack of belief in himself; a deep-seated lack

of confidence which originated in childhood in his relationship with his parents, in particular his father:

It is difficult for me to believe any good of myself. Within the oftentimes bombastic and truculent appearance that I present to the world, trembles a heart shy as a wren in the hedgerow or a mouse along the wainscoting ... I was trained into [this lack of belief in myself] by my parents at so early an age that it became part of myself ... I do not doubt that my parents loved their little boy, but their love did not prevent them laughing at him and persuading him that he was inherently absurd; and it is not wise to do this, for as soon as the child ceases to take himself seriously he begins to suspect that he is inferior, and I had begun to doubt if I would ever come to much, even before I failed to read at the age of seven, without hesitating, a page of English with the long *ff*'s, whereas my father could remember reading the *Times* aloud at breakfast when he was three. I could see that he thought me a stupid little boy, and was ashamed of me, and as the years went by many things occurred to confirm him in his opinion ... The slight success that has attended my writings did not surprise my relations as much as it surprised me, and ... if the success had been twice what it was, it would not have restored the confidence in myself that I lost in childhood. I am always a novice, publishing his first book, wondering if it is the worst thing ever written ...²⁵

The thematic return, throughout *Hail and Farewell*, to dismissive parental responses to his shortcomings indicates a deep-rooted sense of ineptitude. By continually revisiting and reworking his writings, Moore was forever retracing his early experience of filial inadequacy, and setting the record straight with his father – a quasi-Freudian super-ego whose death, as he admitted in his *Confessions of a Young Man*, had ‘freed’ the then 18-year-old and given him ‘power to create myself – that is to say, to create a complete and absolute self out of the partial self which was all that the restraint of home had permitted.’²⁶ Self-creation is, inevitably, as much about the rewriting of (or authorial severance from) a parental ideal or a family inheritance as it is about the assertion of an individual identity free of a past. Often the earliest critics and reviewers, as the selections from book reviews reproduced in the individual volumes of this edition make clear, did think some of Moore’s work amongst the ‘worst thing[s] ever written’. Such condemnation prompted Moore to return to his texts, to settle the everlasting battle with his father. As a reviewer remarked in 1918, ‘No author who regarded his work as sacred or inspired could have made such extensive changes’ as those Moore undertook to his works throughout his life.²⁷

There was also the inherent compulsion to write, which Moore figured in terms of a beautiful woman drawing him ever onwards in a kind of ‘thrall’. As he explained to John Freeman in the 1920s when looking back to his earliest works: ‘I simply did not know how to write ... But if you ask why, when I found I couldn’t express myself in prose, I didn’t give prose up ... there’s but one answer ... it was the *story* that held me in thrall, the story that was and is my *Belle Dame Sans Merci*. I’ve always been able to conceive, to invent a story.’²⁸ His intention throughout his writing career, he wrote to Lady Cunard on 24 August 1927, had been ‘to write narratives different from those written by my predecessors.’²⁹ But Moore’s status as either innovator or imitator has

always been a matter of debate. Arthur Symons wrote in 1919 that 'George Moore has been described, with impressive inaccuracy, as the English Zola', underlining the contentious nature of Moore's style and literary merits even at a period when he was an established figure in the literary firmament. Symons went on to elaborate on what he saw as Moore's 'singularly interesting' literary career, and his words, as those of a contemporary, are worth quoting at length here:

At what was practically the outset of his career he gained a certain notoriety; which did him good, by calling public attention to an unknown name; it did him harm, by attaching to that name a certain stigma ... George Moore's literary career has been singularly interesting; his character as a writer is very curious. A man who respects his art, who is devoted to literature, who has a French eye for form, he seems condemned to produce work which is always spotted with imperfection. All his life he has been seeking a style, and he has not yet found one. At times he drops into style as if by accident, and then he drops style as if by design. He has a passionate delight in the beauty of good prose; he has an ear for the magic of phrases; his words catch at times a troubled, expressive charm; yet he has never attained ease in writing, and he is capable of astounding incorrectnesses – the incorrectness of a man who knows better, who is not careless, and yet who cannot help himself. Yet the author of *A Mummer's Wife*, of *The Confessions of a Young Man*, of *Impressions and Opinions*, has more narrowly escaped being a great writer than even he himself, perhaps, is aware.³⁰

Symons's reference to Moore's lack of 'ease in writing' underlines the importance of craft and revision in Moore's literary production. Rewriting, for Moore, was a good thing, in spite of it being a 'disease', because it improved, or aimed to improve, the quality, clarity and artistry of the finished text. The dogged persistence, meticulousness and determination with which Moore focused entirely on his material was something that even those who disliked either the work or the man could not fail to appreciate. George Bernard Shaw, who knew Moore in the early 1880s, recalled:

He was always telling stories about himself and women. In every story there was a room full of mirrors and chandeliers, and the story usually ended with some woman throwing a lamp at George and driving him out of the house. Everybody used to laugh at George and no one believed him, but he had an imperturbable good humour and if you said: 'But George, don't talk such nonsense, you are making it all up', he was not in the least put out or angry but just said: 'Don't interrupt me', and went on as before.³¹

The desire to embellish the autobiographical moment or 'real' event in order to make it a better tale was something which remained consistent in all Moore's writing; Susan Mitchell in her 1916 book on Moore notoriously quipped that 'Some men kiss and tell, Mr Moore tells but doesn't kiss.'³² But what most struck Shaw and others in the early stages of his career was that this talent for exaggerated tale telling as entertainment amongst friends could be turned into sustained, written story telling. When he was alerted by William Archer to 'a most wonderful naturalistic book' (*A Mummer's Wife*) written by a new writer, and was given the name George Moore, Shaw replied:

'Nonsense! ... But I *know* George Moore. He couldn't possibly write a real book. He couldn't possibly *do* anything.' But, he had to concede, 'there it was. He had written it, and then I began to understand the incredible industry of the man.'³³ This 'incredible industry' produced a large body of literary texts 'now almost forgotten by the general public',³⁴ which are perhaps unique in revealing when taken as a whole the process of redrafting, reshaping and re-imagining that went into Moore's *oeuvre*. His urge to rewrite and the self-perception that, just as the individual consciousness may change, so too may the representation of that consciousness in art are themselves, of course, not entirely original. Writers have always revised and rewritten their work; it is part of the nature of the craft. However, Moore's intense self-awareness of the persona of 'George Moore', the authorial figure within the text he narrates, or even the knowledge that the characters in a tale might change and develop in line with the author's own consciousness, mark him out as proto-Modernist. As Virginia Woolf noted in 'A Sketch of the Past', 'What I write today I should not write in a year's time',³⁵ echoing and articulating precisely Moore's recognition of the mutability of artistic taste, authorial drive and the motivations behind literary creation.

Moore's first forays into print were largely journalistic and in his *Confessions* he explains his move from the production of articles to the short story: 'The daily article soon grows monotonous, even when you know it will be printed ... my prose was very faulty, and my ideas were unsettled, I could not go to the tap and draw them off, the liquor was still fermenting; and partly because my articles were not very easily disposed of, and partly because I was weary of writing on different subjects, I turned my attention to short stories. But short stories did not represent my ambition.'³⁶ The suggestion here that it was the usefulness of a particular form at a particular moment which attracted Moore to the short-story genre is interesting, but may be misleading (the *Confessions* are at one level anything but 'confessions'). While it is clear that Moore did not intend to make his name solely through his short stories, it was in them, nevertheless, that he experimented with ideas, played with the psychological make-up of his characters and sought to find ways of articulating that artistic 'ambition' in a small-scale testing ground before launching into a novel on a similar theme. But the process also worked in reverse, as can be seen in the relationship between Moore's first novel in his 'Don Juan trilogy',³⁷ *A Mere Accident* (1887), and its subsequent rewriting into the novellas 'John Norton' in *Celibates* (1895) and 'Hugh Monfert' in the 1922 and 1923 versions of *In Single Strictness*.³⁸ There was, then, something about the form itself which Moore found suited to the exploration of particular themes and issues.

Part of this interest in the short story as a genre might be traced to Moore's exposure to European literature in Paris in the 1870s and 1880s. The influence of figures such as Balzac, Flaubert, Maupassant and above all Zola on Moore's writings is self-evident, but in his criticism from the period the figure of Turgenev also has a prominent position. In an article originally published in the *Fortnightly* in 1888 and later reprinted in his *Impressions and Opinions* (1891), a collection of his periodical pieces on literature and the arts from the 1880s, Moore made it clear that, for

him, it was Turgenev's short stories that displayed the greatest skill in terms of both form and subject matter. Dismissing the Russian author's more famous novel *Fathers and Sons* (1861), Moore argued that 'it is not until we come to the *contes*, the short stories, that we find Turgeneff standing quite alone, towering above all competitors'.³⁹ We might read the subsequent comments Moore made on Turgenev's style as important steps in his own growing awareness of what kinds of insight could be achieved in this genre:

From the first line the narrative rushes forth; there is no hesitation, there is no stop, nor is the reader warned of what is going to happen. This is not necessary, for so perfectly are the events chosen that they follow without jostling or discord, and as each comes into the reader's mind he is surprised at once by its naturalness and unexpectedness. The illusion is complete; it is just, as the phrase goes, like life itself. And what is still more marvellous perhaps is that a mere narrative, I will say a bare narrative, should possess the same intellectual charms as the psychological novel.⁴⁰

Moore would himself from the mid-1890s onwards seek to use the short story as a device to convey some of the same themes, concerns and 'intellectual charms' to be found in his novels, with the 'John Norton' narrative cited above as a prime example. Following Turgenev, Moore sought to be part of what he termed the 'thought school' rather than the 'fact school',⁴¹ a phrase which denotes the desire to portray a concern with the 'idea of things, and not the things themselves'.⁴² In many ways this makes the events of the narrative incidental to the idea that is to be conveyed to the reader. A good example of Moore's technique in this mode can be found in his relatively late short story 'Wilfrid Holmes' (*In Single Strictness*, 1922; reproduced in Volume 5 of this edition). It is a very short tale in which, in many respects, nothing happens, for the assumption that drives the events, the decisions and the fears of the eponymous protagonist, prove to be false at the story's end. Yet the text itself is full of the idea and history behind those fears, and readers are left feeling as if Holmes's psyche had been exposed to them in a quasi-clinical context.⁴³ By the time of Moore's final collection, *Celibate Lives*, published in 1927, the intellectual element or 'thought' of the narrative tale had been combined, as Moore wrote in his 'Advertisement', with the sense of 'the melodic line' to be found in the form.⁴⁴ Moore's terminology acknowledged the connection, inherited from his reading of Robert Louis Stevenson, between music and literature, the 'nearest equivalent' between the two arts being found in the idea of 'story'. Thus the melodic telling of an idea through a tale, the interconnectedness between the message and the medium, became the hallmark of Moore's later work.

The ideas Moore sought to express in his shorter fiction were always connected by a determination to explore the singularity, even peculiarity of the individual human condition, no matter how diverse the background or the setting. Moore's Irish tales are concerned with the unfulfilled or troubled life, the narratives in which external forces, particularly the Church, seek to suppress the individual will and desire, while his non-Irish stories speak of the world of the *fin de siècle* and the lives of dissatis-

fied aesthetes and ascetics, loners and lovers, the discontent and the malcontent. His world is, though of the same period, unlike that of his fellow Irish contemporaries Oscar Wilde and George Bernard Shaw, whose popularity and representative status have, in contradistinction to Moore's, never been in question. As the Scottish poet, novelist and translator Edwin Muir (writing as Edward Moore) pointed out in 1918, looking back on the period twenty years before:

Mr. Moore is much nearer in temper to Oscar Wilde than to the realists. He is an aesthete essentially, and a realist only in the second place, and only because he is an aesthete. The province of selected exquisite beauty had been exhausted by Wilde and his school; so Mr. Moore turned to the squalid, the commonplace and the diseased in Life, there to find his 'aesthetic emotion.' This explains the curious effect at once of colour and of drabness in his books. He is a perverted Wilde; doubly a decadent.⁴⁵

'Doubly a decadent': perhaps this is why both Wilde and Shaw took such an instant (and in Wilde's case intense) dislike to Moore and his work. Commenting on Moore to Frank Harris, Wilde, who had known Moore since their childhood,⁴⁶ declared:

George Moore has conducted his whole education in public. He had written two or three books before he found out there was such a thing as English grammar. He at once announced his discovery and so won the admiration of the illiterate. A few years later he discovered that there was something architectural in style, that sentences had to be built up into a paragraph, and paragraphs in chapters and so on. Naturally he cried this revelation, too, from the housetops, and thus won the admiration of the journalists who had been making rubble-heaps all their lives without knowing it. I'm much afraid, Frank, in spite of all his efforts, he will die before he reaches the level from which writers start. It's a pity because he has certainly a little real talent. He differs from Symons in that he has an Ego, but his Ego has five senses and no soul.⁴⁷

The statement that Moore's education was conducted in public might be seen as a cheap shot from Wilde, who himself threw on his very public existence as a drawing-room wit to fuel the publicity surrounding and interest in his work. Nevertheless it is true that 'George Moore' as a public figure forever in the process of *becoming*, a betrayer of confidences and a publisher of intimacies was one of the faces – or masks – of Moore the writer, who, throughout his life, derived great pleasure from playing the part of *agent provocateur*. This 'George Moore' was as much a work of art, a character in the fiction which is daily life, as Wilde himself was and remains.⁴⁸

Moore's pose, his artistic fascination with recreating the self or multiple 'selves', was endorsed by some of his contemporaries as 'the highest form of man's creative activity',⁴⁹ but to others like Susan Mitchell proved distinctly unnerving.⁵⁰ Yet Moore's frequent return to the moment lived in order to create the moment understood is also about the interpretation, re-interpretation and sympathy that must be given to the human condition. Moore's rewriting of his short stories, as with his autobiographies, is, as the following volumes reveal, about finding better ways of understanding what makes individuals who they are and how they seek to learn,

discover and control their lives in the process. Moore was cruelly honest about this side of his character. As he wrote of Lewis Wellton Hawkins ('Marshall') in his *Confessions*: 'I was conscious that I was growing, and that Marshall, already arrived at maturity, could teach me. And I used him without shame or stint, as I have used all those with whom I have been brought into close contact. I cannot recall a case of a man or woman who ever occupied any considerable part of my thoughts that did not contribute towards my moral or physical welfare.'⁵¹

The dislike of Moore's self-creation exhibited in Wilde's comments was reciprocated in Moore's views on Wilde. Asked by Frank Harris in the 1920s to comment on his compatriot, Moore sought to echo Wilde's criticisms of his own work by implying that, as far as he was concerned, Wilde had also not made the 'level from which writers start':

The first thing you ask is for me to write to you about Oscar Wilde, and this I can do easily, but I am afraid that my opinions regarding him will not please you, or they are not the opinions you hold. You would put him in the first class as a writer, and I should put him in the third or fourth. It is not a long time since I read a book of his called 'Intentions,' and it seems to me very thin and casual, without depth, therefore, unoriginal; no man is original in the surface of his mind; to be original we must go deep, right down to the roots, and Oscar Wilde's talent seems to me essentially rootless: something growing in a glass in a little water. I was struck by his lack of style; by style, I mean rhythm. It is all quite clear and correct but his sentences do not sway. He had a pretty ingenious drawing-room wit, and these qualities enabled him to write plays that are not intolerable to a man of letters, and superficial enough to attract audiences. If I understand your letter rightly you seem to think that Wilde's abnormal impulses mark him out as an interesting subject for literary study. It might be so if Wilde were a great writer. He is that in your opinion, but in my opinion, as I have already said, he is in the third or fourth class and, therefore, not worth troubling about, and I do not think that anybody would have troubled about him if the Marquis of Queensbury had not written him a post card; had it not been for that unlucky post card Wilde and his literature would be sleeping comfortably in the dust at the bottom of an almost forgotten drawer ...⁵²

It is intriguing that it is Wilde's public troubles that Moore perceived as having the effect of awakening the world to Wilde's work; especially so given that Moore's own reputation as an artist rested a great deal on his 'education in public' and the persona he created around the figure of 'George Moore'. Even more interesting is Moore's swift dismissal of Shaw in the lines following this discussion of Wilde: 'You ask me to express opinions about Shaw, and his work, but I can only express my opinion about writers whose aims are the same as mine and you know that Shaw and I have nothing in common.'⁵³ By implication, Moore's comments on Wilde suggest that they did share a common thread, which may well be found in their mutual antagonism about the purposes behind, and the reasons for, their public personae.

Moore is not the major player he once was. Part of this might be due to general lack of awareness of Moore's work, which itself originates from the relative unavail-

ability (other than on the second-hand or print-on-demand markets) of all but a few of his texts, a sharp contrast with the omnipresence of new editions of Shaw and Wilde, Joyce and Yeats. The short-story collections *Celibates*, *In Single Strictness*, *Celibate Lives* and *A Story-Teller's Holiday* have not been reprinted or are not available in scholarly editions.⁵⁴ While *A Story-Teller's Holiday* has been praised since its first publication for 'exchange[ing] the restrictions of conventional fiction for the flowing outlines of the folk-story',⁵⁵ and *The Untilled Field* has been recognized as a definitive collection in the history of both the Irish and English short-story tradition, with Richard Allen Cave even declaring that 'modern Irish fiction came into being' through Moore's narratives in that volume,⁵⁶ Moore's other collections have received distinctly less public and critical attention. This may be because their subject matter, like that of many of Moore's novels, remains harder to deal with, exposing as it does the uncomfortable and painful sides of the human condition, especially in terms of familial, emotional and sexual relationships. Yet if Moore's career, to quote Symons again, was 'singularly interesting', then so too is his subject matter, because it is the 'singular life' which intrigued Moore beyond any other subject, especially when this celibacy or loneliness was placed into conjunction with artistic leanings or religious dogma. This is the pre-eminent theme in Moore's short stories, for even those with an Irish setting often have at their heart the conflict between the individual will or consciousness with the larger community or the teachings of the Church. As Adrian Frazier has pointed out, 'Critics who like controversy will have a field day with the works of George Moore.'⁵⁷ The short stories collected in *Celibates*, *In Single Strictness* and *Celibate Lives* in particular have remained controversial. Moore sought to rewrite these texts in order to make issues more explicit but also perhaps more understandable to the everyday experience of his readers. (It is noticeable, for example, that the characters of the individuals portrayed in *In Single Strictness* and *Celibate Lives* are more fragile, vulnerable and in some ways ordinary than those found in *Celibates*.) The importance of the reworking cannot be doubted when one considers that Moore's rewritings typically introduce radical alterations to the original, with the effect of producing a new text with new character constellations and new meanings, all of which in turn affect our perception and reading of the first version of the text. Edwin Gilcher had good reason in characterizing Moore's work as 'a bibliographic jungle',⁵⁸ but it is a 'jungle' in which it is worthwhile venturing to the innermost, and often uncharted, depths.

The Edition

Editing George Moore is indeed impossible without editing the multiple incarnations of Moore's works. This edition places Moore's stories into the wider context of his concern with particular themes and also brings into the centre of the interpretive discussion Moore's reworking of narratives from first published form through to the final version.

Although this five-volume edition is representative of Moore's experiments with the short-story form, there are more 'stories' than we have collected here because 'story' is itself a loose term to use in relation to Moore's publications. There are, for example, multiple character sketches, 'moods and memories' and other material interpolated in his autobiographical writings (*Confessions, Memoirs of My Dead Life, Hail and Farewell, Conversations*) which might be considered stories in their own right. In his correspondence⁵⁹ and conversations with interviewers⁶⁰ in the late 1920s Moore indicated that he was working on another story collection, to be called *In Minor Keys*. David Eakin and Helmut Gerber, who used Moore's suggested title for their own edition of the 'uncollected' stories in 1985, commented that if all Moore's short texts were brought together there might be enough material for 'at least eight or nine volumes';⁶¹ they further highlighted the problem when they commented that because Moore 'constantly revised, rewrote, amalgamated, and rearranged these stories, it is difficult to say how many distinctly separate stories he actually wrote.'⁶²

Our selection criteria, then, were based on the five collections of stories interlinked in style and subject matter (psychological portraits of unstable identities affected by gender unease and sexual dysphoria in *Celibates, In Single Strictness, Celibate Lives*; explorations of the tensions between the individual and the community via the medium of the Irish folktale in its encounter with the European prose story in *The Untilled Field* and *A Story-Teller's Holiday*) which Moore continued to rearrange; and stories published in the periodical press but not collected during his lifetime (many of these were compiled by Eakin and Gerber).

Volume 1, *Celibates*, reproduces Moore's first short-story collection together with the first (serial) version of one of the stories ('Mildred Lawson') and extensive extracts from *A Mere Accident*, the first (novel) version of the central *Celibates* novella. *Celibates* (1895) is a collection of three novella-length stories about *fin-de-siècle* aestheticism, the role of religion in addressing conflicted family and gender relations, sexual repression and 1890s hysteria. The collection begins with the story of the alienated female aesthete Mildred Lawson, moves to a focus on male celibacy and sexual angst in the case of John Norton, a rewriting of Moore's 1887 novel *A Mere Accident*, and concludes with the tale of Agnes Lahens, an adolescent girl who, traumatized by her mother's lack of chastity and her father's helplessness, returns to her childhood convent to seek solace in religion. All three stories haunted Moore's subsequent writing, as testified by his desire to undertake continual revisions even in his collections of the 1920s (see the Introduction to Volume 5). They therefore mark a suitable beginning to this edition both chronologically as Moore's earliest collection and in the way in which their subject matter points to some of the most dominant themes in the volumes which follow.

Volume 2 reproduces Moore's periodical tales across his writing career. While some of these precede and others postdate *Celibates*, most of them are contemporaneous with his first story collection and share some of its central concerns. We have not included stories which were published in revised form in any of Moore's other

collections. Such stories are reproduced or discussed in the editorial apparatus of the volume concerned.

Volume 3 turns to Moore's Irish stories. Moore's collection *The Untilled Field*, originally published in 1903, holds a central place in the history of the twentieth-century Irish short story and was heavily influenced by his experience and exposure to continental developments and innovations in writing technique during his time in France in the 1870s and 1880s. These interconnected narratives of rural Ireland deal with the themes of homeland, escape, exile, idealism, disappointment and disaffection. Moore had previously published several of the stories that appear in *The Untilled Field* in periodicals (some in Gaelic translation) and extensively revised the collection on a number of occasions. We use the 1931 edition because this was the last substantially revised version of the text published in Moore's lifetime, but the volume also includes some of the earlier versions of specific tales where the variations between the 1931 version of the text and a prior incarnation warrant such treatment.

Volume 4 continues the Irish theme by reproducing Moore's *A Story-Teller's Holiday* (1928), which includes *Ulick and Soracha* (a text that initially appeared separately in 1926 and was subsequently incorporated into the revised, two-volume edition of *A Story-Teller's Holiday*). Originally published privately for subscribers in 1918, these volumes contain a series of stories of love, sex, sinfulness and desire in a medieval Ireland populated by monks and nuns, in conjunction with European-influenced contemporary narratives of sexual frustration and gender confusion. Inspired by the German scholar Kuno Meyer's (1858–1919) information that in Ireland it was once believed that individuals could earn a higher status in heaven in proportion to the magnitude and number of the temptations they had resisted in life, Moore set about writing his tales of sensuality and frustrated desire. Moore provided a framing narrative in which the author-narrator meets a fern-gatherer called Alec Trusselby, with whom he begins a competition about which of them can tell the best story – the folkloric-influenced Trusselby or the European modernist 'Moore'. In their shared subject matter (sex, celibacy, desire, temptation) the stories of Trusselby and Moore illustrate Moore's own understanding of the timeless nature of human concerns about morality and mortality. Tinged with sadness but also undeniable humour, *A Story-Teller's Holiday* draws together the diverse range of Moore's interests and provides a good connecting text between the 'celibate lives' of Volumes 1 and 5 and the Irish dimension of Moore's work in Volume 3.

The final volume of the set returns us to the themes of family relations, identity and sexual repression in Moore's work as explored in Volume 1's *Celibates*. In reproducing the 1922 edition of *In Single Strictness* we nevertheless reveal how Moore changed the text when he republished it as *Celibate Lives* in 1927. We therefore include the story 'Albert Nobbs' (which replaced the central 'Hugh Monfert' narrative, itself a rewriting of the 'John Norton' story in *Celibates*) from the latter volume together with the earlier version of 'Priscilla and Emily Lofft' ('Emma Bovary', from

Lippincott's Magazine (1902)). The alternative 1923 ending of 'Hugh Monfert' is reproduced in the Appendices.

All the volumes contain, in addition to a full list of textual variants across editions published in Moore's lifetime, extracts from earlier versions of a particular story where the changes are extensive, contextual material (such as letters from Moore concerning the text) and contemporary reviews.

Moore's *Memoirs of My Dead Life* contains a short narrative entitled 'Bring in the Lamp' in which the reader is entreated to 'Think of the writer of stories!' Moore allows us an example of this writer's consciousness in a moment when he thinks on the subject of the lastingness not only of story but of life itself. Moore tells us that

stories are often briefer even than the men who write them, and are certainly born for no other end than to be forgotten. In twenty years, in five, perhaps in a week, I may be among the gone, sooner than the flowers in my garden; so wherefore do I rue that these strings of words will not be read by men always? We are being forgotten day by day, and our stories are less than we.⁶³

What we hope to achieve with this edition is an illustration of the undiminished vibrancy of Moore's stories. 'Nothing would more amuse Moore,' John Eglinton wrote in 1929, 'than to be taken with absolute seriousness';⁶⁴ this seriousness, however much the thought might have entertained Moore, is what his work deserves.

Editorial Principles

In Volumes 1, 2 and 5 we print the first published texts. We reproduce the *first* version of a story if the later version/s contain/s no significant alterations; the *last* version if it does; all or a number of versions if the alterations are so considerable as to change the nature of the text. Where Moore undertook more notable changes to a particular text (such as in the alternative endings to the 'Hugh Monfert' texts of 1922 and 1923) the altered, later versions are reproduced in the respective volume's Appendices. In Volumes 3 and 4 we use the last English editions of *The Untilled Field* and *A Story-Teller's Holiday* published in Moore's lifetime.

The Bibliographical Note following each volume's Introduction gives full information on the various editions produced during Moore's lifetime, and how these changes are accommodated in the texts printed in this edition. In the case of variants, we reproduce complete texts for significant reconceptualizations – these are then discussed in the introductions to the individual volumes; provide extracts in the case of limited, but significant changes (as, for example, a different ending); and discuss less significant changes to an original version in the Textual Variants section of the apparatus. Reviews are reproduced in chronological order; where a month but not a day is given, the review precedes all others published in that month.

Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn

Notes

1. George Moore, *Confessions of a Young Man*, annotated edn of 1916 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1939), p. 177.
2. George Moore, 'Apologia pro Scriptis Meis', in the Carra edn of *Lewis Seymour and Some Women* (New York: Boni & Liveright, 1922), p. xxiii.
3. Edwin Gilcher (comp. and ed.), *A Bibliography of George Moore* (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1970; now available from Colin Smythe); David B. Eakin and Robert Langenfeld (eds), *George Moore's Correspondence with the Mysterious Countess* (Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, English Literary Studies, 1984); Robert Langenfeld (ed.), *George Moore: An Annotated Secondary Bibliography of Writings About Him* (New York: AMS Press, 1987); Edwin Gilcher (comp. and ed.), with Robert S. Becker and Clinton K. Krauss, *Supplement to A Bibliography of George Moore* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1988); Helmut E. Gerber, with the assistance of O. M. Brack (eds), *George Moore on Parnassus: Letters (1900–1933) to Secretaries, Publishers, Printers, Agents, Literati, Friends, and Acquaintances* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1988).
4. Colin Smythe's George Moore series – which includes *A Drama in Muslin*, *The Untilled Field*, *Selected Plays* by George Moore and Edward Martyn, edited by David B. Eakin and Michael Case, and Richard Allen Cave's edition of *Hail and Farewell* – has done much to keep Moore in print. Many of Moore's writings are available via the internet print-on-demand facility; this services the needs of scholars but is unsuitable for curricular purposes.
5. See Elizabeth Grubgeld, *George Moore and the Autogeneous Self: The Autobiography and Fiction* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994); and Adrian Frazier's magisterial biography, *George Moore 1852–1933* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); as well as two recent international George Moore conferences, hosted by the University of Cork in March 2005 ('George Moore: Literature and the Arts') and the University of Lille, France, in March 2007 ('George Moore: Across Borders').
6. The biographical information presented here largely derives from Joseph Hone, *The Life of George Moore* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1936); Frazier, *George Moore*; Edwin Gilcher's article on 'George Moore' in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), and Moore's own autobiographical works. Additional biographical information, where appropriate, is referred to in the introductions to each of the volumes of this edition.
7. Gilcher, 'George Moore', *ODNB*.
8. See Mark Llewellyn and Ann Heilmann, 'George Moore and Literary Censorship: The Textual and Sexual History of "John Norton" and "Hugh Monfert"', *English Literature in Transition*, 50 (2007). See also Pierre Coustillas, *Literature at Nurse, Or Circulating Morals: A Polemic on Victorian Censorship* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1976).
9. For an account of the Vizetelly trial, see Ernest Alfred Vizetelly, *Emile Zola, Novelist and Reformer: An Account of His Life and Work* (London: John Lane, 1904); for details of Moore's involvement with the translations of Zola, see pp. 249–50; see also Frazier, *George Moore*, pp. 98–9.
10. We give here the date of first publication, although a large number of Moore's novels were rewritten at later dates.
11. For Moore's collaboration with Bernard Lopez (1817–96, 'M. Duval' in the *Confessions*) on *Martin Luther*, and his inspiration for his first play, *Worldliness* (modelled on his triangular, unconsummated relationship with Lewis Welldon Hawkins, called 'Marshall' in the *Confessions*, and his lover Alice Howard), see *Confessions*, pp. 45–6, pp. 80–1; Hone, *Life of George Moore*, pp. 59–62; and Frazier, *George Moore*, pp. 33–5.
12. Pearl Richards was the daughter of a wealthy American. She spent her childhood in Britain and was educated in London and Paris. In 1887 she married a banker, Reginald Walpole Craigie, with whom she had a son, but whom she divorced in 1895, having converted to Catholicism and taken the name 'Mary-Teresa' in 1892. The pseudonym 'John Oliver Hobbes' is supposedly derived from the forenames of her father and Cromwell and the surname of the philosopher Thomas Hobbes; Craigie recounted several different stories about her pseudonym choice, see Margaret Maison, *John Oliver Hobbes: Her Life and Work* (London: Eighteen Nineties Society, 1976), p. 7. Hobbes was

the author of numerous successful novels from *Some Emotions and a Moral* (1891) through to *The Dream and the Business* (1906). Craigie and Moore co-authored Hobbes's first play, *Journeys End in Lovers Meeting* (1894); Act I of their first collaborative effort, *The Fool's Hour*, was published in *The Yellow Book's* initial issue earlier that year. The exact reason for the split between Moore and Craigie that occurred either later in 1894 or early in 1895 has not been discovered, although Moore (in a probably largely fictionalized memoir in the 1920s) refers to a meeting during which Craigie suddenly announced she no longer wished to see him, giving no reason for this decision. From the wreck of their friendship was born Moore's short story 'Mildred Lawson' published in the collection *Celibates* (1895; reproduced in Volume 1) and, almost thirty years later and long after Pearl Craigie's death in 1906, the revised version published as 'Henrietta Marr' (see *In Single Strictness*; reproduced in Volume 5); between these two short stories there were also Moore's novels *Evelyn Innes* (1898) and *Sister Teresa* (1901), both also thought to be based in part on the character of Craigie.

13. Edward Martyn (1859–1923) was a playwright and like Moore came from the Irish landowning class. A misogynist and devout Catholic, Martyn was the inspiration and model for one of Moore's most unsettled male characters, John Norton (see the Introduction to Volume 1). Like Moore, Martyn was acquainted with W. B. Yeats, with whom he frequently disagreed on matters of religion and spirituality, although he was a large funder of the Irish Literary Theatre. The author of plays including *The Heather Field* (1899), *Maeve* (1900), *The Tale of a Town* and *An Enchanted Sea* (both 1902), Martyn also wrote nationalistic pamphlets such as *Ireland's Battle for her Language* (1900). The first president of Sinn Féin, the party he co-founded, Martyn's main legacy was his financial support for the artistic projects of the Irish Literary Renaissance. He died of a brain tumour in December 1923. See John Kelly, 'Edward Martyn', in *ODNB*.
14. Moore collaborated with Yeats (1865–1939) during the period in which he was involved with the Irish Literary Theatre. Although their friendship was sealed in part through controversy and not least because Yeats recognized that Moore 'was obviously a world-class troublemaker' whom he though he could put to use in his own cause (see Frazier, *George Moore*, pp. 290–2), it was Moore's troublemaking which meant the 'sound of their [friendship] tearing apart would be long and loud' (p. 312). The falling out between the two writers occurred over the use of a real-life tale, that of the poet and prophet Philip Francis Little, as the basis of a new collaborative venture. When Moore and Yeats decided not to write the piece together a wrangle occurred over which of them could use the plot, with Moore even threatening a lawsuit in the process (Frazier, *George Moore*, p. 321). A wary friendship was re-established briefly in 1904, but any chance of a lasting one was destroyed by Moore's unflattering portrayal of Yeats in his publication of the autobiographical volumes later collected as *Hail and Farewell*. For further information, see Roy Foster, *W. B. Yeats: A Life, vol. I: The Apprentice Mage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 250–3, 267–70, 507–9.
15. Moore's other contributions to Irish literary life in this period are discussed in greater detail in the Introduction to Volume 3 of this edition.
16. The longest and most intense affair was with Lady Maud Cunard (1872–1948). Moore may have been the father of her daughter, the poet Nancy Cunard (1896–1965). See Frazier, *George Moore*, pp. 259, 263–4, 420, 429, 453–4.
17. Hone recounts that when Moore was 'persuaded to his bedroom' two days before he died, he went 'regretting nothing except that *Madeleine de Lisle* [his final novel] and *A Communication to My Friends* remained unfinished' (*Life of George Moore*, p. 452).
18. As recorded by Antonin Proust and cited in Frazier, *George Moore*, p. 64.
19. Like Robert Louis Stevenson, G. B. Shaw and Oscar Wilde, Moore was an Irish writer who spent most of his life outside his native country, in Britain and in France.
20. As an atheist Irish writer Moore was deeply concerned with the crippling impact of rigid religiosity and dogma on art, life and (especially Irish) identity.
21. Moore, *Confessions*, p. 196.
22. *Confessions*, 2nd edn, cited in Patrick Bridgwater, *George Moore and German Pessimism* (Durham: University of Durham, 1988), p. 40.
23. In 'Apologia pro Scriptis Meis', Moore refers to Alec Trusselby's stories as 'yarns told by an Irish vagrant in his own rustic English', in the Carra edn of *Lewis Seymour and Some Women*, p. xxxii.

24. George Moore, 'Prefatory Note' to the 3rd edn of *Vain Fortune* (London: Walter Scott, 1895), p. vi.
25. George Moore, *Ave* (Uniform edn, 1933; London: William Heinemann, 1947), vol. I of *Hail and Farewell*, pp. 61–2. This sense of inadequacy was also expressed in his correspondence and in conversation with friends and family. Thus he wrote to his mother of his fear of having a 'dash of genius' only: 'We are the unfortunates who finish alone in the fight and upon whose bodies others ascend the peak of genius.' Similarly, Vincent O'Sullivan 'found him ... uncertain to an almost irritating point about the worth of his books.' (Both cited in Hone, *Life of George Moore*, pp. 150, 208.) For the first letter, to Mary Blake Moore, 8 April 1883, see also Robert Stephen Becker, 'The Letters of George Moore, 1863–1901' (PhD thesis, University of Reading, 1980), p. 232.
26. Moore, *Confessions*, p. 24.
27. J. S. Watson, Jr, 'A Story-Teller's Holiday', *Dial*, 65 (14 December 1918), p. 535 (p. 304, Volume 4 of this edition).
28. Moore, cited in John Freeman, *A Portrait of George Moore in a Study of His Work* (London: T. Werner Laurie, 1922), pp. 72–3.
29. George Moore to Lady Cunard, 24 August 1927, in Gerber, with Brack (eds), *George Moore on Parnassus*, p. 730.
30. Arthur Symons, 'Studies in Realism: Sketch Estimates of George Moore, George Gissing and Others', *Vanity Fair* (April 1919), p. 35.
31. G. B. Shaw, cited in Charles Morgan, *Epitaph on George Moore* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1935), pp. 15–16.
32. Susan L. Mitchell, *George Moore* (Dublin: Maunsell & Co., 1916), p. 47.
33. G. B. Shaw, cited in Morgan, *Epitaph on George Moore*, pp. 15–16.
34. Gilcher, 'George Moore', *ODNB*.
35. Virginia Woolf, 'A Sketch of the Past', *Moments of Being: Autobiographical Writings*, new edn, ed. Jeanne Schulkind, intro. Hermione Lee (London: Pimlico, 2002), p. 87.
36. Moore, *Confessions*, p. 200.
37. The other novels are *Spring Days* (1888) and *Mike Fletcher* (1889).
38. See Llewellyn and Heilmann, 'George Moore and Literary Censorship', and the Introductions to Volumes 1 and 5 in this edition.
39. George Moore, 'Turgueneff', *Fortnightly Review*, 43 (1 February 1888), p. 247 (p. 148, Volume 2 of this edition); repr. in *Impressions and Opinions* (London: David Nutt, 1891), p. 88.
40. Moore, 'Turgueneff', *Fortnightly Review*, pp. 247–8 (p. 148, Volume 2); *Impressions and Opinions*, pp. 89–90.
41. Moore, 'Turgueneff', *Fortnightly Review*, p. 238 (p. 148, Volume 2); *Impressions and Opinions*, pp. 68–9. In contemporaneous letters Moore was more explicit in his condemnation of Romance and adventure writers like Rider Haggard. Writing to Henry Barnett (editor of the *Court and Society Review*) on 30 March 1887, he distinguished between 'Realism' and 'Romance', the 'literary school and the illiterate school', Haggard falling into the latter, Zola into the former. See Becker, 'Letters of George Moore', p. 405.
42. Moore, 'Turgueneff', *Fortnightly Review*, p. 238 (p. 146, Volume 2); *Impressions and Opinions*, p. 69.
43. For a detailed discussion of 'Wilfrid Holmes', see the Introduction to Volume 5.
44. 'Advertisement', *Celibate Lives* (London: William Heinemann, 1927), p. vi (p. 260, Volume 5 of this edition).
45. Edward Moore (Edwin Muir), *We Moderns: Enigmas and Guesses* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1918), p. 189 (p. 299, Volume 4 of this edition).
46. Hone, *Life of George Moore*, pp. 24–5.
47. Frank Harris, *Oscar Wilde* (New York: Dorset Press, 1989), pp. 278–9.
48. For a brief discussion of the analogies between Moore's, Wilde's and Pater's masks, see Patrick Bridgwater, *Anglo-German Interactions in the Literature of the 1890s* (Oxford: Legenda, 1999), pp. 186–7; see also ch. 9 on 'Masked Men: Nietzsche, Pater and Wilde'.
49. Watson, 'A Story-Teller's Holiday', p. 536 (p. 305, Volume 4).

50. Moore 'never loses sight of any of his selves in any of his works, but returns continually to write new prefaces to old books, reanimating in turn each of his dead memories' (Mitchell, *George Moore*, p. 16).
51. Moore, *Confessions*, p. 39.
52. George Moore to Frank Harris, no date given, *Moore versus Harris* (Chicago, IL: privately printed, 1925), pp. 10–11.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *In Single Strictness* was reprinted in the Short Story Index Reprint Series by Ayer Co. in 1972 but is now out of print. *Celibates* is available via print-on-demand only. *A Story-Teller's Holiday* and *Celibates Lives* have not been reprinted since the 1920s.
55. John Eglinton (William K. Magee), 'George Moore and Holy Ireland', *Dial*, 86 (April 1929), p. 341 (p. 339, Volume 4 of this edition); see also Anthony Farrow, *George Moore* (Boston, MA: Twayne, 1978), p. 143.
56. Richard Allen Cave (ed.), 'Introduction', *The Untilled Field* (London: Colin Smythe, 2000), p. vii.
57. Frazier, *George Moore*, p. xix.
58. Gilcher, 'George Moore', *ODNB*.
59. See his letters to J(ames) R. Wells, 9 February 1927; and to Maud Cunard, 24 August 1927; both in Gerber, with Brack (eds), *George Moore on Parnassus*, pp. 729–30, 745.
60. See Lawrence C. Groom, 'Mr George Moore: An Interview', *New York Herald Tribune* (16 October 1927), sec. vii, p. 9 (see pp. 138–40, Volume 2 of this edition); and John Austin, 'Hail, My Farewell!', *T.P.'s Weekly* (12 November 1927), p. 70 (see pp. 140–2, Volume 2 of this edition).
61. David B. Eakin and Helmut Gerber (eds), *In Minor Keys: The Uncollected Stories of George Moore* (London: Fourth Estate, 1985), p. 13.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
63. George Moore, *Memoirs of My Dead Life*, rev. edn (London: William Heinemann, 1928), p. 201.
64. Eglinton, 'George Moore and Holy Ireland', p. 339 (p. 338, Volume 4).

INTRODUCTION

[T]he more realistic you are the better[.]¹

[T]his psychical investigation ... will ... be no more than an experimental demonstration of the working of the brain into which we are looking[.]²

This first volume reproduces *Celibates* (1895), George Moore's collection of psychological case studies of *fin-de-siècle* malaise, the collection he revisited and reworked twice, as *In Single Strictness* and *Celibate Lives*, in the 1920s. The three novellas compiled under the title *Celibates* were first planned and written in the late 1880s and early 1890s, at the culmination point of Moore's experimentations with the realist and naturalist form, a time which saw the highest output in his short-story production.³ '[T]he more realistic you are the better': the mantra impressed on the aspiring artist in 'Mildred Lawson' reflects Moore's own philosophy for much of his life. The French inflections of this impetus quickly assumed legendary status, not least because of Moore's portrayal of his cheek-by-jowl relationship with the Parisian avant-garde in *Confessions of a Young Man* (1888). The self-confessed 'youngest of the naturalists ... [and] eldest of the symbolists'⁴ was later remembered by Edmund Downey, sub-editor of Tinsley's (the publisher of his first story in 1882), as 'fresh from France – redolent of Zola, the Goncourts and Flaubert.'⁵ Harry Thurston Peck, an American classical scholar and critic, in fact applauded Moore for 'never separat[ing] himself from the French school of literary art' as represented by Guy de Maupassant, Emile Zola and Joris Karl Huysmans; he was, Peck stressed, 'the only writer of English who exemplifies the whole manner and spirit of the Realists. In everything but his language he is French, and not only French, but Parisian.'⁶ In the early stages of his career Moore referred to himself as 'un ricochet[er] de Zola',⁷ and was conceptualized, acclaimed and condemned as a disciple of French naturalism long after he had berated Zola's style, narrative practice and 'superior mediocrity'⁸ with the very flamboyance with which he had initially embraced them.⁹ Temple Scott, who introduced Brentano's 1915 impression of *Celibates*, called him 'a naturalist in the finest sense of that word'.¹⁰ When this first novella collection appeared in 1895, it was instantly associated with the 'scientific mood',¹¹ 'jaundiced vision',¹² 'mental degeneracy'¹³ and 'grossness ... nauseating and un-English'¹⁴ of the author of *Le Roman expérimental*,

even though in title it paid allegiance to another French writer: Honoré de Balzac, pace Moore ‘the great moral influence of my life’.¹⁵

The title of Moore’s first collection is adapted from Balzac’s *Les Célibataires* (1843), a compilation of three long novellas, ‘Pierrette’,¹⁶ ‘Le Curé de Tours’ – a novella which in Moore’s eyes encapsulated ‘the genius of Balzac in epitome’¹⁷ – and ‘Les Deux Frères/Un Menage de Garçon’ (‘The Two Brothers’/‘A Bachelor’s Establishment’). A frail young girl exploited and abused by cruel relatives who escapes into death; a naive priest divested of his home and worldly possessions by his spinster landlady and a ruthless colleague; the divergent fates of two brothers, one an upright artist, the other a deceitful wastrel: this is the material which Moore reshaped into the brother/sister, businessman/artist pair in ‘Mildred Lawson’; the conflict between the world of the flesh and a life of contemplation in ‘John Norton’; and the flight from the dysfunctional family back into the shelter of the convent in ‘Agnes Lahens’. The sequential order of the stories Moore initially had in mind – ‘Agnes Lahens’, ‘John Norton’, ‘Mildred Lawson’ – would have corresponded exactly to Balzac’s structure (the young girl, the priest, the ‘bad’ sibling).¹⁸ Balzac’s provincial French setting is replaced with Sussex bourgeois society in the first two novellas, both of which were revised from already existing texts and further reworked in Moore’s later collection *In Single Strictness* (1922; reproduced in Volume 5 of this edition). The much shorter ‘Agnes Lahens’ is the only story originally, and exclusively, written for *Celibates*; it was never revised, and its place was later taken by ‘Sarah Gwynn’, the tale of a reluctant and unhappy nun. It is in what Madeleine Cazamian called his ‘solides études documentaires’¹⁹ and Jean Noël his ‘Naturalisme “psychologique”’,²⁰ his profound psychological scrutiny of – and, importantly, empathy with – the mental, spiritual and sexual anguish of the late-Victorian celibate that Moore’s book differs most from, and in force and concentration by far surpasses, Balzac’s. The flip-pant *fin-de-siècle* credo and androgynous pose Moore embraced in *Confessions* – ‘I am feminine, morbid, perverse. But above all perverse; almost everything perverse interests, fascinates me’²¹ – found its most compelling expression in *Celibates*, acting on his contemporaries in much the same way that all things perverse did on him: as a source of horrible, irresistible fascination. ‘It is a queer age we live in’, commented the *Bookman*:

We are sentimental over physical suffering. We protect children and animals from blows, give opiates to the sleepless, invent painkillers and anaesthetics, and put as many hindrances in the way of vivisection as we can. But there are no restrictive laws, and there is evidently little indignation, against a book that tortures every sensitive mind, that wounds, and keeps the wounds open for tedious scrutiny, that brings no opiate at all, and but little promise of future relief.²²

Writing at the other end of the spectrum, from the naturalist point of view, William Dean Howells confirmed that what gave these stories their importance and dreadful appeal was ‘their naked truth, which is very, very naked now and then.’²³ This was precisely, argued Max Meyerfeld (Moore’s German translator),²⁴ what accounted for

Moore enjoying a greater reputation abroad; as a psychological anatomist he lacked any 'specifically English quality'.²⁵

One of the 'naked truths' Moore's clinical eye laid bare to the reader's captive imagination was that individual psychological malfunction frequently had its origins in an impaired family rapport; an idea that Sigmund Freud was exploring at the time. All of the characters in *Celibates* share a troubled relationship with their parents: Mildred Lawson's sense of alienation can be traced back to her contempt for her mother and the early death of both parents;²⁶ Norton's psychosis too is symptomatic of an unresolved mother complex, complicated by the death of his father; and Agnes Lahens's retreat behind convent walls reflects an infantile desire to return to the womb of the 'good' mother in a situation in which neither parent is able to offer emotional stability. The conflict-laden child-parent experience which shapes the characters' psychological development, predestining them for what Brendan Kennelly has called 'the problem of loneliness',²⁷ disabling them from forming or sustaining fulfilling sexual relationships in adulthood, is displaced into a fixation with physical chastity. If the spectacle of maternal adultery exacerbates the threat of sexual harassment for Agnes (pointedly named after a martyr renowned for her chastity even when exposed to the threat of violation), Norton, too, feels imperilled by the loss of his inviolability: 'chastity had never afflicted him; it had ever been to him a source of strength and courage. Chastity had brought him peace of mind, but the passion to which he had in a measure yielded had robbed him of peace of mind, and had given him instead weakness, and agitation of spirit and flesh' (p. 161). To Mildred, even more than to Norton and Agnes, 'her chastity was her one safeguard, if she were to lose that, she had always felt ... that there would be no safety for her. She knew that her safety lay in her chastity, others might do without chastity, and come out all right in the end, but she could not: an instinct told her so' (p. 92).

The stylistic device of repetition in Mildred's speech may indicate some of the intensity of the psychological impasse Moore wished to convey in his depiction of the celibate, male and especially female, determined to protect her or his bodily and hence mental autonomy while being susceptible to physical desire, a desire that was then displaced into art, religion and, in Mildred's case, something altogether more reprehensible. It was this 'chaste depravity',²⁸ the concurrence of sensuality and sexual resistance (conceptualized as frigidity in the emerging language of psychosexology) in a character who tapped into topical cultural debates about the New Woman – the young, educated, middle-class woman in quest of self-development and a life of her own: a degenerate for some, a force for social reconstruction for others – that most divided Moore's contemporary reviewers. 'Mildred Lawson' was pronounced either a scam, vulgar and disgraceful of the author,²⁹ or a 'masterpiece',³⁰ comparable to Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* – if only, as Henry Harland lamented in the *Yellow Book*, Moore had paid more attention to style.³¹ Julia Frankau (writing under the pseudonym of Frank Danby), a one-time friend who had already satirized him in *A Babe in Bohemia* (1889), voiced her condemnation in terms which prompted a heated rep-
artee from Moore in the pages of the *Saturday Review*: "Mildred Lawson" is worse

than a bad story: it is a good story deliberately spoiled. Mr. Moore has wrenched the word "celibacy" from its meaning; in his hands it becomes merely incontinency.³² Her objection was to the representation of female prurience: unlike Agnes Lahens, Mildred was not an 'innocent' in any sense of the word, nor did she lack any sensual impulses; she deliberately provoked sexual responses in her victims in order better to enjoy the spectacle of their frustration and humiliation; this indicated a perverted sexual drive on Mildred's part and had nothing to do with celibacy. Piqued, Moore responded by referring Frankau to the Latin roots of the word:

celibate is not derived ... from 'celestis,' but from 'coelebs,' which means single life, unmarried state. Mildred Lawson is therefore a celibate in the one true and only sense of the word. She is the real demi-vierge, that combination of sexlessness and sensuality which go to make a type sufficiently common to justify artistic treatment. This type and the disasters which follow in its wake appear in my story for the first time in fiction; and for the first time in journalism a critic has undertaken to criticize a book the meaning of the very title of which she is unacquainted.³³

This is a barbed comment. As Adrian Frazier suggests, Moore may have played the role of Mildred in Frankau's own life, edging her on with lusty conversation but backing out of any physical involvement when his bluff was called.³⁴ If this was the case, then to charge her with not knowing the meaning of celibacy (in his sense, the unmarried state; in hers, sexual continence) would have added insult to injury. Hence perhaps Frankau's angry response that 'Mildred ... is nauseous and unconvincing. Her sentiments ... and her conversation ... are mere pegs on which Mr. Moore has hung immodest suggestions.'³⁵

Not surprisingly, women journalists and writers likely to be categorized as New Women themselves responded to Moore's portrait of the modern, Ibsenite 'disagreeable girl'³⁶ with more acerbity than their male colleagues. In 1916, when a second generation of New Women was claiming greater sexual freedom for itself, Susan Mitchell, who had her own axe to grind, was still defensive in her verdict: 'Mildred Lawson is a very clever study of a feminine George Moore ... "Celibates" is one of Mr. Moore's books that I should leave alone.'³⁷ This sentiment was not shared by the emerging generation of modernist men; James Joyce, then living in Trieste, translated the first chapter and attempted to find an Italian publisher for the book.³⁸

'Mildred Lawson' (*Celibates* / *Lady's Pictorial*) and 'Henrietta Marr' (*In Single Strictness*)

The opening story of *Celibates* is often read through the lens of Moore's abortive relationship with the novelist and playwright Pearl Craigie, the woman behind the *nom de plume* John Oliver Hobbes, and the author of *Some Emotions and a Moral* (1891), *The Sinner's Comedy* (1892) and *The School for Saints* (1897).³⁹ If Mildred was 'one of the most interesting and one of the most complex women' Henry Harland professed to have come across in fiction,⁴⁰ Craigie appears to have been one of

the most intriguing, and, as Moore later said, 'the only [truly] disagreeable woman [he] ever knew' in real life.⁴¹ His impressions of her (named 'Agate') and an account of their ill-fated affair are related in the 'Lui et Elles' section, Chapter II of the Carra edition, of *Memoirs of My Dead Life*.⁴²

From a wealthy American Protestant background, Craigie was, at the time of their first meeting, engaged in divorce proceedings against her husband Reginald who, as a physically violent man with a history of syphilis,⁴³ appeared to have issued straight out of the contemporary New Woman novel.⁴⁴ At home in fashionable social and artistic circles, Craigie enjoyed a reputation as a sparkling conversationalist and epigrammist à la Wilde. While disposed to engage in the pleasures of intimate flirtation, she had no intention of jeopardizing her social position (compromised as it was already by the divorce court); the physical relationship Moore craved held no appeal for her (Moore later admitted that he had not paid any attention to her coded warnings).⁴⁵ Given her marital legacy, it may not be all that surprising that Craigie's interest in sex might have been exclusively cerebral; nor was it uncommon for the intelligentsia of the period to combine elaborate discussions of sex with a strict adherence to conventional morality; Karl Pearson's Men and Women's Club is a case in point.⁴⁶ There is little doubt that Craigie encouraged Moore, but he also badly misjudged the signals.

After an initial exchange of letters initiated by 'John Oliver Hobbes' in December 1893, Moore caught fire as soon as he was alerted to his fellow writer's female identity. Their correspondence developed speedily amidst plans for authorial collaboration on two comedies, *The Fool's Hour* and *Journeys End in Lovers Meeting*.⁴⁷ An intense flirtation was conducted via letters and frequent, often prolonged, meetings and outings in the early months of 1894, but when Moore urgently and insistently pressed for more, she dispatched him; probably, so Moore maintained, because of her growing interest in a more attractive proposition – Lord Curzon,⁴⁸ then Secretary of State for India, soon-to-become Viceroy of India, a fervent anti-suffragist who would eventually assume the presidency of the Anti-Suffrage League. There is no doubt that Moore was profoundly hurt, even less doubt that he was furious about his casual dismissal:⁴⁹ sentiments which vented themselves in his mordant portrait of Mildred Lawson.

Though Moore protested to Lena Milman that 'the character was not drawn from one model',⁵⁰ the references to Craigie are numerous: like Morton Mitchell's, Moore's first impression of a rather 'dowdy' woman was quickly superseded by enamoured enthrallment;⁵¹ in conversation Craigie recalled a hapless professor so desperately in love with her, while all the time living with another woman, that he was driven to suicide; when the two women met, Craigie received a harsh dressing down.⁵² Like Mildred, Craigie was always lavishly and extravagantly dressed, often in the style of Watteau;⁵³ preferred the company of men, confessing that she could not 'live without men's society; if I am deprived of it for a week I begin to wilt';⁵⁴ and was a convert to Catholicism. In the process of fictionalization Moore shifted the sequence of events, such as Mildred's conversion, with the effect of her greater

incrimination: in the words of Adrian Frazier the story is 'a first-rate piece of character assassination.'⁵⁵ By the time he revised the story (now called 'Henrietta Marr') for its second book version, *In Single Strictness* (1922), Moore had renewed grounds for cynicism. In 1904 there had been a rapprochement between the two writers, who had again collaborated on a number of plays, which Craigie had then proceeded to treat as her sole intellectual property.⁵⁶

Perhaps it was because Craigie displayed such crafty business sense and single-mindedness in her exploitation of artistic alliances that her fictional alter ego had to be exposed as a consummate artistic failure. A profoundly cold-hearted individual, Mildred is depicted as a woman in search of the authentic emotion she is incapable of experiencing and hence of translating into art: 'She wished to feel, she longed for the long ache of regret which she read of in books, she yearned for tears' (p. 47); 'perhaps some of these days she would meet some one who would make her feel. She hoped so, she wanted to feel. She wanted to love ...' (p. 55). The story is presented as a study of female hysteria and degeneration, reflecting Moore's personal and professional ambivalences not simply towards Craigie individually, but more generally towards contemporary women artists and their struggle for artistic and sexual autonomy. In this respect Moore's novella articulated concerns also expressed by other male writers like Rudyard Kipling, whose 1891 novel *The Light That Failed* presents an even more dismal account of the woman artist's destructive impact on gender relations and male artistic endeavour.⁵⁷ In her incarnation as Henrietta Marr Mildred's character is given harsher treatment. In her twentieth-century configuration she has very few genuine artistic aspirations at all, but, like a lesser Becky Sharp, poses as an artist in order to rise in society: 'if one has not a title', she tells her brother at the outset of the story, 'one has to do something, to write a book or paint a picture. But what I don't understand are people with titles bothering themselves about books or pictures – why aren't they satisfied with their titles?'⁵⁸ Once the coveted title is brought within reach via extensive flirtation with a French count in possession of an ailing wife, she drops her artistic plans and friends in pursuit of an advantageous match; when the wife dies and the count shows no inclination to oblige, she swallows poison, in a dramatic scene which recalls the ending of *Madame Bovary* as well as a number of New Woman narratives.⁵⁹ This dénouement can be read as another merciless reflection on Pearl Craigie, who suffered a fatal heart attack in 1906, at the age of 39, some weeks after the death of Lord Curzon's bedridden wife: an unexpected finale to Craigie's candidly avowed marital aspirations, and one which Moore was convinced amounted to suicide.⁶⁰

While less unscrupulous about her social ambitions, Henrietta's 1895 incarnation, Mildred, nonetheless fails in her artistic goals because for her, too, art is not born from a sense of vocation or inner necessity but primarily serves as a means to an end: in this case art is a justification for circumventing the conventional female career of wife and mother. The story begins with the 20-year-old Mildred's sleeplessness one hot summer night, depicting her intense desire, evoked through references to her burning sheets and 'the aching smell of lilies' (p. 7)⁶¹ – a desire not, as the

reader might infer, directed towards a male object, but rather to the exciting prospects opened up by a bespectacled, dowdily dressed Oxford woman graduate with cropped hair, a Mrs Fergus whom she met at a dinner party the night before. In *A Modern Lover* the realist writer Harding, a mouthpiece of Moore the artist, blames 'these confounded women, with their poetry, their art, their aspirations' for the demise of contemporary art;⁶² in 'Mildred Lawson' it is precisely such a woman who is responsible for Mildred's awakening into narcissistic self-absorption and artistic dilettantism. For what might have spelt the first stirrings of Mildred's sexuality is channelled into a yearning for self-liberation which consolidates her hostility towards men and the thought of all bodily relations.⁶³ As Mildred ruminates:

There was something in life which forced all girls into marriage, with their will or against their will. Marriage, marriage, always marriage – always the eternal question of sex, as if there were nothing else in the world. But there was much else in life. There was a nobler purpose in life than keeping house for a man. Of that she felt quite sure, and she hoped that she would find a vocation. She must first educate herself ... (p. 9)

She wished to live for something; she wished to accomplish something; what could she do? There was art. She would like to be an artist! She paused, astonished at the possibility. (p. 8)

Mildred, whose parents are both dead, lives with her older brother Harold in Sutton, a country seat in provincial Sussex. He is a devoted heir to the family business, a London distillery; she is increasingly bored by the monotony of keeping house and listening to her brother's business talk. As in a conventional marriage, the relationship has fossilized into ritualized disputes. Little wonder perhaps if the glimpse of a different lifestyle provided by Mrs Fergus begins to take hold of a mind desperate to occupy itself: 'There is nothing for me to do here' (p. 11); 'how I hate housekeeping! How I hate Sutton! ... I should like to have a house in London and be presented at court ... I know I should succeed in society' (p. 12). As Harold is reluctant to invest in a fashionable London house, she decides to take up a pursuit which will allow her to leave her by now stifling home. Art thus comes to stand in for the purpose and occupation that is absent from her life; art, she believes, will fill her empty days and provide her with a *raison d'être*.⁶⁴

To Arnold Bennett, writing as 'Barbara' in *Woman*, Mildred Lawson appeared a 'typical' specimen of contemporary womanhood: she represented 'that numerous class of suburban women, who, mysteriously stirred by the *zeitgeist*, and finding themselves without occupation and without monetary anxieties, strive to fulfil themselves in the pursuit of art'.⁶⁵ In the event, however, the text's invocation of the New Woman, with her emphasis on education, a purposeful life, self-realization, and female companionship, serves to expose feminist contemporary discourse as hypocrisy concealing blatant self-interest. Initially Mildred feels oddly attracted to the idea of the all-female environment of a women's college, is fascinated by Mrs Fergus's stories about girls enjoying themselves 'danc[ing] with each other, and never [thinking]

about men' (p. 8), and is intrigued by Mrs Fergus having felt the need to apologize to her friends for her marriage (p. 8).⁶⁶ Yet when she takes up her private art studies Mildred soon tires of female company, especially that of drab New Women like Mrs Fergus, and instead prefers to spend her time with her love-stricken art teacher, the impoverished painter Ralph Hoskin, whose advances she encourages until they begin to interfere with her independence. Later, in Paris, she is only too keen to join the men's studio (controversial on account of its nude model) rather than being what she considers 'cooped up' (p. 31) with the women. In her ready assumption that 'whatever men do is the best' (p. 31) as much as in her creative sterility Mildred illustrates Moore's verdict, in *Modern Painting*, that women

do not penetrate below the surface, and if they attempt to do so the attempt is but a clumsy masquerade in unbecoming costume. In their own costume they have succeeded as queens, courtesans, and actresses, but in the higher arts, in painting, in music, and literature, their achievements are slight indeed – best when confined to the arrangements of themes invented by men – amiable transpositions suitable to boudoirs and fans.⁶⁷

It is indeed the art and artifice of the boudoir at which Mildred excels. One of her most capable, albeit unfinished, studies is a copy of Jean-Baptiste Greuze representing 'the soul of a courtesan in the body of a virgin' – a narcissistic object of desire, for Mildred recognizes herself in the painting: 'She was like that; and, inspired by the likeness between herself and the picture, Mildred took up her charcoal and continued her drawing' (p. 47). The juxtaposition of sexual innuendo and naive innocence in Greuze's two variations on the theme, *The Broken Pitcher* (1763) and *The Broken Jug* (1785),⁶⁸ correlates with aspects of Mildred's own personality and anticipates her subsequent incarnation as *Bal Blanc*, the sexually beguiling and yet technically 'innocent' writer of daring society columns in whose room Harold stumbles across a pornographic book. In Greuze's painting a girl with an angelic face and the barest hint of a smile, her ruffled bodice exposing her left breast, presses an object (presumably the broken jug, symbol of her lost maidenhood), hidden within a cloth, against her body in a way which invokes her (clothed, hidden) pudenda. The implication is that Mildred, a 'Vestal vampire',⁶⁹ knows exactly what she is about sexually when she plays the innocent in her serial seductions and then rejections of men.

Narcissistic and self-absorbed, Mildred can see and reflect only herself, and becomes an ever more accomplished actress after honing her skills on Ralph, who dies of disappointed love (not, however, without satisfying his more earthly desires with a mistress). In the course of her journey she progresses from the landscape painter Morton Mitchell to the corrupt parliamentarian and socialist publisher M. Delacour, and from second-rate attempts at painting to society gossip, drawing-room intrigue and shady financial deals (Harold is almost more shocked about her involvement in the Panama scam than about her apparent immorality). She affects a spiritual conversion, presumably to ingratiate herself with and distract the invalid Mme Delacour while pursuing the attentions of her husband. When M. Delacour's

financial speculations fail and her money is lost among accusations of corruption and adultery, she returns home, a shadow of her former self: now, at last, not only willing but indeed desperate to marry almost anyone. Mildred's consummate failure in all of her endeavours appears rooted in her fundamental lack of authenticity and her inability to step out of her icy self-containment. In a circular movement the text ends with a sleepless night, the prospect of a marriage to a man she does not love and who proposed to her only for her money's sake, and the invocation of the passion the desire for which she had always repressed: 'She threw herself over and over in her burning bed, until at last her soul cried out of its lucid misery: "Give me a passion for God or man, but give me a passion. I cannot live without one"' (p. 114).

The female artist, Moore implies, is bound to fail if she denies her body; if, as he wrote in *Modern Painting* in anticipation of Virginia Woolf, 'she will not tell the truth about herself' and her body.⁷⁰ The contemporary feminist belief that '[t]here is no sex in art'⁷¹ and that '[i]n the studio a woman puts off her sex' (p. 65) is misappropriated by Mildred in her sterile flirtations: it is with statements like these that she aims to draw attention to herself as a woman. The notion of art being sexless is, the text suggests, fundamentally mistaken. It is precisely *because* she is incapable of inscribing her sex into her art (which itself is a result of her wilful suppression of her sexuality) that Mildred fails as an artist.

The inevitable failure of the female artist who is unable to project herself and her sex into her art is reflected in the later 'Henrietta Marr' version of the story. Significantly Henrietta is unable to capture the feminine in her painting. In Paris, she draws from a male model under male instruction and, while anything but an inspired student, produces passable results, albeit with tremendous effort. However, when, back in Britain, she sets out to paint a motif based on her imagination and attempts to depict a young female musician (a symbolic representation of the woman artist), she fails to breathe life into the figure, and after repeated failure is forced to acknowledge her artistic impotence. On her return to France, she rejoins her friends only to announce her withdrawal from art and to attach herself to high-society circles instead.

Henrietta's or Mildred's alienation and dissociation from her body is manifested in her response to nature. When Mildred joins an artist community in the village of Barbizon, near Fontainebleau, and takes a stroll through the wood with the painter Morton Mitchell, the uncontrollable wilderness of the place frightens and repels her:

Their way lay through a pine wood where the heat was stifling; the dry trees were like firewood, scorched and ready to break into flame; and their steps dragged through the loose sand. And, when they had passed this wood, they came to a place where the trees had all been felled, and a green undergrowth of pines, two or three feet high, had sprung up. It was difficult to force their way through; the prickly branches were disagreeable to touch, and underneath the ground was spongy, with layers of fallen needles hardly covered with coarse grass. (p. 74)

'Stifling' and 'scorching' heat which threatens to burn her, 'prickly' and 'disagreeable' objects which obstruct and assail her; a 'spongy' and 'coarse', almost swamp-like surface which might engulf her – this is clearly not the celebratory bodily response of a Tess of the d'Urbervilles and augurs badly for Morton's chances of success as a prospective lover. Morton, like Mildred, reads the forest in sexual terms, but her alarm and repulsion are contrasted with his sensual arousal. The tall tree trunks rising above them which appear to her 'like plumed lances' (p. 75) to him assume the aspect of feminine erotic pliability: 'And how beautifully that beech bends, what an exquisite curve, like a lance bent in the shock of the encounter' (p. 75). An enchanted wood in his eyes, worthy to be peopled with nymphs and fauns, a 'great temple, hushed in the beautiful ritual of the sunset' (p. 75), it represents 'a great green prison' (p. 76) to Mildred, a place where deadly duels are fought and casualties are inevitable. Significantly, the couple encounter a snake-charmer who shows them his beautiful pair of vipers, only to disclose that he is on his way to a vivisectionist (p. 75). And yet, when Mildred shortly after decides to abandon Barbizon, art and Morton (the latter amidst accusations of attempted rape) in order to launch into a new, socially more upmarket life with the wealthy and influential Delacours, the storm that orchestrates her and her friends' departure from the village signals the collapse of any possibility of bodily fulfilment with the one man who might have aroused the passion in her which she has always craved:

the earth gave forth a rumbling sound and was lifted beneath their feet. It seemed as if subterranean had joined with aerial forces, for the crumbling sound they had heard as they ran through the scattered pines increased; it was the roots giving way; and the pines bent, wavered, and fell this way and that. But about the rocks, where the girls crouched the trees grew so thickly that the wind could not destroy them singly; so it had taken the wood in violent and passionate grasp, and was striving to beat it down. But under the rocks all was quiet, the storm was above in the branches, and, hearing almost human cries, the girls looked up and saw great branches interlocked like serpents in the writhe of battle.

In half an hour the storm had blown itself out. But a loud wind shook through the stripped and broken forest; lament was in all the branches, the wind forced them upwards and they gesticulated their despair. The leaves rose and sank like cries of woe adown the raw air, and the roadway was littered with ruin. (p. 86)⁷²

This atmospheric, naturalist-impressionist description of the storm-tossed forest carries evident symbolism: it spells the death of Mildred's potential for authentic sexual self-realization. Thereafter Mildred banishes herself to hothouse life indoors, until social ruin strikes in the form of the Delacours' political demise. The only time Mildred is seen venturing outside again, in the tamed and contained garden of her Sussex home, coincides with her brother's fatal heart-attack and the hasty proposal by and acceptance of a snubbed ex-fiancé who discovers Harold's body and hence Mildred's monetary desirability before anybody else does. Thus Mildred is trapped within her own web of deceits, a 'trivial toy made of coloured glass' broken under the impact of her stubborn denial of her body and its desires (p. 83).

The psychological study of the female celibate, the woman who lives 'in the shallow of vanity',⁷³ is also a study in personal cathartic release. Yet, while Moore evidently invested the *Celibates* version of Mildred Lawson and *In Single Strictness's* Henrietta Marr with recognizable traits of Craigie, the *original* protagonist and story were conceptualized in markedly different terms. Brendan Fleming recently discovered an earlier, serial version of the 'Mildred Lawson' story,⁷⁴ published in the *Lady's Pictorial* in 1888,⁷⁵ a good five years before Moore and Craigie met for the first time. This version differs significantly from the later texts. Like the *Celibates* version it also begins with a sleepless summer night, but here Mildred is much more genuine and earnest in her desire for an education and a purposeful life. Whereas the later Mildred is primarily propelled by the pleasure principle, her earlier incarnation is in thrall to her moral responsibilities: whether in painting or in keeping up a correspondence with her brother, she has 'a duty to perform' (10 March 1888, p. 290; see also 3 March, p. 279; 17 March, p. 291). The Mildred of *Celibates* merely pretends to embrace socialism and Catholicism in order to gain access to M. Delacour without alienating his religious wife; in contrast, the *Lady's Pictorial* protagonist is genuine in her fervent partisanship for the poor, and is indoctrinated into socialist radicalism by Mrs Fargus's friend, Mlle Thierry, and her father, M. Thierry, who own the radical newspaper *La Voix du Peuple*. The father-and-daughter pair here assume the role of the Delacours in the *Celibates* version of the story, and the Comte de Malmédy and his wife in 'Henrietta Marr'. Even before Mildred makes the acquaintance of the Thierrys she has a sense of social inequality and attacks the economic system on which her own and her brother's wealth is founded:

Beautiful place! I hate the place, I hate it – a nasty, gaudy, vulgar place, in a vulgar suburb, where nothing but money-grubbing is thought of from morning, noon, till night – how much percentage can be got out of everything; cut down the salaries of the *employés*; work everything on the most economic basis; it does not matter what the *employés* suffer so long as seven per cent dividend is declared at the end of the year. I hate the place. (18 February 1888, p. 272)⁷⁶

This might signal the social pretentiousness of the upwardly mobile middle-class daughter embarrassed by her mercantile origins, and in the later versions of the story and especially in 'Henrietta Marr' this is certainly the case. Here, however, Mildred's contempt for the 'money-grubbing' bourgeoisie is attached to a germinating political consciousness. Unlike the later Mildred she is engaged in charity work, and in contradistinction to the conventional philanthropic lady she has become weary of a social system which condemns so many people to irretrievable misery: 'I am tired of visiting the poor ... There is no end to it, no result – the people remain poor all the same' (25 February 1888, p. 272). This is fertile ground for demagogues like Mlle Thierry, who urges her to throw her protégés over and embrace socialist political activism instead:

what you do is like trying to empty the sea with a thimble; it is a drop in the ocean; you relieve the misery of one, two, three, or six – I will say a dozen – families. What is that? Nothing. It is as if you were to rub a little ointment on a leaf of an enormous tree that is incurably rotten at the root; better strike with the axe, cut it down. (3 March 1888, p. 280)

It is, however, not until her artistic plans have floundered that Mildred throws in her lot with the Thierrys. As in the later versions, she moves to Paris to study under a French master, but here she capitulates much more abruptly after coming to the conclusion that, despite grinding work and absolute dedication, she can produce nothing that is not 'stiff and lifeless as a doll' (3 March, p. 280). It is at this point that she moves in with the Thierrys. The single most dramatic difference between this and the later versions of the story is that there are no love affairs. Not only is Mildred not a flirt, but she actively suppresses a genuine attachment to a young fellow-painter for fear of getting distracted from her work. Just as her commitment to art was absolute, so now her commitment to the Thierrys and their cause becomes the purpose of her life. Despite Mrs Fargus's hints about Mlle Thierry's exploitative attitude ('she would like to see people giving a little of their own before talking of giving away other people's property', 3 March, p. 281), Mildred steps in without a moment's hesitation and hands over her inheritance when the socialist newspaper of the Thierrys threatens to fold. Her devotion to the Thierrys can be read as a displaced family romance: this is an alternative family with a 'sister' or even youthful mother to whom she can look up and whose work – unlike Harold's – she can wholeheartedly support; and though a love-object, M. Thierry is not a lover but replaces the lost father, a father loyally and lovingly nursed. The later character of the unscrupulous, cold-hearted fraudster is foreshadowed not in Mildred, but in Mlle Thierry, who assembles crowds of male admirers, enjoys the excitement of delivering rousing political speeches without compromising herself through active commitment of any kind, and otherwise is perfectly content with living comfortably out of other people's pockets. She ends by embezzling the money Mildred has poured into the newspaper, which inevitably collapses, hastening the death of M. Thierry. The object of Moore's authorial irony here is not so much the emotional trickster and would-be artist as the female socialist: the very protagonist of many female-authored and feminist novels of the time.⁷⁷ And yet in the face of her evident exploitation Mildred experiences her new life as her happiest and most fulfilled, gloriously purposeful time. She assumes the editorship of the paper and launches into euphoric activity. When her alarmed brother hastens to Paris to urge her to reinvest her money in a safer outlet, he faces a new woman in the literal sense of the word: the 10 March 1888 illustration in the *Lady's Pictorial*⁷⁸ depicts a physically unconfined, unbonnetted, rationally dressed professional woman busy at work at her desk, her confident and expansive body language leaving the reader in no doubt about just how much Mildred has changed from her first appearance in the 18 February instalment as a heavily corseted, constrained, nervous lady trapped within the domestic sphere.⁷⁹ Having come into her own, Mildred has turned into a physically more appealing variant of Mrs Fargus, whose poor