

“LET ERIN REMEMBER”: A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE JOURNAL OF THOMAS MOORE

by Wilfred S. Dowden

Thomas Moore began his Journal in 1818 and made almost daily entries in it until 1847, when failing health prevented his maintaining it further. After his death the manuscript formed a substantial portion of Bessy Moore's inheritance. In 1852, Longman, Green and Company offered his widow £3000 for the Journal and correspondence, provided that Lord John Russell, Moore's friend and literary executor, edit the work. In spite of his very pressing political duties, Lord John agreed to do so.

In the years 1853-1856, Russell published the *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of Thomas Moore* in eight volumes. The "Memoirs" consists of an autobiography written late in life covering the years of Moore's youth, while the "Journal" includes entries for the years 1818-1847. Russell published a newly edited and abridged edition of the *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence* in 1860, which is based on the 1853-1856 text. Subsequent editions include *Tom Moore's Diary*, a selection with an introduction edited by J. B. Priestley (Cambridge, 1925); and *Thomas Moore's Journal*, a selection edited by Peter Quennell (New York, 1964). Both of these are based on the 1853-1856 edition. Recently, Lord John's eight-volume edition of the *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence* has been reprinted by the Scholarly Press (St. Clair Shores, Michigan, 1973), who also brought out a reprint of Priestley's edition of selections in 1971.

In spite of the fact that Lord John had access to a large collection of the poet's letters, he included only four hundred eighty-seven in the "Correspondence" portion of the eight-volume work. These letters were reprinted (with annotation and numerous corrections of dates), together with over a thousand hitherto unpublished items in *The Letters of Thomas Moore*, edited by Wilfred S. Dowden (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1964), 2 vols.

When Lord John completed his edition, he apparently caused the holograph manuscript of the Journal to be stored at Longmans. In the years that followed, the publishing house suffered several near-disastrous fires, and their valuable collection of manuscripts and rare books was damaged. Consequently editors and critics have assumed that the manuscript of the Journal

Mr. Dowden is Professor of English at Rice University.

was either lost or destroyed. This opinion was corroborated by a member of the firm, as reported by Howard Mumford Jones in the preface to his biography of Moore (1937):

Lord John was both a busy statesman and a careless editor. Motives of prudence led him to suppress or change a great many passages in the original manuscript. . . . Now that those who are mentioned in the diary and correspondence have passed from the scene, it would be possible to supply the omissions, were it not for the fact that, according to information furnished me by Mr. W. A. Kelk of the firm of Longmans, the originals were destroyed at some time close to the opening of the present century. One is therefore forced back upon the eight volumes for good or ill.¹

While searching for another item in the manuscript and rare book room of Longmans in 1967, I discovered the manuscript of the Journal, which makes possible a new edition based on the original.

The manuscript is contained in twelve notebook volumes, written in Moore's hand on recto and verso, filling over thirteen hundred pages. It was partly damaged by water, but it is, for the most part, readable. An exception is one thin notebook, the pages of which are so tightly fused that two specialists in manuscript restoration have judged the content to be irretrievable.

Moore's handwriting is legible, though small and cramped and sometimes blurred by time and damage to the manuscript. His punctuation was casual, and he used the dash as his all-purpose mark for ending phrases, sentences, and often paragraphs. He was inconsistent in his capitalization at the beginning of sentences and in spelling place names and names of people. For example, he sometimes spelled the name of his friend Lord John Russell with only one *l*. Frequently he left out diacritical marks when writing foreign languages. In the new edition, I have modernized the spelling of "o'clock," which Moore consistently spelled "oflock," and have made no attempt to reproduce superscripts in such abbreviations as "Mr." With these exceptions, Moore's text is presented *ad verbum ad litteratim*.

A new edition of the Journal is desirable because the recovery of the manuscript makes possible the restoration of much valuable material deleted in the text published by the first editor. Editing the Journal from the original also furnishes the opportunity of correcting errors caused by the outmoded editorial practices of the nineteenth century.

It should be remembered that Lord John was not a professional editor, that he was at the time fighting for his political life, and that his edition was hastily prepared and is not annotated. Moreover, he expurgated many sections of the manuscript for reasons of Victorian propriety or because the diary discusses prominent personalities in a manner which Russell obviously felt might prove embarrassing if published; other passages were apparently deleted because Lord John judged them repetitious or uninteresting to his readers. One senses also that the task of editing the long manuscript grew

burdensome, for by his own admission large sections of the Journal are deleted after the year 1833. In the preface to the sixth volume (1829 to 1833), he wrote,

To the close of the present volume I have given from Moore's own diary, fully and minutely, the story of his life. Having reached a period only twenty years from the present time, I propose to employ with more reserve the remaining portion of the materials.²

How "fully and minutely" Russell reproduced Moore's diary may be judged by scrutiny of the numerous deletions restored in the new edition.

Russell apparently sent the manuscript itself to the printer, who set type directly from it. His method of indicating printing procedure to be followed and passages to be deleted varies. When he wanted a passage to be omitted he sometimes struck through Moore's handwriting with a straight or wavy line. He enclosed other sections to be deleted in square brackets. Often he used both brackets and the straight or wavy line. He sometimes indicated longer deleted passages by the use of several vertical or slanting lines. Occasionally a passage with no mark at all on the manuscript will nevertheless not appear in the printed text. Apparently these passages were cut from the proof sheets before final printing. Too often Lord John defaced the manuscript with heavy ink markings so that Moore's text may never be fully restored.

As the result of a study of these many deletions, it is safe to say that what Lord John Russell published is simply not the Journal Moore wrote. The omission of significant phrases, sentences, and lengthy passages altered, distorted, and often reversed Moore's meaning. This fact can be demonstrated by citing examples chosen at random.

Restoration of the Journal to its original state, insofar as that is possible, will, as these recovered passages indicate, increase its value as a social and historical document. It will also render the diarist and his circle of friends and acquaintances more human and appealing. Some of the restorations, for example, show that the recorded conversations were more earthy than Russell's edition would lead us to believe. Thus when Scott says to Moore that Lady Byron must not marry a man named Cunningham, that she must never let another man bear the name of husband to her, Lord John neglected to record that Scott also said "being even a w— would be better than that." Many of Moore's pithy comments about his contemporaries do not appear, such as his calling Sotheby "Botherby" (an echo of *Beppo*, stanza LXXII, and *The Blues*), or his remarking that his friend Perry is "coxcomical." He notes that his friend Mary Dalby thought that the "Grossets" (the name of a family) were a species of small bird, like small grouse. Miss Miles's singing of an aria from an Italian opera is like French and Italian dishes with Birmingham cookery. He records that a man named Hare separated from his wife and took up residence with a woman named Payne, by whom he had

several children variously called Hare-Payne-Pierce; "what a poly-onomous family." He includes some of Sheridan's most caustic remarks about his contemporaries, such as, "Here comes Tierney, with that down look of his, seeing if he can pick his own pocket." When Moore notes in his diary that one of his squibs in a newspaper was truncated, Russell cleans the passage by printing "minus a stanza" instead of "castrated of a stanza," as Moore wrote it.

Deletions of other short passages are less humorous but no less damaging to the context. Moore records that he met an MP named Abercrombie at dinner at Bowood. Russell neglected to include Moore's identification of this man as "Lord Lansdowne's member from Calne," thus obscuring the implication that Lansdowne was something of a political boss in the area. On another occasion Moore was assured by his neighbor Hughes that Warren Hastings was almost worshipped by the natives of India. Moore had just begun work on the *Life of Sheridan* and had studied Sheridan's involvement in the impeachment and trial of Hastings. He was, therefore, familiar with Hastings's role in India. Thus when Russell deleted the line "Hughes is a poor authority for any thing" he concealed Moore's skepticism and, perhaps, an implication that there was a body of popular opinion contrary to that expressed by Hughes.

Moore often recorded full accounts of his business dealings with his music publisher Power and the Longmans. Whereas it is evident that they were generous to him in many of his financial adversities, it is also clear that he sometimes felt put upon by these men of business, and his attitude toward them is often concealed in the deletions. Thus Russell failed to include a damning comment about James Power which shows that, in spite of his friendship for the publisher, Moore was not blind to the penchant of men of affairs to drive hard, often devastating bargains. Lord John softened Moore's attitude toward Power by printing "Two or three things he said during our conversation annoyed me a good deal" instead of "Two or three things he said during our conversation annoyed and disgusted me a good deal—as showing the cloven foot of the litigant & keen man of business much more than I could have wished."

One impression left by the 1853-1856 printed version of the text is that Moore was uncritical of his closest friends, that he never, even to his diary, confided his doubts about them or his annoyance with them. Restoration of certain passages indicates that he often had doubts about their characters, recorded their most amusing or annoying eccentricities, and did not hesitate to pass judgment on them in ways which he would not have expressed orally or in his letters. One of the best examples of this type of Journal entry is that dealing with Lord and Lady Lansdowne. Moore settled at Sloperton Cottage, Wiltshire, about three miles from Bowood, in 1818, the move being made at the suggestion of Lord Lansdowne. Soon Moore was a

welcome guest at the fashionable luncheons and dinners held at Bowood, where some of the most intellectual and socially elite figures of the age gathered for good food and sparkling conversation. Russell included in his text an account of one of these visits which occurred on December 19, 1818, a few months after the Moores moved to Sloperon. Moore records a somewhat desultory exchange with Lord Lansdowne concerning Fearon’s book on America, which Lansdowne recommended highly. Abruptly, and for no apparent reason, he shifts to a partial list of people who were in the house. He then says that he returned home, having unaccountably declined Lady Lansdowne’s pressing invitation to dine with them on a day of his choosing. The entire passage, as it appears in Russell’s text, is disjointed and confusing. Lord John omitted a section which gives the entry its direction and explains Moore’s reluctance to accept the invitation. After the account of the conversation with Lord Lansdowne, Moore notes that they

Went into luncheon & saw Lady Lansdowne— Never did woman with so much prettiness, good sense & generally pleasing manners contrive to interest me so little— the whole secret of which is that she gives one the notion of a person thoroughly cold & *unattainable*. Whether this idea does her injustice or not I know not—but she and her Lord appear to me most perfect examples of how much may be done by direction, tact and good-sense without either genius or feeling having much to do with the matter— By mere dint of agreeable manners and correct taste, they attract, they please, they even charm—in short do every thing but make one love them— That is a tribute which the heart gives to heart alone—and they have but little—at least I think so.

In spite of Moore’s early attitude, there grew up between this Irish grocer’s son and this member of the English aristocracy a life-long friendship built upon mutual affection and respect; and they lived in harmony as neighbors over thirty years. That is why we find the following interlineation at the end of the passage just quoted: “1840— I shall let the above stand as a proof of the injustice one may do to character till better acquainted with it.”

Moore left the impression with all who knew him that Samuel Rogers, the banker-poet, was one of his most valued friends. It was at Rogers’s home that he first met Byron, whom he had written in an effort to settle their altercation over Moore’s objection to a slighting reference to him in *English Bards*. “If, however, you should feel inclined to meet my sincere wishes for reconciliation,” he said in a letter to Byron, “I shall mention the subject to my best & most valued friend Mr. Rogers . . . and I have no doubt that he will be most happy to become a mediator between us.”³ They did meet at a memorable dinner at Rogers’s home, and the reconciliation was accomplished. That Moore and Rogers remained close friends cannot be doubted. Yet their friendship, unlike that between Byron and Moore, or Scott and Moore, was threatened at times by jealousy, anger, and even contempt. None of these emotions is evident in the printed text of the Journal, for Russell took care to cull them out. Moore records, for example,

a lengthy conversation with a friend named Allen mainly about Monk Lewis, who had recently died en route from Jamaica. The friend (evidently with Moore's approval) compares Rogers unfavorably to Lewis. Though the former has "ten times [Lewis's] sense," he is a social climber and has been seen to be shattered for a whole evening when some countess neglected to shake hands with him. He would not accept an invitation from Lady Holland to ride in her carriage because he was afraid of the cold, but promptly consented when the Duchess proposed the same. In another entry Moore complains of Rogers's lack of consideration "for my little businesses"; and in still another passage he describes some "ridiculous exhibitions of his with Lady Louisa Vane" when Rogers concealed himself in a gallery niche and jumped out upon her as she passed. Nothing demonstrates Moore's ambivalent attitude toward Rogers so much, however, as a record of a conversation—omitted by Russell—about Moore's *Epicurean* shortly after its publication:

I was foolish enough to pour out a little of my prosperity on him— A silence ensued, & at last he said "You *stop* very strangely in your book." "Oh then" I said, "You've read enough of it, to find out the bad stopping?"— "No—" he answered. "I merely turned over a page of it at a bookseller's yesterday." The next time I saw him about the middle of the week, he said "Well, I have read the last three lines of your book & think it very pretty." The only set-off against all this is that if my book had not been succeeding, he would have been foremost to give it a lift.

Lord John was careful to delete from his printed text all matters even remotely connected with questions of sex. These expurgations often are ridiculously prudish, as when Moore says that he walked to Devizes to get a nursing shield for Bessy, whose breasts were sore from suckling her newborn child. Some of the most touching passages are also omitted, as in the case of a simple statement recorded just before Moore and Bessy were to be separated for a long period: "Bessy came into my bed at 5 o'clock this morning." His somewhat naive comments on works of art which he saw while in Italy are made to seem even more amateurish by the omission of any descriptive passage which faintly hints at sex or explicitly refers to the genitals.

Admittedly, the passages Russell expurgated are anecdotal, but diaries are inherently anecdotal. It is by piecing together incidents far removed from one another in the documents and by relating them to other external information which has come to light that we may add to the sum total of knowledge about any person or event. With this maxim in mind, let us examine some of the deleted passages dealing with two of the most important figures of the age: Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Lord Byron.

Moore began his *Life of Sheridan* in 1818, although it was not published until 1825, the writing having been interrupted by Moore's temporary exile in Paris from 1819 to 1822. Entries in the Journal reveal that he gathered

information by examining letters and documents and by interviewing as many of Sheridan's relatives and acquaintances as possible. From the latter he gleaned anecdotes which he duly recorded in his diary but did not include in his biography. Since Russell expurgated those most damning to Sheridan (and incidentally to Moore), many of them have never come to light. Among other revelations we learn from a conversation between Moore and Sir Robert Adair, held on May 7, 1819, that Sheridan “had . . . intrigued with Tickell's wife (his sister-in-law) & . . . That Tickell had possessed S's wife—before her marriage to him.” Richard Tickell married Mary Linley, sister of Elizabeth Ann, Sheridan's wife. When Moore reported Adair's conversation to William Lambe on May 16, the latter remarked that he believed Tickell had lied when he “informed S. that he (Tickell) had had intercourse with Mrs. S. before her marriage . . . but S. mentioned he had all Mrs. S's. sisters in turn— Tickell's wife among the rest, and it was possibly in revenge that Tickell said this.”

Sheridan's penchant for amorous conduct is, of course, well known; but how persistent he could be and how ridiculous he made himself appear in the eyes of his contemporaries is not as clearly set forth in the modern biographies of him as it is in such passages as the following record of a conversation between Moore and Lady Holland, held on October 7, 1818, which was deleted from Russell's text. Lady Holland thinks the first Mrs. Sheridan “a little mad,” and that the life of the Sheridans “from continual love, jealousy & infidelity towards each other must have been a series of scenes.” She repeats the rumor that Mrs. Sheridan had a child by Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and, amazingly, reveals her own involvement in their lives:

Lord Lorn was also a lover of hers— “at the time *he* [Sheridan] was making love to *me*” said Lady Holland “and she was flirting with Lord Lorn, they would, both of them most willingly have given us up for each other, if they could have come to some explanation together”—

She then proceeds to recount a sordid tale of Sheridan's infatuation with her, including a threat to blackmail her over “a person, for whom I certainly did not care the least,” and, when this failed, taking “another most extraordinary method.” Disguising himself as a servant who had a message to deliver to her, he gained entrance to her room and “rushed at [her] with a ferociousness quite frightful” and bit her cheek “so violently that the blood ran down [her] neck.” Afterwards she was afraid to go into society for fear of meeting him. She relates other unsavory examples of Sheridan's conduct, which prompts Moore to express his doubts in his Journal: “I wonder are all these stories of my Lady's true.”

Lady Holland had an explanation for Sheridan's profligacies. She attributed them to attempts to compensate for the obscurity of his birth, a

kind of vanity. Lewis Gibbs, Sheridan's biographer, accepts this view, saying,

Vanity . . . has more to do with love affairs than is generally supposed, and Sheridan's vanity appears in more than one guise; but it always betrays a sense of insecurity, and, perhaps of injustice.⁴

Perhaps so, but on the day Moore recorded this conversation with Lady Holland, he also included a lengthy summary of one with her husband (included in Russell's edition), in which Lord Holland gave the following explanation of Sheridan's conduct:

[Lord Holland] told me that one remarkable characteristic of S. and which accounted for many of his inconsistencies was the high, ideal system he had formed of a sort of impracticable perfection in honour, virtue &c.—any thing short of which he seemed to think not worth aiming at—and thus consoled himself for the extreme laxity of his practice by the impossibility of satisfying or coming up to the sublime theory he had formed—hence, the most romantic professions of honour and independence were coupled with conduct of the meanest & most swindling kind—hence, too, prudery & morality were always on his lips while his actions were a series of debauchery & Libertinism.

This is a much more thoughtful explanation of the ambivalence in Sheridan's character than the over-simplified statement that he acted out of vanity. It was his understanding of this complex person, as well as his grasp of the contemporary views as to what was permissible in print, that motivated Moore to omit in his biography such sordid details as that described by Lady Holland. Whereas he did not conceal Sheridan's profligacy, he did not enter into details; he presented such matters with tact and decorum.

One could hope that the discovery of this manuscript would furnish answers to questions concerning Byron which have occupied the attention of scholars for decades, or that it would corroborate reasonable conjectures which have been made. The publication of this new edition, which will, I trust, do much to restore the integrity of the Journal, will add to the sum total of our knowledge; but it will not, unfortunately, answer the question of what Moore did with the documents he used in preparing his biography of Byron. It will not give us a copy of even a portion of Byron's Memoirs, nor is there anywhere in it a suggestion that Moore caused a second copy (in addition to the one we know about) to be made.

There is, unfortunately, a costly hiatus which extends from September 1, 1822, to October 20, 1825, a crucial period in Byron scholarship. At least some of the entries for 1822 are included in the notebook which cannot be restored to readable condition. But this book is too thin to contain all of the entries for those inclusive dates, and I have not been able to account for the other missing material.

Nevertheless, there are significant deletions from other entries dealing with Byron. References to him (most of them deleted by Russell) appear on over four hundred pages of the typescript. The Journal itself will have to be examined to determine how extensively Lord John bowdlerized it in this respect,

but attention should be called to passages which do cast a different light on certain events in Byron's life.

There are two types of deletions from these entries: those having to do with Byron's dissolute life in England and during the first few years in Italy, and those indicating the difficulty Moore experienced in collecting information for the biography. The story of the latter is well known. We see in his letters how difficult it was, for example, to get anything worthwhile out of Murray. The publisher was so recalcitrant, in fact, that Moore once wrote him a letter of complaint which adequately expressed his frustration: "You simply *must* let me see, in some way or other, his original letters to you. . . . You shall stand over me if you please while I read them, and act flugleman—'eyes right—eyes left' whenever I come to the objectionables. . . ."⁵

The events which proved to be so important in the lives of Moore and Byron began when the former left London in the company of Lord John Russell on September 4, 1819. He was not to return to England (except for one short visit) until 1822. Before going to Paris he stopped for a time in Italy to see Byron, who had arrived there three years earlier. It was a crucial time in the life of Byron; he had been through the depths of depression and depravity in 1816 and 1817 and had just formed his liaison with Teresa Guiccioli. Thus Moore had the opportunity to observe at first-hand the type of life he had been pursuing. As in the case of deleted entries concerning Sheridan, many of these have to do with the most sordid aspects of Byron's life. Since, however, they do give us another contemporary view of a complex figure of the age, special attention must be given them.

Moore records many of the well-known rumors and details of Byron's sojourn in Italy, such as the story that Count Guiccioli poisoned his first wife and caused a man to be assassinated. In recounting some of these tales, however, Moore calls attention to matters that may have escaped notice.

We know that Guiccioli applied to Byron for a loan, and Moore duly records this fact but with a suggestion as to *why* such an appeal may have been made. On October 7, 1819, he notes that Byron's friend Alexander Scott "Thinks Byron will not be able to get rid of the Countess, unless he will cash those bills for the husband. . . . Byron, however, swears he will not cash the bills, and lays a wager of two sequins with Scott that he will get rid of the Countess notwithstanding." Russell omitted all of this, though he included Moore's account of his first meeting with Teresa: "Forgot to mention that Byron introduced me to his Countess before we left La Mira— She is blonde & young— married only about a year—but not very pretty." Lord John failed to include Byron's facetious comment about her, however: "I say, Tom, you might have been my salvation—for if you had come here a little sooner, I'll be damned if I would have run away with a red-haired woman of quality."

Whether we accept the theory that one reason for Byron's deciding to undertake the Grecian venture was his desire to rid himself of this entangle-

ment, we cannot doubt the sincerity of the feeling he developed for her. The point here is that at the time of Moore's visit he still looked upon the affair as a casual one, like those that went before.

Moore did not ignore these intrigues in his diary, as Russell would have had us believe. He notes that Byron's first love, the Segati (the merchant's wife) was rather pretty, and that she was at the time of his visit living with an Austrian officer who had ruined himself trying to be as generous to her as Byron was. Marguerita was, he notes, little better than a "blowing." She went from Byron to his friend Scott, "who offered, bye the bye, to send her to me." Moore does not say whether he accepted the offer. Angelina, the nobleman's daughter whom Byron visited by climbing a high balcony every night, "is an ugly little ill-made girl & the balcony is a portal window at the side of the hall-door, through which he used to pay his addresses to her at night for some time."

There is an item in an entry made on October 16, 1827, bearing on a subject which has generated considerable debate and controversy: whether the separation of Lord and Lady Byron was caused by his incestuous relations with Augusta Leigh or his sexual aberrations with his wife.⁶ Moore and Mrs. Robert Arkwright, a singer of his acquaintance, are discussing Byron. The conversation shifts to Lady Byron, and Moore quotes Mrs. Arkwright as saying that

an intimate friend of Lady Bs. had told her such horrors of Lord B's conduct to his wife as were inconceivable, and on the authority, as she supposes, of Lady B. herself, not only (as Mrs. R. A. said) "attempts to corrupt her morals but things not to be named which without having heard them one could not even have imagined."

There follows a sentence which has been so heavily marked through that it is almost totally illegible.

One cannot present this entry as proof of anything; it smacks too much of gossip: a friend of Lady Byron, *apparently* upon Lady Byron's authority, told Mrs. Arkwright, who told Moore. It is not even secondhand information. Nevertheless, it will be of interest to those who have written on either side in this controversy.

Recovery of the deleted and expurgated passages in the Journal and hence the restoration of the integrity of the text focuses our attention on the changing concepts of morality, taste, and political outlook in the nineteenth century. The Journal was begun in the Romantic Period when the era of the Regency was nearing its end; the last entry was made ten years after Queen Victoria ascended the throne. It was edited and published after the decade of the 1840s, which has aptly been called "The Age of Paradox."⁷ By the 1850s, when Russell published his edition, Victorian standards of public conduct, private morality, and notions of literary propriety were well established. What would have been more or less commonplace in conversation and print in the early years of the century was simply not

acceptable at the time the Journal appeared in printed form. One cannot imagine *Don Juan*, or, for that matter, some of Moore's early lyrics appearing for the first time after 1850.

Given the Victorian social and moral milieu in which the Journal was first published, we can perhaps understand Lord John's reluctance to print the entries he chose to delete, though we may smile at the innocuous nature of many of them. Apparently he had three reasons for suppressing passages which might be damaging or shocking: 1) he wanted to protect Moore's good name; 2) he was reluctant to make public matters dealing with others mentioned in the diary, fearing that their reputations or those of their families would be harmed; and 3) like other political leaders before and since, he evidently looked upon himself as the protector and arbiter of public morality.

Although we sympathize with Lord John and may even understand his predicament, we cannot overlook the fact that, because of his willful misuse of the material in this Journal, we have been deprived of significant, sometimes revelatory matter for over a century. Furthermore, as the result of his ruthless defacement of the manuscript we may never be able to retrieve some of its important passages.

The new edition of the Journal will, I think, reveal Moore in a new light. We may still say with Byron that "Tommy loves a lord"; but we will also see that the lords and ladies whom Tommy loved (including the one who made the facetious comment) also loved Tommy. It is inconceivable that men like Scott, Byron, Lansdowne, Russell, and many others of sound taste and judgment, who walk across the pages of this Journal, would have held a dilettante in such high regard. One might speculate on why Moore's reputation suffered after his death and say that it was partially because he offered himself so willingly as an entertainer at fashionable dinner parties. We must assume, however, that he apparently did sing his songs well and that they were and are worth singing. Furthermore, statesmen like Lansdowne and Russell; writers like Byron and Scott; journalists like Jeffrey, of the *Edinburgh Review*, and Barnes, of the *Times*; plus a host of budding young authors and politicians did actively seek and cherish his advice and assistance.

His basic honesty as revealed in the Journal justifies their faith in him. Whereas he often exhibited almost childish delight in accolades which came his way, he was, nevertheless, acutely conscious of the fact that he was not a Titan on Parnassus. He recorded with commendable objectivity his own strengths and weaknesses as well as those of his contemporaries. He confided his most honest opinions to the Journal with a notable lack of carping criticism or the obsequious humility so often attributed to him by his detractors. In short, he can no longer be viewed as a man who lacked the critical acumen and discriminating taste to be much moved by his experiences.

NOTES

This paper was presented by invitation at a seminar commemorating the 150th anniversary of the death of Byron, held at Trinity College, Cambridge, June 26 through July 1, 1974.

1. Howard Mumford Jones, *The Harp That Once* — (New York: Holt and Company, 1937), p. ix.
2. Russell, *Journal of Thomas Moore* (London: Longman, Green and Company, 1853-1856), VI, v.
3. Wilfred S. Dowden, editor, *The Letters of Thomas Moore* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), I, 162.
4. Lewis Gibbs, *Sheridan* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1947), p. 117.
5. Dowden, *Letters of Thomas Moore*, II, 683.
6. See especially G. Wilson Knight, *Lord Byron's Marriage: the Evidence of Asterisks* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957); Leslie Marchand, *Byron* (New York: Knopf, 1957); Doris Langley Moore, *The Late Lord Byron* (New York: Lippincott, 1961); Malcolm Elwin, *Lord Byron's Wife* (London: Macdonald, 1962); and Bernard D. Grebanier, *Uninhibited Byron: an Account of his Sexual Confusion* (New York: Crown, 1970).
7. John W. Dodds, *The Age of Paradox: a Biography of England 1841-1851* (New York: Rinehart, 1952).