

## Robert Browning and Mick Imlah: Forming and Collecting the Dramatic Monologue

John Morton

One could be forgiven for thinking that the young but very active field of neo-Victorian studies is exclusively concerned with fictional and filmed narratives. However, just as the poetry of the Victorian age resonates in the most unlikely of places, from films such as *Hellboy 2* (2008) and *Skyfall* (2012), both of which feature readings from Tennyson, to the extract from Tennyson's "Ulysses" reproduced on the wall of the London 2012 Olympic Village,<sup>1</sup> so it endures in contemporary poetry, both in quotation but also in terms of form. Contemporary poets, not least Carol Ann Duffy, have returned in a general way to one of the poetical forms (if it can be termed a form) most associated with the Victorians, the dramatic monologue. The two poets I will focus on in this article Mick Imlah, along with the older Anthony Thwaite, neither of whom has had a great deal of academic attention paid to their work until now,<sup>2</sup> come to the act of writing and collecting the Browningsque dramatic monologue from a standpoint which in recent years has been specifically defined as neo-Victorian by critics such as Ann Heilmann, Mark Llewellyn, and Marie-Luise Kohlke. In assessing their neo-Victorian returns to the composition and collection of dramatic monologues, I will consider their engagement with the nineteenth-century tradition of focusing such poems on marginal figures, while maintaining a sense of self-awareness at the artificiality of the form. I will briefly consider how the dramatic monologue affords Thwaite the opportunity to voice figures from the Victorian past who might have disappeared forever before moving on to a longer study of how Imlah follows this model at times but also expands it to consider the interrelation of England (often represented by Oxford) and Scotland, and their literary and intellectual heritage.

The poetry such as I discuss here has been something of a neglected area of neo-Victorian studies. Ann Heilmann and Mark Llewellyn's recent *Neo-Victorianism: The Victorians in the Twenty-First Century, 1999-2009* (2010), focuses near-exclusively on fiction in prose and on celluloid, and in its definition of the term, the focus is clear:

[T]he "neo-Victorian" is *more than* historical fiction set in the nineteenth century. To be part of the neo-Victorianism we discuss in this book, texts (literary, filmic, audio/visual) must in some respect be *self-consciously engaged with the act of (re)interpretation, (re)discovery and (re)vision concerning the Victorians*. (4)

Though the collection does not claim to be exhaustive, and is clear in stating the limits of its focus, it is far from atypical in its centring on works of prose fiction. Though the prospectus of *The Journal of Neo-Victorian Studies* specifically includes poetry in its scope, it has as yet has not published a single article which focuses purely on verse, while publishing special issues on adaptations of Dickens and Steampunk, along with many articles on other works of prose fiction. In one of the earliest theorisations of the cultural phenomenon, Sally Shuttleworth identified the "Retro-Victorian" novel, and in a later theorisation of the term, Andrea Kirchknopf exclusively focused on works in prose.

This focus is understandable, given the proliferation of neo-Victorian novels and films in the last twenty or so years and to an extent matches the indelible association, in terms of popularity and historical resonance, between the Victorian age and prose fiction. Neo-

Victorian fiction has consistently demonstrated an interest in the verse of the period; but, as Kohlke claims in passing in her introductory essay to the first issue of *Neo-Victorian Studies*, despite the ability of novels such as A. S. Byatt's *Possession* to "reanimate the period's poetical imagination and voices", poetry itself "can arguably do the same more resonantly and with greater versatility" (6). As yet very few articles have investigated the resonance and versatility of neo-Victorian poetry, and this article will demonstrate that contemporary poetical responses to Victorian verse manifest key contributions to our understanding of not only the neo-Victorian phenomenon but also afford an insight into the twentieth-century reception of Victorian poetry.

Despite the dramatic monologue being the most significant poetical innovation of the Victorian period, and one which is still in widespread use today, scholars are still no clearer about its boundaries, its typical features, even its appearance on the page, and indeed most attempts at definition in recent years have focused on its hybridity and complexity, a form which should perhaps not be defined as a single entity. Dramatic monologues are at once some of the most obviously crafted of all literary forms, and yet at the same time are literally meant to be representations of, to steal Wordsworth's phrase, a man (or a woman) speaking to men (and/or women). Wordsworth and Coleridge's *Lyrical Ballads* itself contains at least one dramatic monologue of sorts, "The Complaint of a Forsaken Indian Woman", and the form has been traced back through Alexander Pope to Shakespeare and even earlier writers. Yet its association with the Victorian age is clear – dictionaries of literary terms invariably cite Alfred Tennyson and Robert Browning among its foremost practitioners (see Baldick 97 and Cuddon 553 for instance). Glennis Byron, building on the work of Isobel Armstrong and Kate Flint, has recently offered an alternative to the dominance of male writers on histories of the form. She focuses on the work of Letitia Landon and Felicia Hemans, noting that the form afforded female writers the opportunity for their work to be considered as something other than simply "an outpouring of personal feeling" (Byron 47). The increase in interest in female-authored dramatic monologues since the 1980s has seen critics unable to deny the centrality of figures such as Hemans, Landon, and Barrett Browning to the development of the form (and indeed to nineteenth-century poetry in general); a representative dramatic monologue in anthologies is now as likely to be Barrett Browning's "The Runaway Slave at Pilgrim's Point" as it is her husband's "Porphyria's Lover". However, the most significant late twentieth-century poetical engagements with the form have been inspired chiefly by the dense, difficult, and highly crafted monologues of her husband.

To understand how Mick Imlah responds to the Browningsque dramatic monologue, we need to examine its salient features – chiefly, self-consciousness and a focus on the marginal, before considering the "afterlife" (or otherwise) of the form, and focusing on the work of Anthony Thwaite, published soon before Imlah began writing in the form. From the earliest monologues, it is clear that poets have been concerned with its potential artificiality. John Woolford and Daniel Karlin note that Robert Browning edited poems such as "Paracelsus" and "Mr Sludge, the 'Medium'" extensively in a bid to excise rhymes, amending the latter to avoid two nearby lines "ending in 'more,' which is problematic in a blank verse poem" (Woolford 25-6). However, the latter is not bereft of lines ending in rhymes; in fact at several points Sludge, in his own words, "turns poet". Most directly this happens near the end of the poem, where we read:

*Fine, draw the line  
Somewhere, but, sir, your somewhere is not mine!*

Bless us, I'm turning poet! It's time to end.  
How you have drawn me out, sir! (Browning V, 336, 1182-1185)

Sludge here claims that his interlocutor has managed to elicit his "true nature", yet it is hard to believe that Sludge is not in full control of his account from start to finish. The decision that it must be "time to end" this fairly lengthy account now that the blank verse of the monologue has spilled over into rhyming couplets is a self-aware joke on Browning's part, linking it to his earlier monologue "How it Strikes a Contemporary", whose penultimate line runs, "Well, I could never write a verse, – could you?"; this follows an account, in verse form, of the "one poet" the narrator had come into contact with in his life (Browning V, 277, 114.). This is allied with the ironies in Sludge's claim to having been "drawn out" – a literal gesture towards his fictionality, having been "drawn" by Browning's pen, in the manner described by the narrator of Browning's "Popularity": "Stand still, true poet that you are! / I know you; let me try and draw you" (V, 119, 1-2).

These gestures are not simply moments of self-aware humour, but are also acknowledgments of the oddity of the form, whereby a speaker gives an account of themselves, usually with a fictitious listener present or imagined, generally unaware of their own presence in verse. Late twentieth-century criticism of the dramatic monologue has been characterised by arguments that, to quote Alan Sinfield, the true characters of the speakers are "unwittingly revealed" through a form they are, more or less, unaware of existing within (7). More recently, Cornelia Pearsall, while writing chiefly about Tennyson, has argued for something close to the opposite – that the act of oration in monologues is in fact "highly intentional" on the part of speakers who "desire to achieve some purpose"; the speakers of monologues, for her, very often "do attain their goals in some measure" (23).

In "Bishop Blougram's Apology" we can see both Sinfield and Pearsall's ideas as having merit; Blougram does reveal his focus on material pleasures above all else, which must be at least in part unwitting, but at the same time he is very carefully manipulating the development of his argument. He goes into some detail discussing the idea of artistic creation and specifically the art of Shakespeare, and in his rhetorical negations ("If I'm no Shakespeare, as too probable") he betrays his intimations of kinship (Browning V, 311, 499). These intimations are deeply questionable – his boast of reading Shakespeare's words "bound in gold, (he never did)" betrays his focus on the enjoyment of material pleasures as opposed to the true pleasures of art – yet he has an answer to this, as so often he does, doubting that "if fate allowed, / He would not have them also in my sense" (Browning V, 312-3, 532-544). Blougram ends this section of his "Apology" with the contentious idea of Shakespeare ultimately "losing" the "game" to Blougram, "if this life's all", since he failed to secure the same kinds of material wealth as the Bishop; but he of course believes that "this life" is *not*, in fact, all (Browning V, 313, 554).

Browning's monologists often use rhetoric to convince the fictional audience not only of their own story, and potential virtue, but also to convince the reader of their own existence. This attempted self-validation is often a result of their status in society. Valentine Cunningham has recently noted of Browning's characters:

Browning's people tend to be in some way or another on edge, on the fringe – in scholarship, music, art, religion, and marriage. He's immensely drawn to failures, dropouts, flouters of convention of every sort, errant thinkers and poets and artists [...]. But it's the more clearly morally transgressive person he goes for most [...] sinners all; people of the moral margin, in the gutter with Sludge. Or with Fra Lippo

Lippi, the painting monk, a wonderful complex of low stuff, of waste matters and marginalities; the boy from the social margin, a street urchin [...]. [...] [Browning's characters are] distressing people in all sorts of distress [...]. (206)

Although Browning's speakers are not as frequently marginal as, for instance, the speakers of Elizabeth Barrett Browning's monologues, this focus on the "edges" is inherently linked to the ideals Browning had for the form. Isobel Armstrong summarises Browning's "democratic" aesthetics in noting that his poetry "decentres both speaker and reader, questioning the authority of both. It dramatises but does not concede to the power relations of communication and interpretation, showing them in operation and enabling a democratic access to their complexities" (288-9). The combination of this "democratic" difficulty with a focus on marginal figures, might explain, in part, the relative unpopularity of Browning's work until late in his lifetime. However, the combination might also explain the ultimately enduring influence of the dramatic monologue, and indeed of Browning's influence on the monologue, chiefly its awareness of its own artificiality, a focus on marginal characters, as well as the difficulty of understanding the monologue, which will be the foci of the rest of this article.

Though a quintessentially Victorian form, the influence of the dramatic monologue is clear in the work of writers from the twentieth century. Modernist poets tended to loudly proclaim their disdain for Victorian verse, yet tended to focus their scorn on forms other than the dramatic monologue. Ezra Pound wrote in 1917 that the form "is the most vital of that [Victorian] period of English," specifically praising Browning's monologues for their "intensity" (419-20). T. S. Eliot was inspired by the form as well, perhaps most clearly in his abandoned first draft of a Dickens-inspired title for *The Waste Land*, "He Do the Police in Different Voices" (5). This continuation of interest might help explain the rehabilitation of Victorian verse more generally after the Second World War, where after Ina Beth Sessions's 1947 *PMLA* article on the form came Robert Langbaum's book-length consideration in 1957. This in turn paved the way for a comparative surge of interest in the 1970s, with a 1974 reprint of Langbaum quickly followed by Alan Sinfield's 1977 appraisal of the form and, in the same year, Frances Bridges Carleton's book on the same topic. This mirrors renewed attention to Victorian culture more broadly in the 1960s and 1970s – witness several British exhibitions dedicated to Victorian artists in the 1960s and 1970s,<sup>3</sup> along with novels such as John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969) and the nods to the Victorian in 1960s pop songs, such as the Beatles' "Being For the Benefit of Mr. Kite!"

This revival was accompanied by (or perhaps helped to inspire) the curiosity of practicing poets, not least Anthony Thwaite who published *Victorian Voices* in 1980. Earlier in his career, Thwaite seemed to adhere to the standard Modernist narrative of verse in English – his *Essays in Contemporary Poetry: Hopkins to the Present Day* (1957) decries Tennyson's "Ulysses" for its lack of "inner tension," thanks to Tennyson's "mind moving in regular blank verse because it is easy for it to do so; technique has become habit" (17). Thwaite here might well have Gerard Manley Hopkins's letter on Tennyson's "Parnassian" poetry in mind, which Hopkins thought "does not sing", as it is spoken "on and from the level of a poet's mind" (23-4). Thwaite's opinions on poetry seem heavily influenced by those of F. R. Leavis in *New Bearings in English Poetry*, which argued that twentieth-century English poetry needed to follow Hopkins "along some other line than that running from the Romantics through Tennyson, Swinburne, *A Shropshire Lad*, and Rupert Brooke" (25-6). Leavis might well have had more time for Browning than Tennyson, but the former's poetry was still, for Leavis, lacking in "adult intelligence" (20). Following Leavis's line of thinking, Thwaite

allies Browning with Tennyson, noting that, although “Saul” “appears to move vigorously”, “two or three readings will begin to convince one that here, too, is a mind which has fallen into a set pattern because it requires no effort” (*Essays* 17-18).

By 1984, Thwaite’s youthful Leavisism had faded somewhat, and in a companion to a television series entitled *Six Centuries of Verse*, Thwaite presented Tennyson as a “story-teller”, and linked Browning to him, labelling him potentially “even more copious than Tennyson. But his best poems [...] are like strangely self-contained incidents from some lost play: a moment of reflection or self-revelation from which we, the audience, have to grasp what surrounds it” (*Centuries* 175). For Thwaite, when we read “My Last Duchess”, “immediately we are plunged into the snobbish and unscrupulous manoeuvring of this odious man – a speaking likeness from the past come to life” (*Centuries* 176). This seemingly newfound enthusiasm might well be a result of Thwaite’s frequent recourse to the dramatic monologue throughout his career – in poems such as “Mr Cooper” (1963), “Ali Ben Shufti” (1967), and most notably in *New Confessions* (1974), a book-length verse biography of St Augustine of Hippo, entirely written in the first person (though frequently organised as prose poetry and feeling more inspired by Modernist monologues than Victorian). Thwaite’s 1984 reappraisal of Victorian poets, though, is surely most heavily influenced by his 1980 publication of *Victorian Voices*, which brought fourteen non-fictional Victorian figures “to life”, in Browningsque fashion, generally at moments of “reflection or self-revelation”. It thus forms a collection of voices, in Browningsque fashion. Perhaps the most obvious nods to Browning in this collection can be found in “The Potter’s Field”, voiced, as Thwaite’s notes tell us, by Edward Bingham, an Essex potter whose son (the “young Edward” referred to in the poem) “specialized in extraordinary fanciful – and frequently ugly – variations on medieval earthenware” (*Voices* 32, 42). Thwaite’s poem begins with a clear allusion to “My Last Duchess” and its Duke’s tour of his art collection:

Here, sir, a fine display of bravery  
And fortitude, all rendered out of clay –  
Here’s Caius Mutius holding his right hand  
Within the fire, showing Porsenna  
The firmness of the Roman character;  
On the reverse, the maid Cloelia  
Selecting from the youthful hostages  
Whom Porsenna will liberate. A piece  
Noble and highly wrought, you will agree. (*Voices* 35)<sup>4</sup>

These showy references to classical subjects are a demonstration of the general Victorian veneration of the cultures of the past, and also a less direct reference to Browning’s own frequent recourse to the Renaissance and its rediscovery of classical civilisation. The poem is also voiced, at least at first, in a self-confident tone of ostentation in the manner of Browning’s Duke of Ferrara (down to the final line in this extract echoing “Which Claus of Innsbruck cast in bronze for me!” [Browning III, 202, 56]). This is one of two poems in Thwaite’s collection voiced by an artist, and both poems seem to be self-conscious commentaries on particularly Victorian artistic practices. The other, “The Studio”, is loosely based on Lawrence Alma-Tadema, and the speaker ostentatiously dismisses Impressionist art, “these Frenchmen and these Dutch [...] / Vogues will come and go / As they have always done” (*Voices* 28). Like Browning’s artist monologues, whose discussions of art are rooted in the Renaissance but are intended to apply just as easily to the act of artistic composition in the Victorian period and indeed beyond, Thwaite’s “The Studio” *seems* to be concerned

exclusively with the period of its setting. Yet it carries a knowingness about posterity that highlights both the self-delusion of the speaker but also ironically reflects Thwaite's knowingly "unfashionable" adoption of a seemingly outdated Victorian form, and his own potential future obscurity.

The speaker of "The Potter's Field" tails off from cataloguing the wonders of the collection he is trying to sell to a visitor, launching into a grim vision of "the crocks" gathering "dust in crumbling sheds, / Back-ends of warehouses, a bankrupt's stock" (*Voices* 36-7). However, the speaker is, as Thwaite tells us in his notes, a "devout and fervent Evangelical", and the poem concludes by looking towards the day when:

The Master Potter works his mystery,  
And every fragment to its fragment's joined. (*Voices* 37)

This, despite the generally foreboding tone of decay and destruction, is one of the more hopeful endings of Thwaite's 14 poems, which frequently conclude with an air of resignation, perhaps most clear in "From the Villa Massoni", about "Ouida", the popular novelist, which actually ends after her death:

[L]ike a Florentine princess  
I lie in Bagni, dead, unread, my name  
A half-romantic joke, something to see  
If tourists can be bothered to search out  
A deaf custodian with a rusty key.  
[...] The iron bell-handle's broken: when you pull,  
The dogs grow hoarse not at the sound of it  
But at the unfamiliar, painful smell  
Which men call Life. And I am out of it. (*Voices* 39)

The poem is not only about physical death, but also literary death, given the rhyme of "dead, unread" which might also allude to Thwaite's own potential literary grave; this could well be an act of identification with the vanished, or vanishing, Victorians, which atones for Thwaite's earlier anti-Victorianism. Thwaite here exhibits an interest in the past which Kevin J. Gardner identifies throughout his career, noting his "impulse to remember that which has been dismembered (as well as forgotten)" (53). He also frequently dwells on the contemporary desire to "possess" the past – Ali Ben Shufti, for instance, deals in stolen relics and antiques, "and for fifty piastres I give you a past to belong to" (Thwaite, *Collected* 78). Thwaite appears to have chosen his Victorian subjects precisely because they had *not* endured in the cultural or historical consciousness into the late twentieth century. Thus the sense of irony surrounding their situation, as well as the fictional attempt at resurrection, can be safely labelled as early neo-Victorian, adhering fairly precisely to Heilmann and Llewellyn's idea of a phenomenon "*self-consciously engaged with the act of (re)interpretation, (re)discovery and (re)vision*".

In 1999, the legacy of this engagement on Thwaite's subsequent career was clear to him. He conducted a book-length interview with Ian Hamilton and Peter Dale, in which he was asked about which collection marked his "high point", and he replied in a slightly tangential manner that *Victorian Voices* was "the book [of his that] people like" – perhaps indicating his unease at being remembered for this collection as opposed to others (Thwaite, *Conversation* 50-51). In the same interview, Thwaite also noted that the inspiration for starting the collection was his wife Ann's research into the life of Edmund Gosse, which was published in 1984. This

might explain Gosse's father, Philip Henry,<sup>5</sup> being the first "voice" the reader encounters in *Victorian Voices*, and along with him Thwaite presciently selected many then-obscure Victorians whose stars would rise over the next 30 years; Eliza Lynn Linton and "Ouida" have had many of their novels reissued in recent years.

Anthony Thwaite was a well-established fixture in contemporary poetry by 1980, and, at this point, other, younger writers were also working with the quintessential Victorian form. Interviewed in 1983, Mick Imlah, then just beginning his poetic career while undertaking graduate research in Oxford, said of the situation he and other British poets found themselves in:

Today's poet is a bit like a Victorian architect; there's no single staple native style available (as, say, the heroic couplet was for Pope) so he has to choose a model for each piece of work: Middle Pointed Gothic, neo-Egyptian, blank verse, this or that kind of stanza, silly one-word lines, whatever. Everyone knows it isn't the real thing, that there's an element of exercise about it, but it's better than rubble. I don't like poems which look like rubble. And I think this self-consciousness and versatility is a good thing in poetry; unlike a town, a book of poems looks better for a mixture of styles. (Jenkins 57)

Despite this ostensible formal playfulness, in Imlah's work the dramatic monologue (in one incarnation or another) dominates, and even in this passage we can see a hint of Browning's letter to Forster where he says that *Men and Women* is comprised of "a number of poems of all sorts and sizes and styles and substances" (qtd. in Armstrong 294). Imlah had been interested in Victorian literature ever since his school days, with a former teacher identifying Hopkins and Swinburne as particular favourites (Piggott 41). However, the upsurge of interest in Barrett Browning, Hemans, and others did not have a particularly direct impact on his writing. The verse he published in maturity seems to be more obviously inspired by two other male poets – Tennyson (who is the subject of an extended "elegy" written for the centenary of the poet's death in 1992) and Browning. Imlah's approach to the dramatic monologue is inspired by Victorian innovations but also a self-conscious gesture towards the past, and future, of the form itself.

Imlah's first published collection of poems, entitled *The Zoologist's Bath and Other Adventures*, appeared in 1982, on a very small-scale, hand-printed Oxford press run by John Fuller. The titular poem is a tightly-controlled Browningsque monologue in which the zoologist in question, the fictitious Arthur William Woolmer (one notes the parody of Victorian names here – Arthur mirroring Hallam and the craze for Arthuriana, and Woolmer seemingly taken direct from the sculptor), is sitting in his bath, trying to prove his thesis that "land species, having descended from sea-going forms, would arrive to return to their original element," with a "crowning race" the "merman" (Imlah, *Birthmarks* 57). The Zoologist in question outlines his theories, finishing by hypothesising that Jesus, himself, might have been a fish:

– Did He walk on water? Did He need to?  
And secondly, what emblem did they choose,  
His persecuted followers, and why?  
And does not man aspire to that? Do I?  
I wrinkle, underwater, in ten minutes.  
Before the hour, I shall have a fin. (61)

This poem can be seen to form an early part of the neo-Victorian movement, which, given its tendency towards “subversion, homage, and [...] social commentary,” often focuses on the oddities and strangenesses of Victorian culture, and containing within it a nod to more recent forms – the final “fin” a nod, potentially, to French cinematic tradition (Bowler and Cox 1). Imlah’s conclusion, with a scientist using his deeply questionable theories to try to prove something about a religious figure, is an outlandish gesture towards the conflict between science and religion explored in a more straight-faced fashion by Tennyson in *In Memoriam* and Browning in the “Epistle Containing the Strange Medical Experience of Karshish, the Arab Physician”; rather than reflecting on his myriad “strange” experiences, as Karshish does, the zoologist is trying to *prove* one imagined theory. The link to Victorian verse, as well as Victorian culture, can not only be seen through the dramatic monologue form, but also in an echo of Tennyson in the line “I wrinkle, underwater, in ten minutes,” which corresponds to “I wither slowly in thine arms” from “Tithonus”, itself a dramatic monologue (Tennyson II, 607, 6).

The early 1980s saw a dramatic surge in interest in marginal subjectivities, and giving voices to the marginal and oppressed, inspired, in part, by Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1979) and its focus on the control of narrative. The desire for authentic voices generated by Said’s work is ironised in the obviously crafted artificiality of *The Zoologist’s Bath and Other Adventures*; indeed, the collection consists entirely of first-person monologues,<sup>6</sup> including “Quasimodo says Goodnight”, a meditation on beauty voiced by Hugo’s nineteenth-century creation. No wonder, perhaps, that Peter Porter (who is, perhaps not entirely coincidentally, included in the acknowledgments to Thwaite’s *Victorian Voices*), reviewing it in the *Observer*, thought it “Browning in the world of Hammer films” (qtd. in Fuller 18). The prevalence of dramatic monologues in Imlah’s oeuvre has led to his being labelled a “‘persona’ poet” in one of the few scholarly articles dedicated to his work (Kirsch 10).

The nineteenth-century focus, and the dramatic monologue form, is slightly more muted in Imlah’s first book-length collection, *Birthmarks* (1988), which nonetheless includes all the poems from *The Zoologist’s Bath and Other Adventures*, along with monologues including “Cockney”, voiced by a working-class Londoner turned classical musician who cannot quite escape his roots, and “Goldilocks”, where a young, arrogant geneticist finds a tramp in the room he has been allocated after a conference in Oxford. These early monologues are bravura performances, without question, but little more links them together than a potential desire to expose the artificiality of the idea of voice, a delight in the form and a desire perhaps to out-weird the Victorians in subject matter.

If Imlah’s voice (and those of his narrators) stood out in the late 1980s, it must have been all the stranger that he published so little in the following decade, despite being appointed Poetry Editor of the *Times Literary Supplement* in 1993, a position he held until his death in 2009. A volume of *Penguin Modern Poets* appeared in 1995, whose pages Imlah shared with Glyn Maxwell and Peter Reading, yet it was made up primarily of poems from *Birthmarks*, with only “Past Caring”, a short poem about alcoholism (not his only poem on the subject), and a long sequence entitled “Afterlives of the Poets” added. Yet, much like Alfred Tennyson (the subject of one of the “Afterlives” poems) and his patient, painstaking compilation of *In Memoriam* over 17 years, so Imlah was working through the 1990s and 2000s on his second collection, *The Lost Leader* (2008). Its publication saw his reputation as one of the most important poets of his generation cemented, not least for its focus on a central theme – as Jamie McKendrick puts it, the collection is “a compendious, subtle meditation on the nature and matter of Scotland, from the historically well-worn to the most arcane” (1001).



Reviews of *Birthmarks* tended to focus on Imlah's having studied and taught at Oxford (the latter for two spells, 1984-5 and 1986-8). Witness Robert Crawford's verdict on *Birthmarks*, that the poetry therein is "often strongly attached to a certain donnish milieu from which it derives part of its brilliance"; for Crawford, its "best things tend to come when Imlah allows himself to be airlifted from the SCR into a world of strange imaginative clarity" – this in a review of Imlah and other contemporary poets which focused on the idea of "home" (23). Crawford ended his review with an appreciation of "Goldilocks," where the aforementioned geneticist evicts the Scottish tramp from his room, "scuttling him off with the push of a boot," and once the man has been driven out, thinks "Och, if he'd known *I* was Scottish! Then I'd have got it" (Imlah, *Birthmarks* 19). Perhaps in response to this same section, Angus Calder, in *Scotland on Sunday*, observed that "Few people thought Mick Imlah, who teaches at Oxford, was a 'Scottish poet'" (qtd. in Imlah, *Leader* 61). Imlah chose this phrase to preface the poem "Namely" in *The Lost Leader*, which compares Imlah's "mongrel and seeming-Islamical M. IMLAH" with "'Angus Calder': it might have been piped by the Black Watch / or lowed by the Tweed [...]" (Imlah, *Leader* 61). Imlah later jokily makes reference to Brooke's "The Soldier," saying "there's a primary school near Edinburgh / that part of me never left," calling himself "a prophet in black-face, fellow / to all those souls who have taken the bait of the Englisher Ashmole" (Imlah, *Leader* 61-2).<sup>7</sup> Imlah's awareness of the ironies of his situation can be located in the epigraph to the collection as well – he quotes Edwin Muir, who claims that "no poet in Scotland can take as his inspiration the folk impulse that created the ballads, the people's songs, and the legends of Mary Stuart and Prince Charlie" – more or less all of these topics are covered in his collection (Imlah, *Leader* n. pag.).

His status as literally marginal – both insider and outsider, a privately-educated poet of the Oxford SCR who is also fiercely proud of his Scottish roots – is surely alluded to in "Sweetheart". This poem (not a dramatic monologue) concerns a meeting in some kind of afterlife of the "Sweet Sixteen" club of alumni of Balliol College, Oxford, affording Imlah the opportunity to dwell on the story of the founding of the college, by John de Balliol, who was married to Dervorgilla of Galloway, and whose son would become King of Scotland (the title stems from Devorgilla building Sweetheart Abbey, near Dumfries [Imlah, *Leader* 15]). Imlah chose Balliol, at least in part, as it demonstrates a Scottish presence at the heart of one of the oldest English educational institutions, and the list of alumni in attendance is prestigious, even if not treated with much reverence; for instance, Jowett appears:

clutching a can of breathing ether,  
But unassisted; now in his hundred-and-forties,  
More bird than man, more fossil coot than either (Imlah, *Leader* 15)

Other alumni in attendance include Cardinal Manning, Gerard Manley Hopkins, A. C. Swinburne, Matthew Arnold, Hilaire Belloc, and G. K. Chesterton. The last pair of these are seen rooming together after the celebratory dinner, where we find "Belloc awake, cursing the human lot," as his "indigestive / Room-mate" tries to "tiptoe from their bedside to the loo," attempting to walk in a "delicate" manner but letting out a "*fart*" at the crucial moment (Imlah, *Leader* 17). This is immediately juxtaposed with a vision of Belloc at Sweetheart Abbey, where he is walking "Out from the Cloisters of the Tender Heart" – the irreverence of the scene is further enhanced by the clear rhyme between "*fart*" and "Heart," undermining Belloc's dreams of grandeur and importance while at the same time underlining the poeticity of the final scene.

This esoteric, jokey poem about Oxford sees Imlah coming close to writing exactly what he had implicitly been criticised for in the *London Review of Books*, yet being placed in *The Lost Leader* saves it from the fate of somewhat irrelevant irreverence, demonstrating as it does the Scottish roots of an English institution.<sup>8</sup> There is also a link to Browning here: his friendship with Jowett led to his being appointed Honorary Fellow in 1867 and he was a frequent visitor to the college, which holds a substantial collection of donated Browning manuscripts. The poem is also a performance of Imlah's position on the margins of Oxford – at once well-informed of its history and intellectual traditions, while deeply ambivalent about the seriousness of both.

If the interest in England, Scotland, poetry, and scholarship in Imlah's collection is clear from "Sweetheart", it nonetheless contains more thoroughgoing considerations of the relationship between Scotland and England, not least the dramatic monologue "Rosebery". In its form, this is something of a roles-reversed response to "Bishop Blougram's Apology", with Gigadibs, a non-speaking presence in the earlier poem, replaced by a journalist called "Modicum", who narrates the vast majority of "Rosebery". Therein this journalist, with his fairly unlikely name, recalls his interview with Archibald Primrose, fifth earl of Rosebery, who was Prime Minister of the UK from 1894 to 1895, and a late Victorian celebrity. The poem must be narrated before 1929, since the poem's epigraph ("Archibald Primrose, 1847 – ") shows that Primrose is still alive at the time Modicum is narrating (Imlah, *Leader* 70).

"Rosebery" is, like the Browning poem before it, an exploration of the idea of worldly fame and legacy. We are perhaps prepared to be underwhelmed by the poem's opening line – "I'm not suggesting he was Oscar Wilde,/ if I say, we all quoted him"; this frequency of quotation is due to Rosebery's penchant for coining soundbites in speeches, like "*nation of amateurs*" (Imlah, *Leader* 70). Modicum recalls that shortly before his audience with Rosebery, the latter has suffered a stroke, and the journalist is nervous, imagining him as fitting the role of "the headstrong general, / let down, scathing of both sides" (Imlah, *Leader* 73). This is a slightly odd analogy to use in a poem narrated and set in the years immediately following the Great War, and might tell us something about the carelessness of this narrator's thoughts. It seems clear from Modicum's planned questions that he is not exactly going to conduct a difficult interview. He plans to ask (the italics are Imlah's own, indicating Modicum's belief that the confident questions belong to a projection of himself as serious journalist):

*Do you regret your ministry was not  
a longer one – though so much was achieved?  
- or, Was it the splits within your own party,  
or the Irish crisis, more, that brought you down –  
no – that we should blame the more for your  
untimely exit? (Imlah, Leader 74)*

The deference encoded in the questions seems unnecessary, even for a man in retirement who has suffered a stroke, demonstrating Modicum's own lack of security and his very definitely unprofessional partiality; one might think back to Browning's Bishop, who consistently insists on Gigadibs "despising" him (Browning V, 293, 13). In contrast, Modicum is immediately won over – on arriving at Rosebery's house in Epsom, he meets "his amazing daughter," reflecting on "the way this being shone in her station [...]" (Imlah, *Leader* 74). The fleeting attraction ("I watched the daisies on her dress") is short-lived as she ushers him through to meet Rosebery himself, and Modicum is too dazzled to heed the warning "don't let him start on the spring flowers!" (Imlah, *Leader* 74). The marginal is again emphasised – Primrose's status on the margins of intelligibility, and Modicum's status as an outsider who is

all too easily overwhelmed by contact with what, in his eyes, is greatness (and its subsequent incarnations). This leads to the arrival of Modicum in Rosebery's presence:

Yet when I knocked  
And entered he was already talking in that  
Maimed magnificent voice, emphatically, as if  
To a nurse or a second invalid concealed  
Round the dog-leg of the sports or morning room;  
To someone who had gone too far  
With *primula*, as a name – “a silly name”;  
And “If I call them primroses, it is  
Because that is *exactly* what they are”. (74-5)

The attempt to control language – specifically, the surname Primrose – seems grimly ironic in light of his apparently imaginary audience. Yet this might also be a self-conscious reference to the strangeness of the dramatic monologue form itself, in which no audience is necessarily fully suggested and when the statements in such a form are essentially a guide to understanding one, usually fictional, individual, who often gives slightly too much away to his or her audience, no matter his or her verbosity, and no matter their rhetorical intent. Imlah includes in “Rosebery”, too, a brief allusion to Browning’s “Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came”, which begins, “My first thought was, he lied in every word” (Browning V, 248, 1) – early in “Rosebery” we read “My thoughts were, then, that men should not be seen / in either of those two colours” (71). Allied to this is an implicit discussion of John Ruskin’s pronouncement, in his observations on the “pathetic fallacy”, of the true nature of a poet. Ruskin claims that men “who are not poets at all [...] [do not] feel”; to these men “the primrose is very accurately the primrose, because [they] do not love it”. Ruskin goes on to say that the poet “of the first order” is one who “perceives rightly in spite of his feelings, and to whom the primrose is for ever nothing else than itself – a little flower apprehended in the very plain and leafy fact of it” (66). Rosebery’s certainty surely leaves him in the class of those who “are not poets at all,” yet the certainty of his near-scientific classification leaves the possibility open that he might yet be one. Imlah’s interest in the marginal here allows for both possibilities.

“Rosebery” is a commentary on Victorian poetry and culture, and their twentieth-century legacies. The usual narrative of neo-Victorian postmodernity is of a self-aware demonstration of a debt to the past which simultaneously announces a presence in the modern, or postmodern world.<sup>9</sup> The ostentatious strangenesses of Imlah’s earlier monologic encounters with the Victorian makes way in *The Lost Leader* for a more reflective and literary-critical creative response to the life, and afterlife, of the Victorian age. This is squarely Victorian in its form – Imlah here follows Thwaite’s example in choosing a real-life Victorian figure as the focus of his poem, but in “Rosebery” Imlah presents the Victorian figure in the post-Victorian world of 1919, going against the neo-Victorian grain which usually visits the forms on the age itself (as, in fact, Imlah himself did in “The Zoologist’s Bath”). It is not the Victorian who voices the monologue, though he does get the last word, but instead it is the younger man, the twentieth-century journalist Modicum, a literal *visitor*, who narrates the majority of the poem. He is a representative, despite his apparent loyalty to Rosebery, of the twentieth century, yet narrates in recognisably Victorian style, in a blank verse dramatic monologue.

If “Rosebery” is, then, to a phrase Imlah used in relation to the narrators of his poems, “a statement made by someone” (Jenkins 59), it feels as though Modicum is as unwittingly, or

partially unwittingly, self-revelatory as one of Browning's monologists (or Tennyson's): there is little sign here of Cornelia Pearsall's idea of epiphanic oratory (23). Imlah here seems to be demonstrating, through poetry, that the twentieth century – or at least the early twentieth century – was rather more Victorian in form and fixations than one might first have imagined. This demonstration comes through a dramatic poetical performance that is, in its very form, taking a stance against the kind of “rubble” Imlah so disliked in poetry and demonstrating the continuing possibilities afforded poets by a form that is indelibly associated with the Victorian age.

The poem named “The Lost Leader” in Imlah's collection shares its title with Browning's angry 1845 response to Wordsworth's political “betrayal,” but Imlah's lost leader is a more fully political figure – Bonnie Prince Charlie. The loss here not personal to the poet, as Wordsworth's was for Browning, even if Browning's poem on Wordsworth features many references to a collective “us”. Imlah's poem is narrated almost entirely by a loyal Jacobite soldier (one of the “followers to the bone”, in his own words), reflecting on the Prince's desertion of his troops at Ruthven barracks. The utterance has an intended audience – or at least, an intended addressee – the Prince himself. The monologue section of the poem ends with a comparison of the soldier's retreat with that of his leader:

The fire of belonging was out.  
 I saw my way, sticking  
 The course of the Tromie,  
 Up to a poor shift made  
 Between rain and wood,  
 And yours: west down channels  
 Of last-ditch loyalty;  
 To France at last, your safety,  
 Prince, Your Highness,  
 Your brandy, gout and syphilis. (Imlah, *Leader* 43)

Both this poem and “Rosebery” are narrated by a loyal follower, though Rosebery's narrator seems still in awe of his “leader” of sorts, while that of “The Lost Leader” is disaffected and betrayed. This is a relatively rare instance of an Imlah dramatic monologue having a traditional ending – in the manner, say, of Fra Lippo Lippi's “Zooks!”, which might also make “The Lost Leader” something of an adherent to Pearsall's idea of a dramatic monologue as a piece of oratory (Browning V, 196, 392). If we think back to Browning's poem, too, the word “lost” resonates – with both Prince Charlie and Wordsworth having decided to abandon their causes, rather than simply losing their way.

Isobel Armstrong recently charted the diverse genres which make up just the first few poems of *Men and Women*, in an effort to demonstrate the range of that collection as well as the importance of reading it in order (“Platitudes”), and Browning seems to have had a clear overall structure in mind for the collection, as he says in “One Word More”:

There they are, my fifty men and women  
 Naming me the fifty poems finished! (Browning V, 141, 1-2)

Armstrong has elsewhere noted that there is an overall coherence to the collection, as its central project “is the investigation of cultural fictions and the form in which they are constructed”; this allows Browning “to explore a multiplicity of modern ideological myths, fictions and forms of thought, and the conditions under which they are created” (*Victorian*

*Poetry* 290-1). Both Imlah and Thwaite viewed the dramatic monologue *collection* as a means to conduct far-reaching investigations of cultural fictions. Thwaite provides us with a typically neo-Victorian collection of voices – those marginalised from traditional histories of the age, collected together in a characteristically nineteenth-century form, generating a work which is, to again quote Heilmann and Lllewellyn, “*self-consciously engaged with the act of (re)interpretation, (re)discovery and (re)vision concerning the Victorians*” (4).

*The Lost Leader*, albeit not made up exclusively of dramatic monologues, follows a roughly chronological historical narrative, detailing various events and characters which together form a polyphonic portrait of Scotland in verse. This is conducted, as often as not, through the form of the dramatic monologue. There is no doubt that the voicing of the poetry, so deliberate, owes something to Imlah’s fellow Scot, Robert Burns. Yet Imlah’s voices are more disparate in their identities and historical situations than the (again performed) voices we find in Burns, perhaps following Browning’s lead in, as Herbert F. Tucker has suggested, using the monologue in order to provide “a remarkably complex moral valuation of imaginary speakers apprehended in dense historical and cultural particularity” (622). To a certain extent this Scottish reincarnation, or ventriloquism, of Browning pre-empts recent work on the Victorian poet as less patriotic than the canonical “Home-Thoughts, from Abroad” might suggest. As Alison Chapman has noted, “the speaker’s self-consciousness flags the voice from the start as fictive and constructed, both teasingly offering the lyric as authentic patriotism and signaling a parodic double meaning that scrutinizes and critiques the parody” (471). Imlah seems to be providing poetical voices to the dispossessed of British history – the Scottish – at the same time as emphasising their artificiality.

Imlah and Thwaite are openly self-conscious in their returns to the Victorian age and its forms; and in their collecting these poems into volumes, they both pay homage to the endurance of Robert Browning’s practice. However, in focusing so clearly on Browning as opposed to the myriad other Victorian monologists, they might also form part of a central problem in neo-Victorian writing; if the voice of Browning still resonates, in formal terms, through their verse, they are in a sense reinscribing Browning’s canonical dominance and are thus somewhat at odds with general critical movements in Victorian poetry post-1980, which have seen critics begin to challenge Browning and Tennyson’s status as the two most important Victorian poets. Nonetheless, in their (undoubtedly self-aware) attempts to voice the marginal through the dramatic monologue, they demonstrate the continuing possibilities afforded by the form to facilitate communication between the past and present, and in this they surely merit consideration in neo-Victorian studies alongside novelists such as Sarah Waters, Michel Faber, and A. S. Byatt.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> For more on *Hellboy 2* see Morton, *Tennyson*, 143 and Miles, 160; for *Skyfall* see Tate, “To Strive”; for the Olympic plaque see Tate, “Last Lines”.

<sup>2</sup> Notable scholarship on Imlah includes articles by Kirsch, Morton’s “No-one,” and the special issue of *Oxford Poetry* 13.2 (2009); on Thwaite, see Gardner, and Garlick; and on “neo-Victorian poetry” more generally see Miles (149-170).

<sup>3</sup> For instance, Ford Madox Brown in 1964, Millais in 1967 and Holman Hunt in 1969, all at the Walker in Liverpool, and Dante Gabriel Rossetti at the Royal Academy in 1973.

<sup>4</sup> One notes here that Thwaite is happier than Browning to include hints of rhyme in his blank verse monologues.

<sup>5</sup> Ann Thwaite would go on to publish his biography in 2002.

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps the furthest Imlah strays from the form are the internally-narrated “Jealousy” and “Abortion.”

<sup>7</sup> This poem requires a working knowledge of Oxford history; “all those souls” encodes All Souls College; and Imlah was a “Junior Fellow” of Magdalen College; Elias Ashmole founded the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

<sup>8</sup> These roots are evident to this day – for instance, the Snell Exhibition is an annual award offered by Balliol exclusively to graduates of Glasgow University.

<sup>9</sup> One thinks here of John Fowles, whose *The French Lieutenant’s Woman* is Victorian-set and -styled but whose narrator cites Roland Barthes (95).

### Works Cited

- Armstrong, Isobel. “Browning’s Generic Platitudes.” Re-Assessing the Dramatic Monologue in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Browning, Before, Beyond.” Royal Holloway, University of London, 28 June 2012. Conference Presentation.
- . *Victorian Poetry: Poetry, Poetics and Politics*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.
- Baldick, Chris. *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.
- Bowler, Alexia and Jessica Cox. “Introduction to Adapting the Nineteenth Century: Revisiting, Revising and Rewriting the Past.” *Journal of Neo-Victorian Studies* 2.2 (2009/2010): 1-17. Web.
- Browning, Robert. *The Complete Works of Robert Browning Vol. III*. Ed. Roma A. King, Morse Peckham, Park Honan, and Warner Barnes. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1971. Print.
- . *The Complete Works of Robert Browning Vol. V* ed. Roma A. King, Jack W. Herring, Park Honan, Arthur N. Kincaid and Allan C. Dooley. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1981. Print.
- Byron, Glennis. *Dramatic Monologue*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Carleton, Frances Bridges. *The Dramatic Monologue: Vox Humana*. Salzburg: Inst. f. Engl. Sprache u. Literatur, 1977. Print.
- Chapman, Alison. “Robert Browning’s Homesickness.” *Victorian Poetry* 50.4 (2012): 469-484. Print.
- Crawford, Robert. “Calaloo.” *London Review of Books* 20 Apr. 1989: 22-23. Print.
- Cuddon, J. A. *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin, 1992. Print.
- Cunningham, Valentine. *Victorian Poetry Now*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. Print.
- Eliot, T. S. *The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts*. Ed. Valerie Eliot. New York: Harcourt, 1971. Print.
- Fowles, John. *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*. London: Vintage, 2004. Print.
- Fuller, John. “The Early Poetry of Mick Imlah.” *Oxford Poetry* 13.2 (2009):13-21. Print.
- Gardner, Kevin J. “The Poetry of Anthony Thwaite: an Archaeology of Belief.” *Literature and Theology* 23.1 (2009): 51-68. Print.
- Garlick, Barbara. “The Message from Her: Anthony Thwaite’s *Victorian Voices* and George Meredith’s *Modern Love*.” *Victorian Turns, Neo-Victorian Returns*. Eds Penny Gay, Judith Johnston and Catherine Waters. Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2008. 193-204. Print.
- Heilmann, Ann, and Mark Llewellyn. *Neo-Victorianism: The Victorians in the Twenty-First Century, 1999-2009*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. Print.

- Hellboy 2*. Dir. Guillermo del Toro, Guillermo. Universal Pictures, 2008. Film.
- Hopkins, Gerard Manley. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: Selected Letters* ed. Catherine Phillips. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Print.
- Imlah, Mick. *Birthmarks*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1988. Print.
- . *The Lost Leader*. London: Faber and Faber, 2008. Print.
- Jenkins, Nicholas. "Interview with Mick Imlah." *Oxford Poetry* 1.2 (1983): 55-58. Print.
- Kirchknopf, Andrea. "(Re)-Workings of Nineteenth-Century Fiction: Definitions, Terminology, Contexts." *Journal of Neo-Victorian Studies* 1.1 (2008): 53-80. Web.
- Kirsch, Adam. "The Subtle Scotsman." *New Criterion* 29 (2011): 9-12. Print.
- Kohlke, Marie-Luise. "Introduction: Speculations on the Neo-Victorian Encounter." *Journal of Neo-Victorian Studies* 1.1 (2008): 1-18. Web.
- Langbaum, Robert. *The Poetry of Experience*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1957. Print.
- Leavis, F. R. *New Bearings in English Poetry*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1950. Print.
- McKendrick, Jamie. "Contemporary Poetries in English: 2." *The Cambridge History of English Poetry*. Ed. Michael O'Neill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 988-1004. Print.
- Miles, Rosie. *Victorian Poetry in Context*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. Print.
- Morton, John. "'No one remembers you at all': Mick Imlah and Alan Hollinghurst Ventriloquising Tennyson." *Journal of Neo-Victorian Studies* 6.1 (2013): 22-40. Web.
- . *Tennyson Among the Novelists*. London: Continuum, 2010. Print.
- Pearsall, Cornelia. *Tennyson's Rapture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.
- Piggott, Jan. "Mick Imlah at Dulwich." *Oxford Poetry* 13.2 (2009): 40-44. Print.
- Pound, Ezra. *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*. Ed. T. S. Eliot. London: Faber & Faber, 1954. Print.
- Ruskin, John. *The Literary Criticism of John Ruskin*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Da Capo Press, 1965. Print.
- Sessions, Ina Beth. "The Dramatic Monologue." *PMLA* 62 (1947): 503-516. Print.
- Shuttleworth, Sally. "Natural History: the Retro-Victorian Novel." *The Third Culture: Literature and Science*. Ed. Elinor S. Shaffer. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. 253-268. Print.
- Sinfield, Alan. *Dramatic Monologue*. London: Methuen, 1977. Print.
- Skyfall*. Dir. Sam Mendes. MGM and Sony Pictures, 2012. Film.
- Tate, Gregory. "The Last Lines of 'Ulysses.'" *Tennyson Research Bulletin* 10.1 (2012): 66-70. Print.
- . "'To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield': Tennyson, 'Ulysses', and the Olympics." *Surrey English Blog*. 2 Aug. 2012. Web. 15 Oct. 2013.
- Tennyson, Alfred. *The Poems of Tennyson*. Ed. Christopher Ricks. Harlow: Longman, 1987. Print.
- Thwaite, Anthony. *Anthony Thwaite in Conversation with Peter Dale and Ian Hamilton*. London: BTL, 1999. Print.
- . *Collected Poems*. London: Entiharmon, 2007. Print.
- . *Essays on Contemporary English Poetry*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1957. Print.
- . *Six Centuries of Verse*. London: Times Methuen, 1984. Print.
- . *Victorian Voices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980. Print.
- Tucker, Herbert F. "Elizabeth Barrett and Robert Browning." *The Cambridge History of English Poetry*. Ed. Michael O'Neill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 617-634. Print.
- Woolford, John and Daniel Karlin. *Robert Browning*. London: Longman, 1996. Print.