
Book Section:
Regis, A.K. (2017) Introduction. In: Regis, A.K., (ed.) The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds. Genders and Sexualities in History . Palgrave Macmillan , London , pp. 1-56. ISBN 9781137291233

https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-29124-0_1

Introduction

I. 'The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds Written by Himself'

The Victorian poet, historian and man of letters, John Addington Symonds, began writing his Memoirs in March 1889. To his friend, Henry Graham Dakyns, he reflected upon the work in progress:

> My occupation with Cellini and Gozzi has infected me with their Lues Autobiographica; and I have begun scribbling my own reminiscences. This is a foolish thing to do, because I do not think they will ever be fit to publish. I have nothing to relate except the evolution of a character somewhat strangely constituted in its moral and aesthetic qualities. The study of this evolution, written down with the candour and precision I feel capable of using, would I am sure be interesting to psychologists and not without its utility. There does not exist anything like it in print; and I am certain that 999 men out of 1000 do not believe in the existence of a personality like mine. Still it would be hardly fair to my posterity if I were to yield up my vile soul to the psychological investigators.
>
> […] You see I have 'never spoken out.' And it is a great temptation to speak out, when I have been living for two whole years in lonely intimacy with men who spoke out so magnificently as Cellini and Gozzi did.[1]

Having worked as a translator of life-writing, Symonds caught the contagion of his subject's lues autobiographica—their autobiographical plague. He resolved to 'speak out', a turn of phrase borrowed from Matthew Arnold: 'He never spoke out. In these four words is

contained the whole history of [Thomas] Gray, both as a man and as a poet.'[2] Fearing himself a Gray-like figure, at risk of being lost, misunderstood or forgotten amidst the works left behind him, Symonds commenced his most extraordinary writing project: an account of his experience as a homosexual man living subject to the moral and legal constraints of nineteenth-century society.

Symonds wavered between conflicting assessments of the Memoirs' potential use and value: the act of writing was a 'foolish thing to do', but the resulting text was 'not without its utility.' He believed the manuscript would provide an important record of an otherwise elided facet of human existence, and he determined to present his sexuality as an integral part of broader roles, responsibilities and identifications. Born in Bristol in 1840, he was acutely aware of the intellectual inheritance received from his father, a highly respected physician, and the duties owed to his family (which included three sisters: Edith, Mary Isabella and Charlotte) as the only surviving son. Symonds married Catherine North in 1864, adding husband and father (to four daughters: Janet, Charlotte or 'Lotta', Margaret or 'Madge', and Katharine) to the roster of familial responsibilities. Symonds had somehow to accommodate a narrative of sexual development within this otherwise normative framework. The Memoirs also present a panoramic view of the social, cultural and intellectual milieu that prepared men of Symonds's class to take their place among the ruling elites of Victorian society: public school, university, foreign tours, personal and professional networks of friends and acquaintances. His account explores the function of these spaces, journeys and relationships in the construction, regulation and expression of licit and illicit identities, gender and sexuality. In response, Symonds attempts to construct a socially legitimate conception of same-sex desire, drawn from studies of ancient Greece, Renaissance history and culture, the poetry of Walt Whitman and emergent sexological literatures.[3] His Memoirs document these

efforts, complicated further by narratives of disease and poor health—his suffering from 'phthisis' (tuberculosis).

But if the Memoirs could be useful, Symonds reserved their utility for posterity. In a Preface appended to the manuscript in May 1889, he appropriates the self-deprecating remarks of Carlo Gozzi, who 'called his Memoirs "useless", and published them (as he professes) from motives of "humility." Mine are sure to be more useless than his; for I shall not publish them' (p. 1 in this edition). However valuable the record of his multifaceted life, however precious the evidence he assembled, Symonds knew that immediate publication was impossible. Even if he found a publisher willing to set the type, booksellers in England would have risked prosecution under the terms of the Obscene Publications Act 1857. Perhaps more worrying still, the details recorded in his manuscript threatened more than just the reputation of those named within its pages. The Criminal Law Amendment Act 1885 had criminalised sexual acts between men: imprecise in terminology but far-reaching in consequence, it declared that so-called 'gross indecency' in public or private could be punished by up to two years' imprisonment. Symonds was an expatriate writer, moving to Davos in 1877 and dividing his time between Switzerland and Italy. He lived and worked outside the reach of these laws: in Switzerland, customs and legislation varied according to canton, but the influence of the French Code Napoleon could be felt in the general tolerance of private acts; in Italy, the Penal Code 1889 (again, following the precedent of the Code Napoleon) decriminalised homosexual acts between consenting adult men. But England was home to Symonds's friends and extended family, and he continued to write for an Anglophone audience. As such, he was sensitive to the hurt his Memoirs might cause—even after his death.

In the Preface, Symonds imagined two future readerships for his manuscript: the first was scientific, the second was sympathetic. Psychologists and sexologists (the latter a

burgeoning field of research on the continent that was soon to make inroads in Britain) might welcome the evidence contained within its pages: they might 'appreciate [his] effort to be sincere in the dictation of a document' (p. 2 in this edition) that could form the basis for future study. Other readers, he hoped, would 'feel some thrill of pity' (p. 2 in this edition) at the record of his life. In both cases the intention was to advance change: to challenge medical misunderstanding, legal injustice and social prejudice through the act of self-revelation and self-analysis. To this end, Symonds worked hard to ensure the manuscript's survival after his death—fearing, not without justification, that it might be destroyed. But he also left instructions for caution to be exercised with regard to publication, for he wished to protect the reputation and happiness of his surviving family. That these instructions were followed is remarkable, and his Memoirs are a fascinating and rare survival.

The present edition is the first to reproduce all the manuscript's surviving materials, allowing its wonderfully detailed, diverse and digressive narrative to stand. 'The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds Written by Himself', to give the manuscript its full title, has been made public on two previous occasions: a significant body of material was printed in John Addington Symonds: A Biography Compiled from his Papers and Correspondence (1895), a dutifully sanitised work undertaken by his friend and literary executor, Horatio Brown; and in 1984, nearly one hundred years after the manuscript was assembled, Phyllis Grosskurth produced an abridged edition containing two thirds of the original text.[4] The present edition enables a first full reading, and by way of preface, the remainder of this introduction is concerned with the history of the manuscript: the difficulties, idiosyncrasies and contingencies that marked its composition and compilation, and obstacles to reading that have characterised its legacy and afterlife. Since his death in 1893, Symonds's manuscript has passed through many hands, subject to restrictions and regulations imposed by successive custodians. His attempt to 'speak out' is bound up with the actions of relatives and executors,

biographers and editors, libraries and publishers—it is a history to which the present edition adds another chapter.

Composition and compilation

In his letter to Henry Graham Dakyns, Symonds presents the memoirs-in-progress as an extended (sexual) case study, an anomaly within the broader field of written lives. At first glance the manuscript confirms this description: broadly chronological, it takes Symonds from his earliest memories in Bristol through to later life in Davos and Venice, and as the narrative progresses we learn of his early sexual fantasies; his place within sexual cultures at Harrow and Oxford; his attempts to suppress and sublimate desire through marriage, work and study; and his later establishment of settled relationships with men from lower social classes. Among these revelations, perhaps the most surprising are those concerned with schooling and university life: the former is marked by sexual bullying and an affair between head master and pupil, while the latter is permeated by fears of exposure and blackmail.

But the Memoirs are more than a determinedly narrow and linear account of sexual heterodoxies. As Symonds worked upon the manuscript, the project changed and evolved. Thematic chapters on sexual development (Chapter 2), emotional development (Chapter 12), intellectual and literary 'evolution' (Chapter 14) and religion (Chapter 15) disrupt the chronology, prompting him to repeat or revise the narrative, drawing out new inferences and conclusions. Late in the Memoirs, Symonds reflects upon the practice and problems of autobiography, expounding more fully his reasons and methods for writing a life. Chapter 16 opens with a lengthy digression on the inevitable distortions of singular, self-written narratives:

> They are so absorbed in themselves that, when they have begun to write, they dwell with even too much emphasis upon their marked peculiarities. They are aware that they, and they alone, possess sources of information concerning the person they are painting; and these they determine to bring forth, in order to explain that person's action in the world, to justify him by appeal to his specific nature, and to let his neighbours know how little they understood the hidden motives of his character. In this way autobiographies are, for the most part, only too veracious—in spite of suppressions, minor mendacities, and falsifications of fact. (pp. 464-5 in this edition)

Symonds feared he would exaggerate or indeed produce (through the act of writing) the very strangeness of which he had previously boasted to Dakyns. Whatever errors he might inadvertently or purposefully introduce into the text, he was determined to tell the truth about his sexual nature. But he saw this as a threat to the broader autobiographical enterprise: focusing upon 'marked peculiarities' risked 'the artistic error of depicting a psychological monster' (p. 467 in this edition). By the time he made these observations, Symonds had rejected the positon outlined in his letter to Dakyns. He no longer wished to produce an extended case study, fearing the impression left to posterity would be that of a man consumed by sex. Instead he posited a new set of methodological principles that would help to shape his Memoirs.

First, he insisted upon the important counterbalance of quotidian things. These are absent, Symonds argued, from the pages of any 'too veracious' autobiography: 'the want of atmosphere, the neglect of qualifying considerations, the absorption in certain engrossing aspects of self to the exclusion of the common stuff of humanity' (pp. 465-6 in this edition). But he doubted his ability to supply this lack through his own retrospective narrative: 'I cannot chronicle the little daily doings, or stipple in the myriad touches of fact and behaviour

which, in their combination with deeper psychical preoccupations, constitute a living man' (p. 466 in this edition). Symonds's solution to this problem constitutes his second methodological principle: 'The report has to be supplemented indeed, in order that a perfect portrait may be painted of the man' (p. 465 in this edition). In other words, autobiographers unable to escape from the tyranny of 'marked peculiarities' must turn to the writings of others.

These reflections illuminate Symonds's practice in compiling the Memoirs, and they help to explain the presence of certain materials contained within the manuscript. Appended to Chapter 3, in a subsection entitled 'Note on the preceding chapter', Symonds includes the text of a letter received from Sophie Girard, his sister Charlotte's governess. This supplement is intended to 'correct the impression' of his early childhood, to modify and moderate the 'somewhat disagreeable picture' he had painted (p. 79 in this edition). Girard provides a near-hagiographic account of the young Symonds's 'perfect' temper, and his 'joyous and bright' demeanour (p. 80-1 in this edition)—though she later reminds us of her indebtedness, sending 'warmest thanks with compound interest for [the] yearly contribution to my income' (p. 82 in this edition). Girard's original letter is inserted into the manuscript: her words, in her own hand, join the collection of writings that comprise the Memoirs. Symonds's wife, Catherine, is also given a voice. Approximately 9000 words are taken from her diary across two separate instalments. As before, the original documents are inserted into the manuscript. This material takes the place of Symonds's own diary: he claims to have destroyed the volume in which he recorded their courtship out of 'respect for [his] wife' (p. 217 in this edition). But the inclusion of Catherine's account goes beyond the plugging of gaps in the evidence. If Symonds's destroyed diary was the 'self-conscious, self-analytical, [and] self-descriptive' (p. 217 in this edition) record he claimed it to be, this material would do nothing to counter the

Memoirs' distorting focus on 'marked peculiarities.' But Catherine's words are perceived differently:

> For once, in these pages, I shall drop the hateful I and me, and let the reader see me, not as I saw or see myself, but as a far superior, happier and diviner being—a pure, beautiful and steadfast woman—saw me, when she deigned to love me. (p. 218 in this edition)

Symonds emerges from the first diary instalment as Johnnie, a young and attractive suitor. But if one begins to suspect that supplements are included to flatter his vanity, the second diary instalment dispels this thought. Though Catherine continues to praise her husband ('Johnnie is so good and patient to me always', p. 249 in this edition), her disillusioned account of marriage and motherhood is deeply touching. She captures their shared unhappiness just fourteen months after their wedding: '[m]arried life is not all romance and glitter, there is much in it that is, that must be painful, wearying' (p. 246 in this edition).

Catherine and Girard produce alternative versions of Symonds. These sit alongside the various selves that emerge from his retrospective narrative and varied use of diaries, letters and poems. These other personal documents are by no means free from 'marked peculiarities', but Symonds valued their contemporary record: he transcribes long passages and includes several poems cut from privately printed editions. Some of this material can seem digressive or tangential, such as his account of journeys to France, Switzerland and Italy, replete with humorous anecdotes of travellers' foibles and detailed descriptions of churches and cathedrals. But Symonds will often provide an explicit justification for their inclusion, focusing in particular upon the beliefs and behaviours of his earlier self: for example, letters used to reconstruct a tour of Normandy indicate 'hyperaesthesia […] upon

every page' (p. 290 in this edition), while a privately printed prose-poem, 'The Song of The Swimmer', reveals his persistent tendency to idealise sexual desire, being 'clearly produced under the influence of Walt Whitman' (p. 355 in this edition).

Many of these supplements survived into the 1895 biography compiled by Symonds's literary executor, Horatio Brown—with the exception of Catherine's diary and homoerotic passages in poems, diaries and letters. Indeed Brown increased the number of supplements, using 'diaries and letters wherever that was possible; holding that they portray the man more truly at each moment, and progressively from moment to moment.'[5] But, as Sarah Heidt first revealed, this is exactly where the 1984 edition of the Memoirs concentrates its excisions. Phyllis Grosskurth made public Symonds's narrative of sexual development, but her editorial practice overlooked his high regard for quotidian things and supplementary materials. For Heidt, these have now become 'the Memoirs' hidden existence, the innermost secrets of the manuscript.'[6] Grosskurth did not reproduce Girard's letter and she included just the second (and shorter) of Catherine's two diary instalments. Of the more than 50,000 words removed from the text, a significant number are taken from diaries and letters. Inevitably these large cuts alter the composition of Symonds's self-portrait. For Heidt, 'Grosskurth's editorial choices have created the impression that Symonds conceived of and represented his sexual self as far more detachable from the rest of his life than his multifarious manuscript shows him to have done.'[7] There is, of course, an irony here: Grosskurth's edition reconstitutes the text as a study of 'marked peculiarities', moulding the Memoirs to fit Symonds's earlier (and rejected) idea of an extended case study.

The present edition restores Symonds's quotidian narratives and supplementary texts. Some of these are made public for the first time, including Catherine's first diary instalment and several examples of homoerotic verse. For Heidt, their presence in the text serves a dual purpose. First, they are not digressions—they 'do not displace [Symonds's] oft-proclaimed

purpose for writing the Memoirs: his desire to "speak out" about his sexuality'—but reveal his conviction that sexual desires formed part and were connected to all aspects of his life. And second, these materials 'vividly present the contradictions and confusion which Symonds confronted in the process of "speaking out".'[8] Quotidian narratives and supplementary texts speak to Symonds's multiple identifications and empathies as father and husband, son and brother, respectable man of letters and sexual subject. These roles could be difficult to reconcile but they were impossible to distinguish and divide. When recounting his relationship with Norman Moor, building his narrative from the evidence of diaries, Symonds had intended to separate 'mental development' from the record of his 'emotional life' (p. 360 in this edition). But he soon abandoned the effort: Symonds realised that Norman had been 'inextricably interwoven with my whole life', and his account must inevitably demonstrate 'the rapport existing in my nature at that time between the domestic, literary, emotional and active aspects of life' (p. 361 in this edition). The Memoirs' collage-like organisation stands as evidence of this concurrence, but the 'contradictions and confusion' identified by Heidt are compounded by further difficulties.

Historians of sexuality have characterised the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a period of terminological struggle with regard to Western conceptions of sexuality. Though I employ the term 'homosexual' when describing Symonds's desires, this is something of an acknowledged anachronism—it provides a convenient shorthand, but one that invokes a later understanding of acts and identities: a 'medicalised conception' that neatly bifurcates into 'heterosexual/homosexual or gay/straight.'[9] Symonds did not share this conceptual model: he employed the term 'homosexual' on rare occasions, but it was never a favoured expression. In the main his sexual lexicon was tentative, uncertain and ambivalent—the product of what H.G Cocks has called the nineteenth century's 'simultaneous negation and description of homosexuality.'[10] As Matt Cook puts it, our

convenient use of the term 'homosexual' should not be presumed to refer to any 'self-consciously assumed or applied identity' current during the period.[11] Symonds lived and worked on the continent from 1877 onwards, but he was keenly interested in English socio-cultural and legal developments (and was sensitive to the expectations of his Anglophone readership). His writings were thus subject to an evasive public discourse reluctant to name and enumerate homosexual acts and desires, despite the increasing incidence of medical and legal definition. And there was also (then, as now) no clear or coherent alternative to heteronormative sexual orthodoxies; rather, there was a multiplicity of practices shaped by countless variables—such as age, class, race, location, etc.[12] Late in Symonds's career, when he began to write more openly (and autobiographically) about homosexual phenomena, these uncertainties were obstacle. In his privately printed essay, A Problem in Modern Ethics (1891), he bemoaned this lack of appropriate and non-prejudicial language:

> I can hardly find a name which will not seem to soil this paper. The accomplished languages of Europe in the nineteenth century supply no term for this persistent feature of human psychology, without importing some implication of disgust, disgrace, vituperation. Science, however, has recently—within the last twenty years in fact—invented a convenient phrase, which does not prejudice the matter under consideration. She speaks of the 'inverted sexual instinct'; and with this neutral nomenclature the investigator has good reason to be satisfied.[13]

Sexual inversion soon became his favoured term, borrowed from the supposed scientific objectivity of early sexological literatures. But inversion is largely absent from the Memoirs: the term occurs just once in the main narrative (Chapter 11), and on four occasions in notes added to the text after the main period of composition. In the margins of his manuscript, and

in an addendum to Chapter 2, Symonds admits that his account was written before he had discovered and studied those 'cases of sexual inversion' documented by continental sexologists (cf. pp. 49 and 340 n. 1 in this edition). This 'neutral nomenclature' came too late—he could not use it to shape the Memoirs. Symonds's manuscript is thus an invaluable record of his attempts to forge alternative languages and identifications, to resist the 'disgust, disgrace, [and] vituperation' that formed part of other available terminologies.

Symonds will often employ long or verbose descriptions in preference to precise labels that might carry unwanted (or unknown) connotations: he refers to his own 'congenital inclination toward persons of the male sex' (p. 104 in this edition), or more generally to the 'sexual relation between man and man' (p. 511 in this edition). These seemingly dispassionate constructions sit awkwardly alongside a range of ideal forms borrowed from art, history and literature: these include Arcadian and Greek love, paiderastia and Whitman's class-crossing comradeship. Ideals proved useful when Symonds sought to sublimate the corporeal realities of sex, but when faced with bodies and bodily acts, he struggled to free himself from medical and legal terminology. His studies convinced him that legal prohibition was built upon the sand of social, cultural and historical contingencies, but Symonds could not escape the fact that English law considered all (male) homosexual acts to be criminal. Science may have held out the promise of a morally neutral language, but Symonds had also to contend with its register of disease and morbidity. It was inevitable that he would internalise and reproduce certain aspects of this homophobic culture, and the Memoirs manuscript reveals the near-impossibility of 'speaking out' in terms that are not self-condemnatory. Examples are legion. In Chapter 14, for instance, Symonds adopts the voice of his imagined reader, ventriloquising their summary of his life: 'He cherished an engrossing preoccupation, an absorbing and incurable proclivity, which found no outlet except in furtive ~~sin~~ self-indulgence' (MS 424; cf. p. 402 in this edition). Adopting the voice of another,

Symonds condemns and forgives himself: his desires become a disease, clearing him of volition; but having reverted to a discourse of sin, he revises the text to transform theological transgression into human weakness. The present edition is the first to offer an extensive record of Symonds's emendations to the manuscript, making legible these struggles with terminology—a previously elided aspect of his attempt to 'speak out.'

Symonds was aware that social standards of propriety and respectability, however unjust, inevitably and irrevocably circumscribed the narratives and subjectivity delineated in his Memoirs. He developed a model of compromised selfhood: 'composite beings' caught between 'impulses and instincts' on the one hand, and 'social laws which gird us round' on the other (p. 132 n. 50 in this edition). Until these laws were changed, self-condemnatory language was inevitable: it was 'frigid reason's self' that '[condemned] the natural action of his appetite', requiring him to view 'his own misdoing not in the glass of truth to his nature, but in the mirror of convention' (pp. 518, 519 in this edition). But however difficult, however constrained by available terminologies and discourse, writing and 'speaking out' about homosexual phenomena was imperative if new languages and identities were to be forged. This formed part of Symonds's original intention in writing the Memoirs (as outlined in the letter to Dakyns): the 'utility' of documenting a 'somewhat strangely constituted' character for a future audience. But it also formed part of writing projects after the Memoirs: his privately printed essay, A Problem in Modern Ethics, in which he celebrated the 'neutral' discourse of inversion, critiqued sexological theories and outlined proposals for legislative change; his biography of Michelangelo Buonarroti (1893) and study of Walt Whitman (1893), both dealing openly with homoeroticism; In The Key of Blue (1893), a daring collection of essays permeated by musings upon masculine beauty; and Sexual Inversion, a collaboration with Havelock Ellis that Symonds would not live to see completed (first published in German in 1896 under the title Das Konträre Geschlechtsgefühl).[14] With the

posterity project of the Memoirs and this accumulation of attempts to 'speak out'—however coded, however limited by 'social laws'—Symonds worked hard to document, describe and defend sexual difference.

Unfinished

One of the final references to the Memoirs in Symonds's surviving correspondence occurs in a letter to his daughter, Madge, written in July 1892:

> What vexes me is the thought I that not only am I growing old, but that I have some unconquerable malady to face—death in fact is near. My soul keeps whispering this to my spiritual ear.
>
> And before I go hence and see the lovely earth no longer, I want to do so much still. I want to write my History of Graubünden, to publish my work on Sexual Aberrations, and to get my Autobiography finished.[15]

He would not live to complete these works: the history of Graubünden was set aside in March that year following the death of Walt Whitman, allowing Symonds to complete his monograph on the poet; and his collaboration with Havelock Ellis would not be published until 1896. But the Memoirs remain perpetually and inescapably unfinished.

The manuscript was in progress by March 1889 and the Preface (written towards the close of the main period of composition) is dated May 1889. Later additions and marginal comments reveal that Symonds revised the text until at least 1891, but the manuscript is incomplete. Promised materials are missing: in Chapter 12 a marginal note reminds Symonds to introduce a 'passage on Imaginative Sin' (p. 353 n. 64 in this edition) from his privately

printed Miscellanies (1885), and in the main text he refers to a letter in French written 'after a passage of intoxicating self-abandonment' (p. 356 in this edition). Neither document is supplied and unfilled spaces are left in the manuscript (MS 377 and 380). It is possible that Symonds intended to fill these gaps at a future point and never did, but other lacunae are not so easily attributed to forgetfulness. Promised chapters are missing: in what now stands as Chapter 1, Symonds refers back to an earlier 'chapter on our [family] origin' (p. 33 in this edition), but this genealogy no longer forms part of the manuscript; and in Chapter 12 a marginal note records the duplication of material from 'the […] Chapter on Sexual Aberration' (p. 352 n. 63 in this edition), but no such chapter title (or duplication) is present in the text. Material is missing between MS 425 and 426 (cf. p. 403 in this edition), although the page number sequence is uninterrupted; and six pages are missing from Chapter 18 (MS 550-55) that presumably contained the promised but unsupplied 'Venetian episode' (cf. p. 510 in this edition). These chapters and pages have been removed or lost, and it is tempting to suspect foul play. But the scant evidence that remains suggests that Symonds had a hand in the removal of materials during the period of revision after 1889. The genealogy, for example, corresponds to an appendix published in Horatio Brown's 1895 biography.[16] Yet Brown appears to have sourced the material from a privately printed edition, not the Memoirs manuscript. Symonds's cousin, Horatio Percy Symonds, published a commemorative edition of this essay on family origins in 1894: 'The manuscript of the foregoing pages was given to me by the author … to use as I thought fit … I have decided to have it printed for distribution among the members of the family.'[17] These prefatory remarks suggest that Symonds removed the chapter and gifted the manuscript before his death, going some way to explain why Chapter 1 was originally numbered 'iii' (see Table 1). On the basis of this evidence, it is sensible to view Symonds's revisions between 1889 and 1891 as a practice of addition and subtraction, of doing and undoing the Memoirs.

But the manuscript was never a closed text. Symonds repeatedly looks outward to published and private writings by himself and others, producing a highly intertextual narrative. Many intertexts form part of the manuscript itself, transcribed or pasted onto the page. But Symonds also invites his reader to digress, to turn to other works and re-read them in the light of his autobiographical revelations. This is particularly true of poetry. In Chapter 18, for example, Symonds urges his reader to look again at more than fifty poems from Animi Figura (1882) and Vagabunduli Libellus (1884). He outlines the exact order in which they should be re-read and offers the following reflection: 'Taken in the order I have indicated, and detached from the artificial context framed to render publication possible, these sonnets faithfully describe the varying moods, perplexities and conflicts of my passion before it settled into a comparatively wholesome comradeship' (p. 504 in this edition). The resulting poetic sequence constitutes a narrative beyond the bounds of Symonds's Memoirs: a counterpart to be read alongside his later act of remembering, producing a dual narrative that will better explain his relationship with Angelo Fusato, a Venetian gondolier. Elsewhere Symonds requests that poetic intertexts be published as part of his Memoirs in the form of appendices: a series of poems entitled 'Dead Love' and the 'Tale of Theodore' should accompany Chapter 6, while the poem 'John Mordan' should accompany Chapter 12. These appendices are absent from the present edition and their alternatives narratives are not easily accessible to readers—a fact that requires further explanation.

Symonds began composing 'John Mordan' in January 1866; it soon became the titular poem of a homoerotic cycle 'illustrating the love of man for man in all periods of civilization' (p. 349 in this edition). Symonds worked upon the cycle between 1866 and 1875 (most intensively during the late 1860s, contemporary with his relationship with Norman Moor) but on the advice of friends it was abandoned and suppressed. The poems were broken up, dispersed and several are now lost, presumably destroyed. 'John Mordan' numbers among

these missing works and Symonds's request to have it printed as an appendix cannot be fulfilled (unless the work is rediscovered at some future point). It remains an inevitable lacuna with the Memoirs. But the same cannot be said of Symonds's other request. 'Dead Love. A Lieder Kreis in Minor Keys. With The Tale of Theodore' was privately printed in the late 1870s and at least three extant copies of this pamphlet survive. They are held by the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York; Somerville College Library, Oxford; and in the Special Collections at the University of Bristol. The latter copy is annotated in Symonds's hand, and in a prefatory remark on the verso side of the title page, he anticipates his future editor:

> This book is in a deep sense of the term a posthumous publication. In spite of its imitative immaturity, the feelings that produced it were spontaneous and genuine, and the editor has reason to believe that they will find an echo in not a few young minds.[18]

Reading these words in the Special Collections at Bristol was an uncanny experience, for here is Symonds feeding me lines. He writes as his editor. There is no date, so I cannot be sure if this statement is contemporary with the writing of the Memoirs but the coincidence is striking: Symonds's reference to 'posthumous publication' is in keeping with his appendix request. In both the Memoirs and this prefatory remark, Symonds insists upon the importance of the poems as a record of first love and I was determined to provide the appendix, if I could.

Sarah Heidt cites this appendix request as part of a test case demonstrating the difficulties faced by any editor of the Memoirs. As such, it is important to consider the manuscript context:

A privately printed series of poems, entitled ‘Dead Love’, and the ‘Tale of Theodore’, portray the state of my mind at that epoch better than I can now describe it. If these Memoirs see the light of publication, I hope that the poems I have indicated will be printed in an appendix. They were written from day to day under the stress and storm of the moral influences which controlled me. No autobiographical resumption of facts after the lapse of twenty-five years is equal in veracity to such contemporary records.

Omit

Here I feel inclined to lay my pen down in weariness. Why should I go on to tell the story of my life? The back of my life was broken when I yielded to convention, and became untrue in soul to Willie.

But what is human life other than successive states of untruth and conforming to customs? We are, all of us, composite beings, made up, heaven knows how, out of the compromises we have effected between our impulses and instincts and the social laws which gird us round.

(MS 190; cf. pp. 132-3 in this edition)

The request occurs before two paragraphs marked for deletion, containing what Heidt describes as ‘one of Symonds’s most powerful, poignant, and succinct acknowledgments of the complicated relationship between his desires and his life’s atmosphere.’ She also suggests that the appendix request occurs in a paragraph ‘almost certainly not intended for publication’ (presumably because of the reflective, commentary-like tone employed by Symonds at this point).[19] Responding to this material, Heidt imagines multiple, contradictory versions of Symonds to whom the editor might seek to be faithful: ‘Should this future editor be true to the Symonds who wrote these two paragraphs or to the Symonds who willed their omission

but nonetheless left them, unobliterated, in the manuscript?' Heidt presents a range of possible scenarios:

> Should she fulfil Symonds's request by reproducing the poems in an appendix, then omitting part or all of the text containing that request? Should she reproduce exactly the words that appear in the manuscript, then offer the poems as a footnote to his proposal of their inclusion? Should she offer the poems as an appendix, then provide Symonds's proposal as an explanatory footnote to that appendix?[20]

Heidt rightly seeks to exorcise the spectre of final authorial intention and to demonstrate the competing claims of equally justified editorial interventions. Symonds's instructions to his editor, alongside alternatives and contradictions within the text, reveal the Memoirs to be 'a work that will ultimately be "made up" not only by his act of writing but also his editors' and readers' reactions to and handling of that writing.'[21] But Heidt does not imagine a scenario in which the appendix request remains unfulfilled. And yet, if an editor must choose, disobeying some authorial acts in favour of others, might not this request be refused? The omission of 'Dead Love […] With The Tale of Theodore' from the present edition is indicative of my own practice in making up the Memoirs. But my handling of the manuscript and Symonds's literary remains has been affected by conditions and requirements beyond the text. Where Heidt examines the complex relation between editors and implied authors, my practice has been shaped by external authorities.

So let me outline my response to this editing test case. First, I have removed the two paragraphs marked for deletion, placing them in a footnote. This, as Heidt observes, is a 'quieting but not [a] silencing' of the material: it is a compromise that disobeys without prejudice, disregarding the instructions of both 'the Symonds who wrote these […]

paragraphs' and 'the Symonds who willed their omission.'[22] But significantly, it makes legible the simultaneous presence of contradictory instructions and acknowledges the incoherence and mutability of authorial intention. Second, I have reproduced Symonds's appendix request in the main body of the text: no markings or notations indicate that the material should be omitted. But I have not been able to reproduce the poems themselves, for the editorial scenarios outlined by Heidt all proved impossible. Symonds had limited copies of 'Dead Love […] With The Tale of Theodore' privately printed, but this does not constitute publication: the pamphlet remains unpublished in the eyes of copyright law. Under current UK legislation Symonds's unpublished work remains in copyright until 31 December 2039, but the identity of copyright holder(s) is less clear. On his death Symonds bequeathed to Horatio Brown: 'all my Copyright interest in my published works and all my manuscripts and unpublished writings (whether in print, or not) and all my letters.'[23] In effect he disinherited his family of a literary legacy. Following Brown's death in 1926, a box of Symonds's unpublished papers and their accompanying copyright passed into the hands of the London Library (see below). But the copyright in other unpublished materials remains uncertain. In principle, at least, ownership passed into the hands of Brown's beneficiaries—two Australian nephews, Hugh and Alexander—and continues to be held by their living descendants. 'Dead Love […] With The Tale of Theodore' is a substantial text: the pamphlet numbers forty-eight pages and permission is required to reproduce the material.[24] It has not been possible to trace Brown's descendants beyond the 1940s, so permission has not been forthcoming. Arguably Symonds's unpublished writings can be declared orphan works, but this does not eliminate the risks of publication without permission. Although the poems are extant and accessible in archives, the decision was taken not to publish.

This edition is not, therefore, a complete and finished text despite its being the first to reproduce all the manuscript's surviving materials. But incompleteness is an essential feature

of the Memoirs: its missing materials cannot be supplied, barring future discoveries, and its readers are repeatedly directed to alternative narratives outside the text. It is also an essential feature of autobiography: a retrospective narrative that can never reach or look back upon its end point, the death that is (in narrative terms) forever desired and deferred. Chapter 18 stutters to a close with a series of endings and continuations: a catalogue of works written and published during Symonds's residence in Davos; a summary repetition of his 'singular life history' (p. 516 in this edition); a nota bene afterthought commenting upon the scene of writing; and a reflection upon the conflict between sexual desires and social laws. Symonds's final sentence insists upon the impossibility of reconciliation: 'The quarrel drives him into blowing his brains out, or into idiotcy' (p. 519 in this edition). But Symonds was to live for some years yet and he continued to revise the Memoirs: correcting assertions, amending terminology, adding and removing materials. Every editor will construct a particular version of this incomplete text, their choices and arrangements affected by the concerns and priorities of interested parties: authors, readers and publishers.

II. Legacies and afterlives

Symonds died in Rome on 19 April 1893. On his death-bed, he penned the following note to his wife, Catherine:

> There is something I ought to tell you, and being ill at Rome I take this occasion. If I do not see you again in this life you remember that I made H.F. Brown depositary of my printed books. I wish that legacy to cover all MSS Diaries Letters and other matters found in my books cupboard, with the exception of business papers. I do this because I have written things you would not like to read, but which I have always felt

> justified and useful for society. Brown will consult and publish nothing without your consent.[25]

This final letter confirmed Symonds's intention to appoint Brown his literary executor and hinted at reasons for leaving his unpublished work and copyright out of family hands: Brown would protect those 'justified and useful' writings (including the Memoirs) that other friends and relatives might seek to suppress or destroy. Symonds's letter also established an awkward set of dual authorities and obligations: executory and familial, legal and ethical. In the margin next to his assurance that Brown would 'publish nothing without your consent', Symonds scrawled a further instruction: 'Show this at once to him.' With these words and actions he removed Brown's autonomy as executor, binding him to consider family wishes when performing his duties. From this moment on the Memoirs' afterlife has been shaped by the rival concerns of owners and custodians, friends and relatives, readers and editors. And this fascinating story reveals competing desires to uncover and conceal, protect and preserve, read and elide Symonds's words.[26]

The art of biography

Horatio Brown was made aware in 1891 that his duties as literary executor would include custody of the Memoirs:

> I want to save it from destruction after my death, and yet to reserve its publication for a period when it will not be injurious to my family. I do not just now know how to meet the difficulty. […] You will inherit my MSS if you survive me. But you take them freely, to deal with them as you like, under my will. I have sketched my wish

> out that this autobiography should not be destroyed. Still, I see the necessity for caution in its publication. Give the matter a thought. If I could do so, I should like to except it (as a thing apart, together with other documents) from my general literary bequest; so as to make no friend, or person, responsible for the matter, to which I attach a particular value apart from life's relations. (p. 527 in this edition)

Symonds acknowledged the difficulties. In his proposed (but not pursued) plan to treat the manuscript as 'a thing apart'—an institutional bequest, perhaps, under his own terms—he betrayed a fear of asking too much, of placing too great a responsibility upon fallible shoulders. But Brown heeded and conformed to his request: he kept a copy of Symonds's letter with the manuscript, underlining his words concerning preservation and publication (see Appendix 1). Brown would keep the Memoirs safe for the rest of his life and these instructions would guide his practice as both an executor and biographer.

Following the death of a respected man of letters, an authorised biography would have been expected. Catherine asked Brown to take on the task: he was an author in his own right, and as executor he had access to the required papers. John Addington Symonds: A Biography Compiled from his Papers and Correspondence was a work of collage and edition: extracts from letters, diaries and lengthy passages from the Memoirs were selected, arranged and interspersed with brief commentaries. In the Preface, Brown explained that he wanted the book 'to be as closely autobiographical as I could make it.'[27] This was an opportunity to make public Symonds's life-writing, but Brown did not (and could not) include the Memoirs' sexual revelations. He was bound by the trust placed in him by Symonds and he worked closely with Catherine (who, in turn, sought advice from another of Symonds's friends, Henry Sidgwick). The surviving Memoirs manuscript bears the trace of Brown's editorial practice: his annotations and deletions, comments and revisions mark its pages (see Notes on

the Text). And in the published biography, religion was employed to overwrite and disguise Symonds's sexual self-scrutiny: 'The central, the architectonic, quality of his nature was religious. By religious, I mean that his major preoccupation, his dominating pursuit, was the interrogation of the Universe, the search for God.'[28]

Brown, Catherine and Sidgwick were all concerned to protect Symonds's posthumous reputation, but there appears to have been some disagreement. That Brown wished to go further than Catherine would allow is suggested by her worried note to Henry Graham Dakyns (to whom she also sent a copy of Symonds's death-bed note):

> You see how the great question was supreme in his mind to the very last. Are we right in being cowardly and suppressing it? I am glad we have Henry's wisdom for final reference. I trust Horatio fully and want to help, but hinder him as you know.[29]

Catherine remained sensitive to the importance placed by her dead husband on his 'justified and useful' writings on sexuality. Despite these doubts, she must have reconciled herself to the role of censor. In 1936 Charles Holmes, an employee of the publisher John C. Nimmo, recalled the extraordinary passage of the biography through the printing press:

> Symonds's own 'Autobiography' was another source of trouble. The manuscript was deliberately outspoken on many matters which are usually handled with reticence, so that Horatio Brown, Symonds's friend and editor, exercised little more than ordinary discretion in cutting out the most intimate self-revelations. But a straiter critic had then to take a hand. The proofs, already bowdlerized, were completely emasculated, so that frank 'Confessions,' which might have made some stir in the world (indeed that was generally expected), emerged as pure commonplace.[30]

The unnamed ‘straiter critic’ could be Catherine herself or Henry Sidgwick (indeed it could be any number of Symonds’s surviving literary friends).[31] But whoever it was, Holmes bemoans their interference. Ironically, he adopts a gendered discourse to characterise the text’s transformation from confession to commonplace. Symonds’s sexuality was silenced in order to safeguard his public reputation and claims to respectable masculinity, but Holmes’s euphemistic account of the biography’s failure to shock depends upon some implied failure or impotence in the man.

Brown has often been criticised, both in public and private. One of the biography’s first readers was Symonds’s friend, the poet and theologian T.E. Brown, who wryly complained: ‘I confess that I had not known Symonds. […] I fancy I can recollect a different Symonds, full of enthusiasm for favourite authors, outspoken, critical, of course, but brimming with love for those he preferred.’[32] The disconnect between the biography’s portrait of a man tortured by religious doubt, and the memories of surviving family and friends, becomes a characteristic refrain found in many contemporary responses. In the Saturday Review, Arthur Symons damned Brown’s ‘art’ of biography with faint praise:

> Mr Horatio Brown’s Life of John Addington Symonds is composed with so careful and so successful a reticence on the part of the author, that it is not at first sight obvious how much its concealment of art is a conscious subtlety in art. These two volumes […] present a most carefully arranged portrait, which, in one sense, is absolutely the creation of the biographer.

Symons chooses his words carefully, conceding that Brown had worked with ‘immense ingenuity and diligence’ to produce a portrait with ‘remarkable subtlety and insight.’[33] But

his comments emphasise artifice, disguise and deception. Brown's role as biographer is concealed by an assemblage of life-writing, lending his text the appearance of autobiography (thus borrowing from the perceived authority of self-revelation). But Symons's telling nod to 'reticence' cuts through this façade of authenticity: Brown has practised the biographer's art of omission. Having raised these objections (albeit through hints and clues), Symons dedicates the remainder of his review to the 'curious self-analysis' on display in extracted material from the Memoirs, diaries and letters. He was clearly fascinated by the former, 'which is not likely at present to be published in its entirety.'[34]

In 1964 these accusations were repeated and extended by Symonds's new biographer, Phyllis Grosskurth. In the Preface to his 1895 work, Brown justified his practice by citing Symonds's claim that 'The report has to be supplemented indeed, in order that a perfect portrait may be painted of the man' (p. 465 in this edition). Grosskurth explicitly countered this move: 'Brown failed to note that a biography which falsifies a man, changes events, and omits important facts, is less than truth.'[35] And when, like Brown, she began to work with the Memoirs manuscript as its editor, her criticisms went further still. She described his biography as a 'filleted version' of the text: 'Frankly, I believe the publication of Brown's biography was a regrettable decision. If he could not speak the truth, there was no necessity for any sort of publication.'[36] These complaints reach their peak in a reflective essay looking back upon her career: 'Brown had been extremely hypocritical, in my view, to suggest that Symonds's problem had been religious doubt. Why bother to publish such a misleading account?'[37] Over the years Grosskurth intensified her rhetoric from failure to hypocrisy, maintaining that Brown ought better to have said and published nothing.

Other critics have been far more ready to consider the conditions under which Brown worked, praising the surprising loquacity of this otherwise muted text. Timothy d'Arch Smith and John Pemble were among the first to offer a defence. As early as 1970 (just six years

after Grosskurth's biography) Smith claimed it was 'high time that [Brown] was acquitted of the charges of expunging all Uranian material from [the biography's] pages.'[38] As evidence, he cites the 'straiter critic' implicated by Charles Holmes. Pemble turned his attention to Symonds's family and emphasised the broader context of posthumous publication: Brown's safe biography should be viewed alongside the imminent and far more daring publication of Das Konträre Geschlechtsgefühl in 1896.[39] More recently, Sarah Heidt has pointed to the ironies at work in Grosskurth's criticism when one considers that she too 'filleted' the Memoirs, reproducing just two thirds of the text in her 1984 edition.[40] David Amigoni, by contrast, has gestured towards new ways of reading Brown's biography, viewing it as part of a broader poetics of translation, one that includes 'movement between genres, perceiving subjects, epistemologies, and systems of discourse.'[41] For Amigoni, Symonds's translation of The Life of Benvenuto Cellini (1888) serves as precedent for Brown's translation of private memoirs into public biography. In the Introduction to Cellini, Symonds acknowledged his subject's preference for 'darker lusts' and cites (in a footnote) his imprisonment in 1556 'on a charge of unnatural vice.'[42] These euphemisms prompt Amigoni to identify 'historical and epistemological translations' that function in addition to alterations in language; in the case of Cellini, these 'involve "evasive" maneuvers, suspended between their overt contexts and the "unspeakable" contexts that Symonds cannot publicly broach.'[43] So too for Brown, whose editing and framing of the Memoirs deployed 'languages of religion and nature' as 'translations of, and alibis for, the language of sexual struggle.'[44] It is Amigoni's notion of a text 'suspended' between different historical and epistemological contexts that provides an opportunity to reassess Brown's biography, for it suggests the palimpsestic survival of overwritten sexual content. An example will serve to demonstrate.

In Chapter 10 of the Memoirs, Symonds records his travels in Normandy with his sister, Charlotte. In Coutances they meet two unnamed women and a man called François

(their nephew and son) in a public garden. Symonds transcribes his account from a letter dated 3 June 1867:

> **He must have a story; for his manners were excellent, and he knew some English, and his intelligence in seizing the nuance of what one said was perfect.** And all the while his liquid eloquent eyes were asking me: 'do you want nothing? Is there nothing to give, nothing to get?' In a sort of way I corresponded; for **these meetings with passing strangers, these magnetisms of one indifferent person by another are among the strangest things in life.** I remember, for example, today, as though it had been yesterday, how several years ago a young man in a shirt and trousers, stretched upon a parapet below the Ponte di Paradiso at Venice, gazed into my eyes as I rowed past him, lifted his head, then rose upon his elbows, and followed me till I was out of sight with a fixed look which I shall remember if we meet in the next world. **Well: when the conversation flagged between Charlotte and me and the old women, one of them would say: 'Ah, quelle heureuse rencontre! Nous étions là assises sur les marches de l'église. Nous nous attendions à rien. Et voilà que vous êtes venus! N'est ce pas François?' And François only smiled a little sadly,** and looked at me with a trifle more of meaning in his deep grey eyes. **I, for my part, felt how idiotically human life is made. Charlotte delighted in the kindly, hale, hearty, sweet-tempered, plain-featured, innocent, hospitable, elderly ladies. They liked the amusement of walking with two English tourists. But the young man and I, we wanted to be comrades, if only for a day or two in passing; he to hear of my life, I of his**; to embrace and exchange experiences; to leave a mark upon each other's memory; to part at last as friends with something added, each by each to each. **And things are so arranged that this may not be,**

perhaps ought not to be, though I cannot, for the soul of me, see why they should not be. (pp. 268-9 in this edition)

Material in bold is reproduced in the 1895 biography: it is permitted to traverse the different historical and epistemological contexts that shape Symonds's private account and Brown's later translation. Omissions serve to lessen but not eradicate the encounter's erotic charge: Brown removes Symonds's imagined acts of unspoken communication with François, his more corporeal desires to embrace the 'passing stranger', and his digression concerning the mutual gaze enjoyed in Venice, the Italian city of pleasures. But even the bowdlerised account remains articulate on the subject of male relations, couched in terms of comradeship and hinting at the social obstacles that prevent their friendship and union. Apprised of Brown's compilation method in the biography's Preface, readers are invited to infer the lost original—to read palimpsetically. This is certainly how Brown chose to defend his work, claiming that sympathetic readers would have no trouble in recognising and decoding the biography-as-translation: 'I have by no means omitted the topic altogether. There are passages […] which contain the most important of Symonds's views on the subject and which will be understood by those who can understand the matter at all.'[45]

The biography was published just a matter of months before the trials of Oscar Wilde brought male homosexuality to public attention and notoriety. It is tempting to speculate whether any delay might have changed irrevocably Brown's practice as editor, biographer and translator. The question is, of course, unanswerable. But Brown stood by his portrait once unveiled to the public. When preparing a second edition in 1903, working in the shadows cast by Wilde's imprisonment and death, Brown undertook no major revisions (including the encounter with François, which remained unchanged): 'I at least could present no other portrait; and so this second edition differs in no essential outlines from the first.'[46]

Bonfire and embargos

During the final years of his life, Brown returned to the question of Symonds's posthumous reputation and the trust placed in him as literary executor. In 1923 he edited The Letters and Papers of John Addington Symonds, making public a new selection of material from letters and diaries. In the Preface to this work, Brown drew once more upon a discourse of portraiture: his stated aim was 'to present a portrait—not the only possible portrait, of course, no portrait is ever that—of a singularly interesting and even challenging personality.'[47] The edition supplements and extends his earlier biography; it was designed to pique the interest of readers who continued to discuss Symonds's work 'in varying tones of sympathy or of dislike.'[48] He sought to reinvigorate public discourse, doing justice to a bold prefatory claim: '[Symonds's] name is still alive in the world of letters.'[49] But the decision to review this public reputation through the lens of private writing necessitated some further comment on Symonds's life apart from his work as a man of letters. For Brown, the edition revealed 'an idiosyncratic animi figura' or portrait of a mind (the phrase is borrowed from Symonds's 1882 poetry collection, that 'self-revealing series of Sonnets'),[50] bearing witness to the subject's 'independence of, and […] antagonism towards, current opinion and accepted standards which had its roots deep down in the anarchic complex of his nature, in the hidden roots of self, where the battle of his dipsychia was fought though never finished.'[51] But there would be no revelation. Brown was bound by Symonds's exhortation to publish nothing that might hurt his surviving family, and though the edition gestures toward a double life, a self at odds with society, it never exceeds the respectable limits of inference and implication.[52]

Once Brown had seen this new literary portrait into print, he turned his attention to posterity and the private record. Under the terms of Symonds's will he was the owner and

custodian of his late friend's unpublished writings, and he had to decide what would become of the material in his possession after his own death. Minded by Symonds's particular request that the Memoirs 'should not perish', Brown sought to make special provision in his will for the manuscript's preservation and protection. A codicil (dated 6 October 1925) reveals an original plan: 'I am endeavouring to get the British Museum to accept custody of J.A. Symonds' Autobiography, with an embargo of fifty years, against publication.'[53] But negotiations soon failed and a subsequent codicil (dated 22 December 1925) outlines a revised solution:

> I desire that a green card-board box tied with strings and labelled J.A. Symonds' Papers, bequeathed to The London Library…subject to conditions agreed on in the Letter of the Librarian (Mr Hagberg Wright) to me dated Dec. 15th 1925 and the letter from me to the Librarian, dated Dec. 21st.[54]

Only the second letter has survived.[55] It reveals that Brown consulted and made arrangements with Charles Hagberg Wright and Edmund Gosse (a member of the Library committee), and the following conditions were agreed: 'the greatest possible discretion' was to be exercised in granting access to the material, and a fifty-year embargo was placed on publication.[56] These documents also reveal that Symonds's Memoirs were not the only item contained within the cardboard box. Brown's will makes reference to an autograph book (with such illustrious contributors as William Gladstone, Thomas Hardy and John Ruskin), while his letter offers the following description: 'This box will contain the Autobiography which Symonds was anxious to have preserved, the Diaries and his letters (of which I have made great use already) and my letters which he kept, will probably be destroyed on my death.'[57] Phyllis Grosskurth has noted the striking ambiguity of the final clause: 'Did Brown mean that his

own letters or his letters and Symonds's letters and diaries would "probably be destroyed"?'[58] In the event, of course, he would not be there to adjudicate how these wishes and arrangements were interpreted and put into practice.

Brown died of heart failure on 19 August 1926. Eight months later, on 11 April 1927, the London Library committee formally accepted his bequest:

> It was proposed and seconded that the gift of the Ms. autobiography of John A. Symonds should be accepted, and that a notice should be placed on the Ms. that it is not to be opened by the Librarian or any other person without leave of the Committee.[59]

The Memoirs manuscript was sealed and the package stored in the Library's safe. Most other materials in the cardboard box—the autograph book, diaries and letters—were almost certainly destroyed. That anything is known about this shadowy episode in Symonds's literary afterlife is due to the investigations and testimonies of his descendants. Shortly after Brown's death, Symonds's youngest daughter, Katharine Furse, began enquiries as to the fate of her father's papers.[60] From her niece (and Symonds's grand-daughter), Janet Vaughan, she discovered that his autobiography was in the possession of the London Library—Janet had this information from Symonds's friend and Brown's Clifton College schoolfellow, T.H. Warren. On 21 April 1927, ten days after the Library sealed the Memoirs, Katharine took to the streets of London. She visited Somerset House to read her father's will; this confirmed that copyright and ownership of his unpublished work had passed to Horatio Brown, and she promptly sent a letter to his executors for further information concerning the disposal of his effects. Travelling from The Strand to St James's Square, her next meeting would bear extraordinary fruit.

Katharine recorded these events and discoveries in a memorandum composed later that day:

> I then went to see Doctor Hagberg Wright at the London Library and he gave me a lot of information, including the following
>
> All Father's M.S. have been destroyed by Horatio's Executors. This was done after they had been looked through by Sir Edmund Goss [sic]. They had been sent in 2 or 3 boxes to Dr. Hagberg Wright by H.B. together with sundry privately published papers.
>
> Dr. Hagberg Wright said, in answer to a question from me, that he thought there were among these papers no M.S. of Father's published works. He did not know what had happen [sic] to the latter. The M.S. which were destroyed to be of a nature which they though it better to destroy.[61]

Hagberg Wright would later contradict this account. In June 1939 he claimed not to remember Gosse being involved with Brown's bequest, and in July 1939 he declared (in direct contradiction of Brown's will): 'The London Library only received the ms, and Horatio Brown's collection of Italian pamphlets. There were no other letters or mss in the box. There was nothing to destroy.'[62] These retractions cloud the truth, but Katharine's memorandum was later supported by Janet Vaughan (see below). In Katherine's version of events, Hagberg Wright and Gosse take a hard line on Brown's ambiguous statement concerning the destruction of papers, acting as guardians and censors of Symonds's posthumous reputation. Their hands may have been tied with regard to the special arrangements made for the Memoirs, but Symonds's letters, diaries and 'privately published papers'—presumably copies of A Problem in Greek Ethics (1873), A Problem in Modern Ethics, and materials collected in

preparation for Sexual Inversion—were most likely consigned to the flames. That Hagberg Wright misjudged the purpose of Katharine's visit in April 1927 is suggested by the further reassurances he took pains to offer:

> Dr. H.W. assured me that there was nothing in any of the papers now extant to which ayone [sic] could take much exception. I told him that we were not very anxious about this as we felt that, now that all subjects were so much more freely discussed, we did not think it mattered.

Gosse and Hagberg Wright sought to make safe the archival record, silencing Symonds's historical, legal and scientific studies of sexual inversion and supressing his personal revelations in letters and diaries. On the evidence of Katharine's memorandum, it seems that Hagberg Wright presumed she would share their concerns and approve of their efforts to prevent public scandal. But Katharine insisted the family would have thought and acted differently.

It is tempting to view this meeting in terms of generational conflict: a daughter fighting to recover her father's legacy from the outmoded pruderies of his Victorian friends and contemporaries. This all too convenient narrative is compounded by Janet Vaughan's memories of an encounter with Gosse:

> When I was a young medical student living in London I used to take tea with Edmund Gosse and Mrs. Gosse on Sunday afternoon. […] One afternoon Gosse said he particularly wanted to talk to me. He said he knew how glad I should be to hear what he had done to preserve the good name of my grandfather J.A.S. […] Then he explained that when Horatio Brown died, Horatio had left all J.A.S.'s papers to him,

> Gosse, to dispose of as he thought best. Hagburgh Wright [sic] and I had a bonfire in the garden and burnt them all, my dear Janet, all except his autobiography […]. I am sure you will agree that this was the right and proper thing to do. I said very little. It was not safe to let myself speak as I thought of those two old men destroying, one could only guess, all the case histories and basic studies of sexual inversion that J.A.S. is known to have made, together no doubt with other letters and papers that would have thrown much light on J.A.S.'s work and friendships.
>
> Gosse's smug gloating delight as he told me, the sense that he had enjoyed to the full the honour fate had given him, was nauseating. There was nothing to be said, I walked out and never went back.[63]

The indignant articulacy of Janet's retrospective account stands in marked contrast to her silence during the tête-à-tête. That she did not feel it 'safe' to speak gives the lie to Katharine's assertion that 'all subjects were so much more freely discussed.' Janet penned her account in September 1967, just two months after the passing of the Sexual Offences Act that decriminalised (male) homosexuality in England and Wales. Forty years had loosed her tongue but the spectre of giving offence haunts this exchange: it provides the motive for Gosse's actions (his fear that Symonds's private papers would offend the reading public), and it lies at the heart of Janet's silent protest. Shared anxieties concerning appropriate public behaviours and utterances cross the generations, cautioning against unproblematic appeals to age difference—the liberated and liberating young, the constrained and constraining old. This was something that Katharine herself rejected in a letter to Hagberg Wright: 'I appreciate the differences in outlook between the Victorian era and the present one, but having my feet in one and my head in the other I cannot be content with a dividing line.'[64] She was barely thirteen years younger than Hagberg Wright, and as she sat in the Librarian's Room at the

London Library, it was relatively easy for this much-decorated, much-honoured Dame Grand Cross of the British Empire to speak back to authority. Not so the young medical student taking tea in a private sitting-room.

Access denied

Posthumous bonfires have long been a primal scene of biographical romance; they are endlessly fascinating and frustrating, inciting desires for archival completion that can never be satisfied. Symonds's lost papers stirred the imagination of his grand-daughter: Janet Vaughan's retrospective account unfolds a counterfactual narrative, conceiving of irretrievable evidence that might prove Symonds's place in genealogies of sexual research and emancipation. Katharine's response was different: she documented her discoveries in a memorandum, wrote 'to sundry people for further information' and sought the surviving material remains of her father's literary legacy.[65] She investigated the sale of Horatio Brown's library at Sotheby's and by Messrs. Hodgson's, the latter having disposed of some pamphlets ('by arrangement of Dr. H.W.') that were part of the Brown bequest to the London Library.[66] The sale was reported in the Saturday Review, which noted the presence of 'fourteen slim pamphlets of verse' by Symonds among the available items. Several of these were purchased by A.J.A Symons, future biographer of Frederick Rolfe (Baron Corvo) and the author of the Saturday Review article. He hinted at their 'far franker self-revelation': the pamphlets revealed that certain poems in Many Moods (1878) and New and Old (1880) were 'palimpsests', public texts that partially erased and disguised original, private sentiments.[67] While Katharine pursued these lines of investigation, she also sought permission to read the Memoirs.

Hagberg Wright laid this request before the London Library committee on 9 May 1927, but not before warning her against the action: 'from my own very cursory glance at one page of it I don't think you would be glad to have seen it.'[68] His concern for Katharine's modesty and memories of her father mattered little, for the committee refused access on account of the conditions imposed by Brown. Katharine did not protest and she recorded her response in an annotation to Hagberg Wright's letter: 'Replied that I accepted decision. All I wanted to establish was that, if anyone saw Father's M.S. his daughter ought to be allowed to do so.'[69]

Here there is a pause in the story of the Memoirs manuscript: the package remained sealed in the Library's safe where it lay undisturbed until 1939. In this year Katharine began to write her own memoirs, researching and drafting the book that would become Hearts and Pomegranates: The Story of Forty-five Years, 1875 to 1920 (1940). Her writing prompted her to consider how lives intersect, how her story was bound up with the stories of others. In May she asked The Times to print an advert seeking further information concerning her father, her aunt, Marianne North, and her late husband, Charles Furse. The Times recommended that she write her request as a letter, which they published on 12 June. More articles in other newspapers soon followed: on 13 June the News Chronicle ran a story (under the headline 'Poet's Daughter Seeks Lost Works') detailing Katharine's attempts to unravel the 'family mystery' concerning 'the disappearance of the private papers of her father'; and the Daily Telegraph on 14 June published a short piece suggesting that 'clues in Australia' (where Brown's nephews lived) might reveal the whereabouts of Symonds's papers and autobiography.[70] It is not, perhaps, surprising that the press sensationalised the story, eliding the aunt and husband in favour of the father's lost archive. But no mention was made of Katharine's prior discovery of the Memoirs being in the London Library's collection. The

Daily Telegraph explicitly described the autobiography (in headline and text) as 'missing', while the News Chronicle implied the same by listing it alongside other 'missing papers.'[71]

That Katharine did not conceal (or forget) the whereabouts of her father's manuscript is suggested by the apology she felt compelled to offer Hagberg Wright:

> I am sorry you were rung up about the Autobiography of J.A.S. by the Evening Standard. I begged them to drop the subject which they did I think but the News Chronicle started the herd with headlines about my searching for father's missing M.S.[72]

Katharine renewed her correspondence with the Library shortly before her letter to The Times was published, but she did not repeat her request to read the Memoirs. Instead she sought Hagberg Wright's assistance in identifying Horatio Brown's literary executors and contacting Percy Babington, author and compiler of the Bibliography of the Writings of John Addington Symonds (1925). Without prompting, Hagberg Wright offered to raise the question of access once more but he remained pessimistic and expanded upon his previous warning: 'My recollection of one page that I read is not a pleasing one and personally I should like it destroyed as not conducing to add to the reputation of an author whose works I have read and admired and bought.'[73] In an echo of their meeting twelve years earlier, Katharine again took the contrary position: she could 'well imagine' that he wanted the document destroyed, but did not 'altogether agree' with him.[74] On 17 July, the committee refused to grant access. But this time the decision was a close-run thing. Writing to Katharine, Hagberg Wright broke the secrecy of the meeting room: he informed her that the committee was divided, and that the Deputy Chair (who was against) held the casting vote. He went on to assure her that the issue would be raised again at the next meeting (scheduled for the autumn), and that the Chair,

Lord Ilchester, had no objections to her reading the manuscript. He thought it likely that permission would be granted and suggested that she send a formal written request.[75] This Katharine did on 11 August, offering the following self-justification: 'It is not idle curiosity which induces me to make this request but a feeling that, as his only surviving daughter, I should be allowed to see what he wrote.'[76] She would have to wait two months for a decision.

Back in June, when Hagberg Wright repeated his warning that the Memoirs were far from 'pleasant', Katharine had sent him a 'copy of Mental Hygiene' and boldly asked: 'Have you studied Sexual Inversion at all?'[77] Her own research in this line owed much to the autobiography she was writing and to nascent plans to correct (as she saw it) Symonds's posthumous public image. She discussed these plans with Virginia Woolf, who was writing a biography of Roger Fry and faced similar difficulties with regard to the public disclosure of private, heterodox desires.[78] Woolf discovered references to Symonds and Brown in Fry's papers; these remarks '[hinted] at the forbidden topics' and Woolf was curious to know how Katharine planned to confront the issue: 'Are you being open? —anyhow more so that [sic] the Horatio Brown Biography.'[79] 'I am trying to write of the "skeleton in the cupboard",' Katharine replied, insisting that 'To my mind, the more said the better.'[80] Her book was under contract with Macmillan and Katharine claimed to have informed the publishers of her intention: she met with Lovat Dickson (her contact at the publisher) and told him that one of her primary concerns was 'to write of father from this point of view.'[81] Rumours of her writing were also beginning to spread through literary and academic circles. Katharine's appeal in The Times provoked quite a response, and in letters to Woolf she complained of importunate advice received from strangers on the subject of Symonds's sexuality. She enclosed an example of the encouraging kind from S.E. Cottam, an Oxford clergyman and Uranian poet: he declared that Symonds was 'a Platonist, a fact stamped on all his writings, and as plain as a pike's staff to at least the initiated'; he hoped this would be 'frankly

admitted' in her book and called for the publication of the Memoirs 'in extenso.'[82] By contrast, other unlooked-for correspondents 'begged [her] not to write of the subject. Implying that I risk my own good name which does not interest me.'[83] Woolf took an optimistic view of the risk to reputation, adding her voice to the chorus of support: she testified to a growing desire to have 'the question openly discussed' and claimed that 'a woman could do it more openly.'[84] Woolf's rhetoric depends upon female exclusion from male same-sex desire, seeming to offer a safeguard against accusations of prurience or vicariousness (and, of course, Katharine could claim the redoubled protection of being a daughter). But her attempt to write of the 'skeleton in the cupboard' did not go to plan.

Katharine's typescript was too long. She revised the text but the publishers insisted that more material needed to be removed; in particular, they wanted to reduce her account of childhood and 'to cut a great deal about J.A.S.'[85] Katharine feared that Macmillan was becoming censorious and no longer wished 'to get mixed up with this subject.'[86] In the event, she must have felt unable to concede to their editorial demands. The contract was broken, and when Hearts and Pomegranates finally appeared in September 1940 it was published by Peter Davies. 'You will be disappointed in my book where it writes of J.A.S.,' she confessed to Woolf:

> What you wrote urging me to "let the cat out of the bag" is not in my text. I re-wrote the chapter about J.A.S. from that point of view several times and each time shed some of my own inhibitions. You may detect some still.[87]

Katharine's self-criticism was only partly justified. In a chapter dedicated to her father she sought to correct the 'morbid impression' left by Brown's biography.[88] She claimed that his account was incomplete because it elided Symonds's 'most vivid and brilliant and amusing

personality' and omitted 'except through inference here and there, all reference to [his] study of homosexuality.'[89] In 1940 it was no longer possible for Katharine to ignore the latter. Symonds's private writings upon male same-sex desire—literary, historical and sexological—had been brought to wider public knowledge in 1925 by Percy Babington's Bibliography. Brown, however, should take some share in the credit: he granted Babington access to his extensive library of Symonds's works—'the most valuable material in his possession'—including seven private poetry pamphlets, A Problem in Greek Ethics, A Problem in Modern Ethics and rare editions of Sexual Inversion.[90] But the bibliography went further than simply enumerating contents: Babington's notes highlight original readerships and dissemination, revisions and reuse, and the controversies provoked. His entry for Greek Ethics includes a letter to Richard Burton, written by Symonds in 1890 to accompany a gifted copy. This document reveals how the essay circulated among coteries of sympathetic readers, for Symonds had read and admired Burton's discussion of pederasty in the 'Terminal Essay' of his edition of the Arabian Nights (1885-88), sending the work 'as a very little sign of my respect' (and requesting its return, if Burton did not care 'to read, or to keep, the opuscle').[91] Entries for the poetry pamphlets reveal Symonds's acts of self-censorship as he revised private texts for a public audience. For example, an early version of 'From the Gulistân' in Many Moods had appeared in 'Lyra Virginti Chordarum' (under the title 'Imitated from Sady') and Babington identified significant changes: 'In the version in Many Moods, the second line of the poem as printed here "Walking the streets I saw a boy most beauteous" is omitted, and the sex of the Beloved is altered from male to female.'[92] But the bibliography was at its most expansive and suggestive when dealing with Sexual Inversion, dedicating five and a half pages to four distinct editions: the 1896 German translation, the first and second English editions of 1897, and an American edition of 1901. In a précis of Havelock Ellis's Preface to the first English edition, Babington reveals that Symonds instigated the

collaboration, and in his notes he hints at the project's controversies: the first English edition of Sexual Inversion was 'suppressed', while the second 'was successfully prosecuted as an obscene work.'[93] He also supplied a 'comparative table' recording the arrangement of material across editions, rendering visible the gradual elision of Symonds's contribution.[94] For Katharine, writing after Babington, the cat was already part-way out of the bag.

In Hearts and Pomegranates she rejected those binaries, those 'clean cut divisions of individuals into classes, such as healthy and unhealthy, moral and immoral, homosexual and heterosexual', that would presume to identify, describe and fix her father's nature.[95] She refused this specificity: 'there are intermediate grades as varied as are shades of colour.'[96] Katharine's discomfort is reminiscent of Symonds's own struggle to articulate his sexuality, wavering between sin and disease, working to reconcile masculinity with prevailing models of same-sex desire. But if Symonds came to hope for future accommodation within a revised medical discourse, Katharine found solace in ambiguity. She equivocates, offering a general observation that her father 'cannot be fitted into any mould' and making no clear statement about his sexuality.[97] If her insistence upon the various 'shades' (not binaries) can be read as a subtle dislocation of heterosexuality, the same is also true of homosexuality. Throughout the chapter Symonds remains a scholar and his interest in homosexuality remains almost exclusively academic. Katharine is at her most direct when she concedes that her father was sometimes 'described as a platonist.' [98] Her turn of phrase is a direct echo of S.E. Cottam's letter, but she does not permit the term to resonate freely. In a footnote, she provides the following definition:

> It has been stated in the Encyclopaedia of Sexual Knowledge, edited by Dr. Norman Haire, Ch.M., M.B. and published by Aldor, that Plato did not think of human love but of the ideal love of beauty, truth, goodness, of the ideal of superhuman perfection.

> Plato's metaphysical conception, therefore, refers not to concrete individuals but to an abstract idea.[99]

Leaning heavily upon the titles and post-nominals of the medical profession, Katharine obfuscates as she clarifies. There is an implicit fear of unfettered euphemism—that readers will understand all too much, all too clearly, by this allusion to the Greeks. But the term loses specificity as it is defined: it becomes 'abstract' rather than 'concrete', concerning itself with ideas and ideals, not the messy facts of human bodies and desires. But this disembodied love does not sit easily alongside her account of Symonds's 'pioneering in the subject of the psychology of sex.'[100] To enact a rapprochement, Katharine emphasises disinterest and altruism. She quotes extensively from her father's correspondence with Havelock Ellis, identifying his efforts to correct medical error and legal injustice. In these letters Symonds insists that sex must be studied inclusively: 'It ought to be scientifically, historically, impartially investigated, instead of being left to Labby's inexpansible legislation.'[101] Throughout the chapter his scholarly conduct remains (paradoxically) personal but selfless:

> There seems to be no doubt that it was the loneliness of his childhood, combined with his revulsion against the social conventions of public school and university which fixed the introspective tendencies in my Father and led him, at an early age, from altruistic motives as much as for the satisfaction of his own analytical interest, to a deep and conscientious study of homosexuality. For he realised, through his own experience, how many difficulties, physical and psychological, have to be faced by those individuals who, through no fault of their own, may be different in their make-up from most of their more virile companions.[102]

Katharine identifies a sympathetic (not empathetic) point of origin for her father's work. She paints him as an outsider: physically weak, lonely and introspective, possessing a 'delicate and sensitive' personality, attuned to the plight of other (sexual) outsiders.[103] That Symonds too was 'different in [his] make-up', sharing those desires that formed his object of study, remains an implication to be noticed or ignored at the reader's whim.

Katharine published her autobiography before she was able to read her father's Memoirs. But Hearts and Pomegranates proved a prescient text. In it she replicated Symonds's appeals to Platonic idealism and scientific objectivity, but she employed them differently. In his engagements with sexology, Symonds repeatedly sought to add his personal experience to the store of evidence: in the posterity project of the Memoirs, and through the case study he supplied for Sexual Inversion. He also came to reject the possibility (and advisability) of sexual sublimation through appeals to higher principles. Rather optimistically, he described his relationship with Norman Moor as '[closing] the period of idealism', prompting him 'to seek a new solution upon lower and more practical lines of conduct' (p. 398 in this edition). Katharine, by contrast, did not permit the scholar's mask of intellectual detachment to slip fully from her subject's face.

Broken seals and light edits

Katharine's third request to read the Memoirs was put before the London Library committee on 9 October 1939. The vote was carried and permission granted 'owing to the confidence which the Committee [placed] in Dame Katharine's loyalty and discretion.'[104] The final word is telling. As Symonds's daughter she was deemed an exception to the rules imposed by Brown's bequest, and in a 'Rider' to its permission the Library made sure to underscore this

point: ‘It is not to be taken as a precedent for similar requests which may be made to the Committee in the future.’[105]

Katharine did not read the Memoirs for another ten years. In the interval between her August request and the October committee meeting, war was declared against Germany and Katharine moved away from London. She was also busy with her book, writing and revising the typescript and negotiating with publishers. Once Hearts and Pomegranates was published, there was little immediate incentive to return to a city under bombardment during the Blitz. The Second World War removed Katharine from proximity to the Memoirs and interrupted her research into family histories and the fate of literary remains. But she did not forget the manuscript, and she began to toy with the idea of writing a book about her father. In December 1940 she once again renewed her correspondence with the London Library. By then a new Librarian was in post (Charles Hagberg Wright having died in March that year), and she wrote to Christopher Purnell to check on the manuscript’s safety. She offered to store it ‘down here [at Ebbesbourne Wake, near Salisbury] where it would be as safe from air raids as anywhere [in] these islands.’[106] Purnell politely refused.

It was not until 1949, four years after the conflict had ceased, that Katharine made use of the hard fought and won permission to read her father’s autobiography. This delay seems extraordinary and there is frustratingly little evidence among her surviving papers to explain its cause. To her friend Walter (‘Wattie’) Roch, she simply claimed to have ‘[waited] till I had leisure and felt the Stimmung to look at it.’[107] The necessary humour arrived with the spring. In March 1949 she wrote again to Purnell: ‘now I feel the time is coming when I should look at the M.S. of JAS Autobiography so, as soon as I see a free time ahead I hope you will let me do so.’[108] On 18 May she visited the Library and began to read the manuscript. In a note among her papers, she records her experience: ‘Was absolutely absorbed by the Autobiography to Page 18.’[109] Katharine soon became a regular visitor; she

was permitted to sit in the Librarian's Room (the scene of her encounter with Hagberg Wright in 1927), reading the manuscript in peace and privacy, completing the task by the end of June. During this period Katharine put her hand to two extraordinary and seemingly contradictory acts of writing: the first was a piece of marginalia; the second was a series of letters to Lord Ilchester, President of the London Library and Chair of its committee.

In Chapter 11 of the Memoirs, Symonds reflects upon his experience of different forms of love:

> Later on, I found the affirmation of religion and contentment in love—not the human kindly friendly love which I had given liberally to my beloved wife and children, my father and my sister and my companions, but in the passionate sexual love of comrades. (pp. 326-7 in this edition)

Horatio Brown has annotated this section of text in the manuscript: the second instance of 'love' (in 'human kindly friendly love') is double underlined in pencil and accompanied by a marginal note: '=affection'; the phrase 'sexual love' is single underlined in pencil and accompanied by '=lust.' Brown also initialled these comments. Below them, also in pencil, is written: 'Let JAS words stand. KF June 1949.' Katharine's rejoinder was first identified by Sarah Heidt, for whom the annotation constituted 'an impossible response to Brown and an unmistakable imperative to future editors.' It was:

> [A] belated reply to her father's first autobiographical editor, pencilled some fifteen years or more after that editor's death—and pencilled somewhat furtively, one would imagine, since Furse had to deface the London Library's property in order to defend her father's diction.[110]

Katharine's hand joins the multitude of others whose writings constitute the Memoirs manuscript: her father, her mother, Sophie Girard and Horatio Brown. Like Brown, her hand occupies the margins of the text and is present through an act of volition (not Symonds's composition); like Brown, her intervention is framed as an action taken on Symonds's behalf. Katharine's written protest would therefore seem an apt and romantic conclusion to the narrative of her efforts to gain access to her father's Memoirs, but shortly after taking this stand, she opened her correspondence with Lord Ilchester.

Katharine wrote on 25 June 1949 to thank him for the hospitality she had received at the London Library, describing her 'great relief' at having finally read the Memoirs. She asked leave to write again once she had 'thought things out', for she had come to the conclusion that the manuscript ought to be 'lightly edited for the sake of a few other people.'[111] The promised missive followed a few days later (misdated 1 June, but presumably 1 July) and in it she outlined her anxieties. She began by returning to her correspondence with Charles Hagberg Wright:

In one letter dated 10th June 1939 he wrote

> "I can ask the present Committee if they would let you see the M.S. we have but I cant [sic] believe it would help you. My recollection of one page I read is not a pleasing one and personally I should like it destroyed as not conducing to add to the reputation of an author whose works I have read and admired and bought."

> The page to which I think he must allude is among the first pages of the M.S. and, read by any one who is not accustomed to accounts of childhood attitudes to sex, is surprising to say the least of it.
>
> It seems to me to be sheer bad luck—almost as though some Poltergeist had placed it at the top of the M.S.—that it should be there. It is not, in my estimation, necessary to the biography.
>
> It describes the sort of thing which many children go through but which most adults seem to forget.
>
> Anyway I agree with Sir Charles Hagberg Wright in wishing that it might be destroyed. It seems to be incidental and leave no gap in the story.
>
> There is no more of the same sort of description in the rest of the M.S.[112]

When Katharine first received Hagberg Wright's warning back in June 1939 her response had been one of contradiction. In June 1949 she saw things differently. She now chose to interpret the pronoun—the 'it' that Hagberg Wright wished to see destroyed—as referring specifically to the 'one page' he claimed to have read. But the antecedent is ambiguous and 'it' can just as easily (and more likely) refer back to the object of his previous sentence: the surviving manuscript in its entirety. This is certainly how Katharine previously understood his words: 'I can well imagine that you may feel that the M.S. should be destroyed but I don't altogether agree with you.'[113] Ten years later she had revised her position, co-opting Hagberg Wright in support of her request for light editions and leaning upon the authority she had previously denied. This is an ironic twist to the story of Katharine's fight to gain access to the manuscript: she concludes her dealings with the London Library by choosing to side, however pragmatically, with the very Librarian who had joined Edmund Gosse in lighting the bonfire of her father's papers.

There are several lacunae in the Memoirs manuscript where material is missing, but there is no evidence to suggest that any of these gaps are the result of Katharine's request. Lord Ilchester side-stepped the question of partial destruction: his reply made clear that the terms of Brown's bequest prevented any such action.[114] And the material to which she took exception survives: Katharine's euphemistic description of an offending 'page' (more likely several pages) corresponds to Symonds's account of 'the first stirrings of the sexual instinct' (p. 46 in this edition) in Chapter 2. This is the shortest chapter of the Memoirs and it recounts several pre-pubescent fantasies and sexual encounters, the latter primarily concerned with genital display and stimulation among peers. It is something of a stretch to describe this material as being 'among the first pages of the M.S.'; furthermore, Katharine's light-hearted joke about poltergeists raising-up superfluous material stands in direct contradiction to Symonds's claim that it would be 'impossible […] to omit' this account of early sexual development 'from a truthful autobiography' (p. 49 in this edition). These words form part of a postscript added to the chapter sometime during or after 1891. Symonds had been reading a range of sexological literatures while at work upon A Problem in Modern Ethics, and this research convinced him of the importance of recording and examining our 'earliest sexual impressions': they were central to a 'proper understanding of vita sexualis' (p. 49 in this edition).

Katharine had also grown anxious about dissemination. Having raised the possibility of editing the manuscript, she went on to query the Library's access arrangements:

> In a letter from Mr Purnell dated 16th Dec. 1940 he writes of the M.S.
>
> > "The packet is labelled Symonds papers and is sealed, but I understood that the MS was autobiographical."

> When I went to the Library and the packet was produced for me the seals were broken.
>
> This is a small point but seems worth recording.[115]

Katharine did not state her reasons for drawing Lord Ichester's attention to the broken seals, but the implicit question is clear: could more pairs of eyes have seen the manuscript (and its offending pages) than those belonging to herself and Hagberg Wright? In his reply, Lord Ilchester reassured her that Lionel Bradley, an employee of the London Library, had broken the seals ahead of her first visit in May.[116] Between the lines, he offered a guarantee against unknown readers.

Writing in the margins of a private text, Katharine defended Symonds's right to speak as he saw fit: she called for his words to 'stand.' But looking to posterity, she sought to shape and control the potential narratives that might emerge from his manuscript. Her first action contested Horatio Brown's authority as editor and translator, but her second action was reminiscent of his editorial practice. In Hearts and Pomegranates Katharine characterised her father's executor as 'the old hen', an over-cautious and mothering figure who edited the Memoirs in line with Victorian taboo, bound (as he was) by Symonds's instructions to 'publish nothing which my mother might prefer to have withheld.'[117] She confessed to feeling 'haunted by the belief that J.A.S. was sacrificed to puritanical and Victorian conventions on behalf of his family', but her later reading of the Memoirs was similarly (an inevitably) shaped by taboo.[118] Though happy to countenance the public discussion of homosexuality (albeit, in Hearts and Pomegranates, couched in terms of her father's studies and not his desires), Katharine was unwilling to extend this privilege to childhood sexuality. Her wish to edit the manuscript emerged from an impulse contrary to her desire to preserve its discourse

on love, yet both these actions serve as attempts to reassert authority over a text no longer in the family's ownership or possession: she countered the actions of an editor, and tested the practices of a library. In her final letter to Lord Ilchester on the subject, Katharine sought to write the family back into the London Library's records. She sent a transcription of Symonds's note to her mother, written on his death-bed at Rome; this letter included his statement of familial authority over Brown's actions as executor ('Brown will consult and publish nothing without your consent'). 'I should be very grateful,' she added, 'if this could be put with the M.S. or with the correspondence between H.F. Brown and the London Library.'[119]

Sub-committees and scholars

Katharine's transcription of her father's final note is among the earliest dated documents in the London Library's acquisition file.[120] The bulk of these records were compiled in 1954 as a result of the first enquiry received from a scholar: the eminent Renaissance historian, John Hale. In June that year Hale wrote to the Librarian, Simon Nowell-Smith, to ask if any papers belonging to Symonds were among the Library's collection. His interest had been piqued by research conducted for a chapter on Symonds in his recently published England and the Italian Renaissance (1954)—the first study of Symonds's life and work to openly acknowledge and discuss 'the homosexual element in his nature.'[121] Having procured a copy of Horatio Brown's will, Hale learnt of his original scheme to offer the Memoirs to the British Museum, and his bequest to the London Library of a green cardboard box containing papers belonging to Symonds.[122] Nowell-Smith only had access to limited records but he could confirm the Library's possession of the Memoirs, acknowledging the fact of Brown's embargo and revealing that Symonds's daughter had been granted special access in 1949.[123]

But Hale's enquiry prompted the Library to investigate the Memoirs, establishing a sub-committee (comprised of Raymond Mortimer, Rose Macaulay and John Trend) to '[consider] the whole question of the Library's moral responsibility towards Symonds and Brown and the propriety of giving scholars access to the manuscript.'[124] Hale shared his copy of Brown's will and made a request to read the manuscript—but this request had to wait until the sub-committee concluded its work.

Mortimer was tasked with reading the Memoirs and writing a report on its contents and the likely impact of publication: he considered the subject matter no longer at odds with social mores and saw no reason to deny scholars access; he noted Symonds's wishes for future publication and hoped this might turn a profit for the Library after the expiration of Brown's embargo.[125] Copies of his report were sent to Macaulay and Trend, and the former's response survives: she concurred with Mortimer, but went further to recommend immediate publication (with the family's permission).[126] Nowell-Smith was tasked with reviewing the Library's records and investigating the circumstances of acquisition. His report was startlingly brief. On the evidence of Brown's will and Library committee minutes, he could do little more than confirm the embargo and precedents for access: namely, permission to read the manuscript should be obtained from the committee, and this had previously been granted to Katharine Furse.[127]

The sub-committee submitted their joint report and recommendations sometime in August or early September 1954.[128] They sought to clarify the Library's position in relation to Brown's bequest and to establish a compromise with regard to his conditions. But throughout their investigations, the sub-committee did not have access to Brown's letter to Charles Hagberg Wright—dated 21 December 1925 and mentioned in his will—in which he outlined precisely their agreed terms. (The Library acquired a copy of this letter in October 1954 after the sub-committee had concluded its work—see below.) In the absence of explicit

instructions—which called for ‘the greatest possible discretion’ when granting access and forbad publication ‘without [Brown’s] consent in writing’ for fifty years—the sub-committee enjoyed considerable freedom to reinterpret the Library’s responsibilities as owner and custodian.[129] They conceded that full publication was impossible before 1976, but they also asserted the Library’s right to grant access and publish in part (following the precedent set by Brown in his biography). Here the sub-committee underscored a legal entitlement to manage private property, but they also set out to defend the Library’s moral duties. Times had changed and the sub-committee considered it part of the Library’s academic mission to set the needs of present scholarship above the outmoded ideas and prejudices of the past. From 1927 to 1954, in less than thirty years, the Library’s position had shifted dramatically—from clandestine bonfires and sealed packages, to ideals of open scholarship. On 6 September Stanley Gillam, Assistant Secretary and Sub-Librarian, wrote to John Hale granting him permission to read the Memoirs.[130] And on 12 October the Library committee reviewed the sub-committee’s joint report and accepted its recommendations. Soon after arrangements were put in place for a typescript copy of the Memoirs to be made, and both manuscript and typescript were bound into two volumes (see Notes on the Text).[131] These conservation measures anticipated an increase in the number of reader requests, where binding and duplication would expedite and confirm the Library’s commitment to increasing access.

One of the first scholars to take advantage of these new arrangements was a former member of the Library committee and its future Vice President: E.M. Forster.[132] Though an Honorary Fellow at King’s College, Cambridge, Forster’s interests were not strictly academic: he cherished a long-standing desire to read the unexpurgated Memoirs. On 10 January 1912, after an evening spent with the surviving family of Symonds’s friend, Henry Graham Dakyns (who died in 1911), he recorded the following in his journal:

> J.A. Symonds. Feel nearer to him than any man I have read about—too near to be irritated by his flamboyance which I scarcely share. But education—(Classics, Renaissance, Eng. Lit.)—, health—(tendency to phthysis [sic])—literary interest in philosophic questions, love of travel, inclination to be pleasant and above all, minorism. True, he married, but he had better not have. His contrary inclinations only dragged him asunder till the strongest triumphed. […] What wouldn't I give to read the Autobiography entire but Horatio Brown will never let me.[133]

Forster's remarks are testament to the persistent open secret of Symonds's sexuality and rumours surrounding the survival of his unpublished autobiography. On this latter point, Forster would become 'nearer' still to the man he admired. In 1913 he began work upon Maurice (published posthumously in 1971), a fictional exploration of homosexual love inspired by the lived example and writings of Edward Carpenter. This novel remained in typescript and manuscript for the rest of Forster's life: it underwent intermittent periods of revision and circulated among friends and sympathetic readers, finally joining Forster's private archive of homoerotic writings (including many short stories collected together and published in The Life to Come in 1972). Like Symonds's care for the survival of his Memoirs, Forster made arrangements to preserve Maurice after his death: a note was found among his papers revealing the location and provenance of six copies of the novel.[134] There was safety in numbers. Forster's hope and intention was that one or more of these copies would survive the potential bonfire for the sake of posthumous reputation.

But Forster made no attempt to publish Maurice during his lifetime. He did not believe that society was willing to accept his work in this vein, and in time he grew decidedly sceptical. In September 1960 he composed a 'Terminal Note' to the novel, doubting whether favourable conditions for publication would ever arrive. He believed the novel's chances

were hindered by the happy ending for Maurice and Alec ('Happiness is its keynote'), and by the government's failure to implement the recommendations of the Wolfenden report.[135] This document had been published in 1957 and called for the decriminalisation of 'homosexual behaviour between consenting adults [read: men] in private.'[136] Three years later and Forster was dismayed by inaction—for legal reform would take ten years to accomplish with the passing of the Sexual Offences Act 1967.[137] As such, the 'Terminal Note' ends bitterly:

> I […] had supposed that knowledge would bring understanding. We had not realized that what the public really loathes in homosexuality is not the thing itself but having to think about it. If it could be slipped into our midst unnoticed, or legalized overnight by a decree in small print, there would be few protests. Unfortunately it can only be legalized by Parliament, and Members of Parliament are obliged to think or to appear to think. Consequently the Wolfenden recommendations will be indefinitely rejected, police prosecutions will continue and Clive on the bench will continue to sentence Alec in the dock. Maurice may get off.[138]

Forster's frustration at the status quo, born of the wilful blindness and deafness of the establishment, provides the context for his reading of the Memoirs. Forty-nine years after confessing his 'nearness' to Symonds in his journal, Forster had the opportunity to test this sympathy and identification through an act of reading. In early 1961 he requested and was granted access to the manuscript; as he read, he paraphrased and copied passages into his commonplace book. Forster's notes focus upon the head master's affair at Harrow, Symonds's dreams and sexual fantasies, his marriage and relationships with men. Forster also composed the following reflective digression:

> The above, and all that follows, is in J.A.S' unpublished autobiography in the L.L. which may not at present be quoted from, nor I think referred to. Will anyone who reads this remember that? Publication possible in 1976. About 150,000 in typescript. A complete life, the many 'literary' bits of which S. has published elsewhere. —He gave up all work to complete it.[139]

Forster's remarks concerning quotation and reference suggest the discovery in October 1954 of Brown's letter to Hagberg Wright had tightened restrictions previously loosened by the Library sub-committee. He responds by turning to posterity, imagining a future reader whose eyes might peruse his commonplace book after his death: would this reader turn from the pages of one private text to those of another? Would this reader remember Symonds? If Forster's rhetorical question remains unanswered, an array of potential responses rise up to fill this silence. He doubts and implores in equal measure. The question functions as an imperative to action, but it also invites a negative reply: Forster cannot help but imagine a future where Symonds's manuscript has fallen victim to a collective amnesia that does not wish to 'think' about homosexuality.

Forster need not have worried. In March 1961, around the same time he was reading the Memoirs in the London Library, the following notice appeared in the Times Literary Supplement in a column entitled 'Information, Please':

> John Addington Symonds (1840-1893): —Any unpublished letters or manuscripts, especially the present location of his unpublished Autobiography, which he left to his literary executor Horatio Brown…
>
> (Mrs) P. M. Grosskurth.
>
> 16. St Leonard's Terrace, London, S.W. 3.[140]

Phyllis Grosskurth was studying for a doctorate at the University of London. Her dissertation explored Symonds's literary criticism, and despite discouraging words from her supervisor, she was determined to locate the Memoirs. By this time Stanley Gillam had succeeded Nowell-Smith as Librarian and he responded to her notice. Gillam informed her of Brown's bequest and embargo: 'He told me that he possessed the precious manuscript of the autobiography in a safe right there in his office.' As a scholar Grosskurth was granted permission to read the Memoirs, but she did not make immediate use of her discoveries: 'Of course this was not the sort of material which one would put into a doctoral thesis in those days.'[141] But rumours soon began to circulate in publishing circles, and before too long, John Guest of Longmans commissioned Grosskurth to write a biography of Symonds.

Gillam granted Grosskurth permission to paraphrase information contained in the Memoirs, but her biography would contain no direct quotation from unpublished materials. Nonetheless she dealt frankly and explicitly with Symonds's sexuality, declaring this fact in the final sentence of her Prologue: he was '[a] man hidden behind a mask, a writer who never attained first-rank, he suffered the tormented struggle of a homosexual within Victorian society.'[142] Her most sustained discussion of Symonds's 'mask' was reserved for a chapter entitled 'The Problem':

> 'THE PROBLEM'—homosexuality—was the overwhelming obsession of Symonds's life. His inclinations affected his friendships, his sympathies coloured his tastes, and all his writing—biography, criticism, poetry, or history—was influenced by this central fact about the man.[143]

Never before had a critic or biographer spoken so publicly and unequivocally about Symonds's desires for men. Grosskurth's chapter title was an allusion to his terminology in A Problem in Greek Ethics and A Problem in Modern Ethics, but it also positioned his sexuality as a question in need of an answer. Here too she followed Symonds's lead, for both were concerned with origins. The Memoirs record Symonds's conviction that his sexual instinct was innate though shaped by external circumstance: words such as 'inborn', 'natural' and 'congenital' abound. Grosskurth, by contrast, would adopt the pose of psychoanalysis. She doubted Symonds's model of 'inborn bias', turning instead to Freudian accounts of 'undifferentiated' infant sexuality as a counter to the Memoirs.[144] She sought an originating trauma, analysing Symonds's dreams as recorded in poems and private papers, and examining a series of women who, together or alone, might serve as surrogate mothers (in relation to whom he could have experienced 'fixation on a female').[145] Looking back on this chapter in 1998, Grosskurth considered it 'a period-piece': she confessed to knowing 'so little about Freud that I was naïve enough to believe that he was the final authority.'[146]

The biography caused a minor sensation when it was published in June 1964. It received remarkable coverage for a first book, and Grosskurth recalled a night-time visit to Fleet Street to read the first reviews while 'the ink [was] still wet.'[147] She attributed the book's success to two major factors: her outsider status as an unknown Canadian scholar (one who 'did not seem driven by any polemical purpose'), and the broader context of socio-legal suspense following the Wolfenden report (to paraphrase Forster, her book required readers to 'think' about the continued illegality of homosexual acts).[148] But it was not the biography's subject matter per se that caught the attention of some readers. On 22 October 1964 the following letter was printed in the Times Literary Supplement:

JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS

> Sir,—Horatio Brown left the letters and diaries to the London Library on condition that they were not published for fifty years after his death. The Library accepted the legacy and the condition. How comes it that an author has been allowed to copy and publish substantial extracts before the appointed date?
>
> Has the Library abrogated its responsibility?
>
> L.H. GREEN.
>
> 6, The Hermitage, Richmond, Surrey.[149]

Grosskurth announced the terms of Brown's bequest and embargo in her Preface, but Green overlooked (wilfully or otherwise) her clarification that quoted material was limited to passages from the 1895 biography. It was also possible that Green did not consider prior publication to be a necessary permission for re-use.

The following week, Stanley Gillam wrote in defence of the Library's policy and practice. His reply borrowed heavily from the 1954 sub-committee report, reasserting the precedent of Brown's biography and stressing that access was limited to scholars; he also closed down the possibility left open in 1954: 'any public use to which [scholars] sought to put unpublished passages should be subject to [the Librarian's] prior approval, and […] no permission to print any passages verbatim should be given.'[150] This rule runs counter to the sub-committee's recommendation that the Library assume authority to permit publication of extracts not contained in Brown's biography. The reason for this volte face is suggested by an annotated copy of the sub-committee's report held in the Library's records. Simon Nowell-Smith added the following proviso: 'no permission to print any passages verbatim shall be given until the ownership of the copyright of the autobiography shall have been determined.'[151] Following enquiries to Brown's solicitors and executors, Mackenzie and Black, the Library confirmed their ownership of the material and its copyright.[152] But the

Library also requested further information concerning the terms of Brown's bequest. Mackenzie and Black were able to supply a copy of the missing letter (dated 21 December 1925) from Brown to Charles Hagberg Wright mentioned in the former's will (see above). In the face of this new evidence the case was altered, and Gillam's letter in the TLS confirmed the Library's revised position. He concluded by offering a rebuttal of Green's accusatory questions: Grosskurth had neither copied nor published extracts beyond those already made public by Brown, and the charge of abrogating responsibility 'surely [required] no answer.'[153]

This exchange sparked a fascinating debate in the TLS concerning the ethics of acquisition and access. The first to throw their hat into the ring was Ian Fletcher, a Professor of English at the University of Reading with a background in Librarianship. He wrote in support of Gillam, arguing that Grosskurth's use of the Memoirs as a 'skeleton framework' (as described in her Preface) was perfectly legitimate: it '[respected] the letter of Horatio Brown's injunction.' 'Far from being censured,' he continued, 'the London Library is to be congratulated on not placing pedantic obstacles before a responsible scholar.'[154] But in the event, Fletcher's defence proved a minority position. Leon Edel entered the debate, having recently joined the ranks of biographers following the publication in 1962 of the first two volumes of his life of Henry James. He expounded 'the serious ethical problem':

> [Brown's] published portions have been used as an argument for showing the unpublished portions to bona fide scholars. But assuredly the logic of Brown's terms is inescapable. And the showing of material, even to discreet scholars, is, in effect, a kind of premature publication. [… A]s a biographer myself, I feel some concern about what has been perhaps a violation of the spirit of a gift even while there has been faithful adherence to its letter. The danger in such a procedure—that of finding ways of 'getting around' testamentary or other stipulations—is that friends, relatives and

> executors of writers will feel privacy wholly unprotected. They may in such circumstances prefer to burn documents rather than lock them away.[155]

While Fletcher was concerned with the letter of Brown's bequest, Edel privileged the spirit: as writers in a field often maligned—preying upon the dead, invading and exposing the private lives of their subjects—biographers needed to act above suspicion. Libraries and archives must also respect (not reinterpret) conditions of acquisition. He reasoned this was in the mutual interest of all concerned, reducing the likelihood of posthumous bonfires of the very kind that had already depleted Symonds's archive. David Randall, a Librarian at Indiana University, wrote in support of Edel: 'The ethical point for custodians seems clear. Either respect the restrictions on use, or simply do not accept the material in the first place.'[156]

***

General principles will rarely accommodate the complexities and contradictions of individual cases. From the date of acquisition in 1926, the London Library was forced to negotiate the competing claims of executors, daughters and scholars calling for access and limits, openness and discretion. Brown's fifty-year embargo remained a guiding principle, but as Katharine Furse feared, the wishes of an executor (however altruistic) came to supersede those of a writer. Setting aside the question of right and wrong with regard to the Library's granting of access to Furse, Hale, Forster and Grosskurth (among others), there was certainly no contradiction when it came to Symonds's hopes that the manuscript would survive and be published. When the expiration of Brown's embargo drew near, the Library invited Grosskurth to prepare an edition of the Memoirs.[157] This was not, perhaps, the afterlife he

imagined for his manuscript; but nonetheless, Symonds found his sympathetic reader, a 'fellow creature' who would 'feel some thrill of pity' at the record of his life.

---

[1] Symonds to Dakyns (27 March 1889). The Letters of John Addington Symonds, ed. by Herbert M. Schueller and Robert L. Peters, 3 vols (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967-69), III (1969), p. 364. I am grateful to Andrew Dakyns for sharing a copy of the original letter.
[2] Matthew Arnold, 'Critical Introduction to Thomas Gray', in The English Poets, edited by Thomas Humphrey Ward, 5 vols (London: Macmillan, 1880-1918), III (1880), p. 303-16 (p. 303). Italics in the original.
[3] For a detailed discussion of Symonds's engagement with these varied sources and discourses, see Emily Rutherford, 'Impossible Love and Victorian Values: J.A. Symonds and the Intellectual History of Homosexuality', Journal of the History of Ideas, 75.4 (2014), 605-27.
[4] The extent of Grosskurth's excisions was first revealed by Sarah Heidt. See '"Let JAS words stand": Publishing John Addington Symonds's Desire', Victorian Studies, 46.1 (2003), 7-31.
[5] Horatio F. Brown, John Addington Symonds: A Biography Compiled from his Papers and Correspondence, 2 vols (London: John C. Nimmo, 1895), I, p. ix.
[6] Heidt, p. 19.
[7] Heidt, p. 15.
[8] Heidt, p. 15.
[9] Matt Cook, London and the Culture of Homosexuality, 1885-1914 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. xiv. See also Sean Brady, Masculinity and Male Homosexuality in Britain, 1861-1913 (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 4-24.
[10] H.G. Cocks, Nameless Offences: Homosexual Desire in the Nineteenth Century (London: I.B. Tauris, 2003), p. 11.
[11] Cook, p. xiv.
[12] Matt Houlbrook has argued for the importance of recognising 'the historical production of diverse models of sexual difference and "normality".' See Queer London: Perils and Pleasures in the Sexual Metropolis, 1918-1957 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), pp. 7-8 (p. 8). Recent work by Helen Smith, for example, has uncovered a range of sexual cultures and self-understandings that vary according to class, region and work. See Masculinity, Class and Same-Sex Desire in Industrial England, 1895-1957 (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).
[13] Symonds, 'A Problem in Modern Ethics', in John Addington Symonds (1840-1893) and Homosexuality: A Critical Edition of Sources, ed. by Sean Brady (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 125-208 (p. 128).
[14] For a detailed discussion of Symonds's later writings and queer public utterance, see Amber K. Regis, 'Late style and speaking out: J.A. Symonds's In The Key of Blue', English Studies, 94.2 (2013), 206-31.
[15] J.A. Symonds to M. Symonds (8 July 1892). Letters, ed. by Schueller and Peters, III, p. 711.
[16] 'Note on the English Family of Symonds' (Appendix 1). Brown, John Addington Symonds, II, pp. 365-86.
[17] Quoted in Percy L. Babington, Bibliography of the Writings of John Addington Symonds (London: John Castle 1925; repr. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), p. 91.
[18] 'Dead Love. A Lieder Kreis in Minor Keys. With The Tale of Theodore' [A401b]. This pamphlet forms part of Lyra Viginti Chordarum, a bound collection of Symonds's poetry pamphlets in two volumes. Bristol University Library holds sixteen pamphlets in total (including 'Fragilia Labilia', which has enjoyed a far wider readership on account of pirate editions).
[19] Heidt, pp. 21, 22.
[20] Heidt, p. 22.
[21] Heidt, p. 23.
[22] Heidt, p. 22.
[23] Last will and testament of John Addington Symonds. MS copy in the possession of the Probate Department of the Principal Registry of the Family Division, London.
[24] Fifteen constituent poems from 'Dead Love' were published as part of the intermezzo essay, 'Clifton and a Lad's Love' in Symonds's In The Key of Blue and Other Prose Essays (London: Elkin Mathews and John Lane, 1893), pp. 155-75.
[25] J.A. Symonds to C. Symonds (n.d.). Letters, ed. by Schueller and Peters, III, p. 839.
[26] Episodes in this story have been told, in part, by Trev Lynn Broughton in Men of Letters, Writing Lives: Masculinity and Literary Auto/Biography in the Late Victorian Period (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 14-20; Phyllis Grosskurth in The Woeful Victorian: A Biography of John Addington Symonds (New York, Chicago and San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. 318-23; and by John Pemble in Venice Rediscovered (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 54-70.

[27] Brown, John Addington Symonds, I, p. vii.
[28] Brown, John Addington Symonds, I, p. xii.
[29] C. Symonds to Dakyns (2 November 1893). Letters, ed. by Schueller and Peters, III, p. 840 n. 2.
[30] C.J. Holmes, Self and Partners (Mostly Self) (London: Constable, 1936), pp. 151-2
[31] Timothy d'Arch Smith favours Edmund Gosse as a candidate for the 'straiter critic'. See Love in Earnest: *Some Notes on the Lives and Writings of English 'Uranian' Poets from 1889 to 1930* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 15.
[32] T.E. Brown to H. Brown (28 December 1894). Quoted in Grosskurth, The Woeful Victorian, p. 322.
[33] 'John Addington Symonds', Saturday Review, 29 December 1924, pp. 709-10 (p. 709). Later reprinted in Arthur Symons, Studies in Prose and Verse (1904).
[34] 'John Addington Symonds', p. 710.
[35] Grosskurth, The Woeful Victorian, p. 320.
[36] 'Introduction' to The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds, ed. by Phyllis Grosskurth (London: Hutchinson, 1984), p. 27.
[37] Phyllis Grosskurth, 'Bringing Symonds out of the Closet: Some Recollections and Reflections', in John Addington Symonds: Culture and the Demon Desire, ed. by John Pemble (Houndmills: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 170-177 (p. 172). This essay was first delivered as a talk at an academic symposium dedicated to Symonds's life and work: 'John Addington Symonds: The Private and the Public Face of Victorian Culture', University of Bristol (April 1998).
[38] D'Arch Smith, p. 14.
[39] Pemble, Venice Rediscovered, pp. 55-6 (and cf. p. 57).
[40] Heidt, pp. 12-14
[41] David Amigoni, 'Translating the Self: Sexuality, Religion, and Sanctuary in John Addington Symonds's Cellini and other Acts of Life Writing', Biography, 32.1 (2009), 161-72 (p. 162).
[42] 'Introduction' to The Life of Benvenuto Cellini, trans. by John Addington Symonds, 2 vols (New York: Scribner & Welford, 1888), I, p. lv.
[43] Amigoni, p. 165.
[44] Amigoni, p. 169.
[45] Brown to Edward Carpenter (n.d.). Quoted in Pemble, Venice Rediscovered, p. 57.
[46] Horatio F. Brown, John Addington Symonds: A Biography Compiled from his Papers and Correspondence, 2nd edn (London: Smith, Elder, 1903), p. viii.
[47] 'Preface' to Letters and Papers of John Addington Symonds, ed. by Horatio F. Brown (London: John Murray, 1923), p. vii.
[48] 'Preface' to Letters and Papers, p. v.
[49] 'Preface' to Letters and Papers, p. v.
[50] 'Preface' to Letters and Papers, pp. vii, vii-viii.
[51] 'Preface' to Letters and Papers, p. viii.
[52] Brown encountered resistance from Symonds's family, particularly his daughter Madge. As a result, the published Letters and Papers were not as explicit as he had hoped. See Pemble, Venice Rediscovered, pp. 59-65.
[53] Last will and testament of Horatio Brown. TS copy, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/005].
[54] Last will and testament of Horatio Brown. Ellipsis in the original.
[55] The London Library acquired a copy of this letter in October 1954 from Mackenzie and Black, Horatio Brown's solicitors and executors.
[56] Brown to Hagberg Wright (21 December 1925). TS copy, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/005].
[57] Brown to Hagberg Wright (21 December 1925).
[58] 'Foreword' to The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds, ed. by Grosskurth, p. 10.
[59] Minutes of the London Library committee (11 April 1927). Quoted in the 'Foreword' to The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds, ed. by Grosskurth, p. 11.
[60] Katharine's research into her father's life, and her attempts to gain access to his Memoirs, were first documented by John Pemble. See Venice Rediscovered, pp. 68-70.
[61] Katharine Furse, 'Memorandum regarding my Father, John Addington Symonds' papers' (21 April 1927). TS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/9].
[62] Hagberg Wright to Furse (10 June and 19 July 1939). MSS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/21 and 24].
[63] Vaughan to Herbert Schueller and Robert Peters (23 September 1967). Letters, ed. by Schueller and Peters, II, pp. 381-2, n. 1.
[64] Furse to Hagberg Wright (18 July 1939). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/23].

[65] Furse to Hagberg Wright (21 April 1927). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/11].
[66] Furse, 'Memorandum regarding my Father, John Addington Symonds' papers' (21 April 1927).
[67] A.J.A Symons, 'The Connoisseur: J.A. Symonds and Others', Saturday Review (8 January 1927), p. 58.
[68] Hagberg Wright to Furse (22 April 1927). MS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/12].
[69] Annotation dated 16 May 1927, added to a letter received from Hagberg Wright (10 May 1927). MS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/14].
[70] 'Poet's Daughter Seeks Lost Works', News Chronicle (13 June 1949), p. 3. 'Missing Symonds Autobiography', Daily Telegraph (14 June 1939), n.p. Cuttings held at the University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM1733].
[71] 'Missing Symonds Autobiography', n.p. 'Poet's Daughter Seeks Lost Works', p. 3.
[72] Furse to Hagberg Wright (20 June 1939). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/22].
[73] Hagberg Wright to Furse (10 June 1939). MS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/21].
[74] Furse to Hagberg Wright (20 June 1939).
[75] Hagberg Wright to Furse (19 July 1939).
[76] Furse to the Secretary of the London Library (11 August 1939). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/25].
[77] Furse to Hagberg Wright (20 June 1939). Mental Hygiene was the journal published by the National Council for Mental Hygiene.
[78] Fry, for example, had several extra-marital relationships while his wife, Helen Coombe, was resident in a mental institution. One of these lovers was Woolf's sister, Vanessa Bell: 'What am I to say about you? […] Do give me some views; how to deal with love so that we're not all blushing.' Woolf to Bell (8 October 1938). The Letters of Virginia Woolf, ed. by Nigel Nicolson and Joanne Trautmann, 6 vols (London: The Hogarth Press, 1975-80), VI (1980), p. 285.
[79] Woolf to Furse (21 July 1939). Rowena Fowler, ed., 'Virginia Woolf and Katharine Furse: An Unpublished Correspondence', *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, 9.2 (1990), 205-27 (p. 207).
[80] Furse to Woolf (31 July 1939). Fowler, p. 208.
[81] Furse to Woolf (2 December 1939). Fowler, p. 220.
[82] S.E. Cottam to Furse (23 October 1939). Fowler, p. 217.
[83] Furse to Woolf (26 October 1939). Fowler, p. 216.
[84] Woolf to Furse (9 November 1939). Fowler, p. 218.
[85] Furse to Woolf (2 December 1939). Fowler, p. 219.
[86] Furse to Woolf (2 December 1939). Fowler, p. 220.
[87] Furse to Woolf (27 August 1940). Fowler, pp. 222-3.
[88] Katharine Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates: The Story of Forty-five Years, 1875 to 1920 (London: Peter Davies, 1940), p. 96
[89] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, pp. 89, 97.
[90] Babington, p. ix.
[91] Symonds to Burton (15 August 1890). Babington, p. 50.
[92] Babington, p. 19.
[93] Babington, pp. 124, 125.
[94] Babington, p. 126.
[95] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 101.
[96] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 101.
[97] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 101.
[98] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 101.
[99] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 101 n.
[100] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 99.
[101] Symonds to Ellis (July 1891). Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 105. 'Labby' refers to Henry Labouchère, the politician responsible for introducing Section 11 into the Criminal Law Amendment Act 1885 (known as the Labouchère Amendment).
[102] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 100.
[103] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 100.
[104] Hagberg Wright to Furse (10 October 1939). MS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/28].
[105] Hagberg Wright to Furse (10 October 1939).

[106] Furse to Purnell (12 December 1940). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/34].
[107] Furse to Roch (19 May 1949). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/71].
[108] Furse to Purnell (15 March 1940). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/64].
[109] Annotation dated 18 May 1949, added to a letter sent to Purnell (27 April 1949). MS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/69].
[110] Heidt, p. 28. As Heidt notes, the final two numbers in the year '1949' are smudged. The evidence of Katharine's letters allows for a degree of certainty in the dating of this annotation.
[111] Furse to Lord Ilchester (25 June 1949). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/89].
[112] Furse to Lord Ilchester (1 July 1949; misdated 1 June 1949). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/75]. This letter begins in media res—'May I add a point to the letter which I wrote to you a few days ago about the M.S. of my father's Autobiography.'—and supplies the 'thoughts' promised in Katharine's letter of 25 June. On 1 June she had not yet completed her reading of the Memoirs: in a letter to Purnell dated 28 May, she reveals that she has only reached the hundredth page (TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/73]). Therefore, the original dating must be incorrect.
[113] Furse to Hagberg Wright (20 June 1939).
[114] Lord Ilchester to Furse (6 July 1939).
[115] Furse to Lord Ilchester (1 July 1949; misdated 1 June 1949).
[116] Lord Ilchester to Furse (6 July 1939). MS, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/88].
[117] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, pp. 95, 98.
[118] Furse, Hearts and Pomegranates, p. 102.
[119] Furse to Lord Ilchester (22 September 1949). TS copy, University of Bristol Library, Special Collections [DM911/96].
[120] The Library still possesses Brown's label to the original cardboard box containing the Memoirs manuscript. This is the earliest document: MS, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/013].
[121] John Hale, England and the Italian Renaissance: The Growth of Interest in its History and Art (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), p. 174.
[122] Hale to Nowell-Smith (1 June 1954). TS, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/038].
[123] Nowell-Smith to Hale (3 June 1954). TS copy, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/038].
[124] Nowell-Smith to Hale (21 July 1954). TS copy, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/038].
[125] Raymond Mortimer, 'Report on the Autobiography of John Addington Symonds' (22 July 1954). TS, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/040].
[126] Macaulay to Nowell-Smith (29 July 1954). TS, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/040].
[127] Nowell-Smith, 'Autobiography of J.A. Symonds'. TS, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/003].
[128] Macaulay, Mortimer and Trend, 'Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to consider problems connected with the manuscript of the autobiography of John Addington Symonds'. TS, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/002].
[129] Brown to Hagberg Wright (21 December 1925).
[130] Gillam to Hale (6 September 1954). TS copy, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/038].
[131] Preparation of the typescript was underway in January 1955 when Symonds's grand-daughter, Katharine West, requested permission to read the Memoirs. The bound TS volumes are stamp-dated 31 March 1955, while the bound MS volumes are stamp-dated 28 June 1955. Nowell-Smith to West (28 January 1955). TS copy, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/034].
[132] Forster was present at the meeting of the London Library committee in October 1939 when Katharine Furse was finally granted permission to read her father's Memoirs. See E.M. Forster, Commonplace Book, ed. by Philip Gardner (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), pp. 352-3n.
[133] The Journals and Diaries of E.M. Forster, ed. by Philip Gardner, 3 vols (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2011), II, p. 35.
[134] Forster, 'Note on the whereabouts of six copies' (c. 1960). MS, King's College Archive Centre, Cambridge [EMF/1/5/18].
[135] Forster, 'Terminal Note' to Maurice, ed. by David Leavitt (London: Penguin, 2005), pp. 219-24 (p. 220).
[136] Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1957), p. 115.
[137] The 1967 Act decriminalised homosexual acts in private between consenting men over the age of twenty-one. This statute only applied to England and Wales, and it made exceptions for men serving in the merchant navy and armed forces, and for acts involving more than two people. Sexual Offences Act 1967, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1967/60/contents> [accessed 6 January 2016].

[138] Forster, 'Terminal Note', p. 224. Symonds expressed similar sentiments in a letter to Edmund Gosse in February 1891; he believed 'unprejudiced people' would accept decriminalisation if the law could be changed 'without discussion', for '[w]hat everybody dreads is a public raking up of the question.' Letters, ed. by Schueller and Peters, III, p. 552. Italics in the original.
[139] Forster, Commonplace Book, p. 225.
[140] 'Information, Please', Times Literary Supplement, 24 March 1961, p. 190.
[141] Grosskurth, 'Bringing Symonds out of the Closet', p. 172.
[142] Grosskurth, The Woeful Victorian, p. 54.
[143] Grosskurth, The Woeful Victorian, p. 262.
[144] Grosskurth, The Woeful Victorian, p. 264.
[145] Grosskurth, The Woeful Victorian, p. 262.
[146] Grosskurth, 'Bringing Symonds out of the Closet', p. 174.
[147] Phyllis Grosskurth, *Elusive Subject: A Biographer's Life* (Toronto: Macfarlane Walter and Ross, 1999), p. 84.
[148] Grosskurth, Elusive Subject, p. 84.
[149] 'Letters to the Editor', Times Literary Supplement, 22 October 1964, p. 959.
[150] 'Letters to the Editor', Times Literary Supplement, 29 October 1964, p. 979.
[151] Macaulay, Mortimer and Trend, 'Report of the Sub-Committee'.
[152] Mackenzie and Black to Nowell-Smith (20 October 1954). TS, London Library acquisition file [LO/CORR/014/005].
[153] 'Letters to the Editor', 29 October 1964, p. 979.
[154] 'Letters to the Editor', Times Literary Supplement, 5 November 1964, p.999.
[155] 'Letters to the Editor', Times Literary Supplement, 3 December 1964, p.1107.
[156] 'Letters to the Editor', Times Literary Supplement, 31 December 1964, p.1181.
[157] For a detailed discussion of Grosskurth's edition and editorial method, see Heidt, pp. 7-31.