

**Cultural Philanthropy, Gypsies, and Interdisciplinary Scholars:
Dream of a Common Language¹**

Regenia Gagnier, University of Exeter

Although he was a major force in fin de siècle cultural philanthropy in both North America and Britain, Charles Godfrey Leland is today known mainly through Occult websites on the Internet. This essay retrieves his research on the gypsies, revealing an unexplored source of Victorian philanthropy, and scrutinizes it from the perspectives of disciplines different from his own, philology: history, demography, ethnic studies, ethics, and politics. The parts of the essay are: I. Victorian Cultural Philanthropy: People Making People, and Some People Making Things, II. Gypsy Lorists: The Non-Christian Roots of Philanthropy, III. Philanthropy's Other: The Persecution of the Gypsies, IV. Interdisciplinarity as Collectivity.

I.

Victorian Cultural Philanthropy:

People Making People, and Some People Making Things

In her recent study *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State: Character and Governance in a Liberal Society* (2003), Lauren Goodlad studies the “paradox” of Victorian philanthropy, the planned building of character in a liberal nation of self-reliant individuals.² This essay supplements this well-travelled road of autonomous character-building versus bureaucracy and social engineering with a study of cultural philanthropy. Cultural philanthropy was the late-Victorian negotiation between ethics, our conduct toward others, and aesthetics, which especially in this period indicated sensuous human activity that gave pleasure for its own sake. The cultural philanthropists brought arts and crafts to the poor. As with any philanthropic movement, the questions we must ask – and I think the questions that the Victorians actually did ask – of the purveyors of philanthropy are these: What are they making – people or products? If people, are they making other people or themselves? If other people, are they making them to be autonomous, free, ends in themselves, or means to one's own end, one's own reflected glory? In the case of cultural philanthropy's “recreative learning”, a person was to be formed through the production of a product. That was Ruskin's, Marx's, Morris's and Gissing's great insight,

the link between form, forming, and in some cases de-formation. This productive process was as true of the philanthropists themselves as it was of those under their pastorship.

In concluding one of her articles on the Home Arts and Industries Association (HAIA), Anne Anderson justifies the organization whose mission was to bring art to the poor as “a vocation for educated women whose lives would have otherwise been ‘unproductive’.”³ Anderson’s work on the HAIA, and Diana Maltz’s on the Kyrle,⁴ allow us to rethink the term “productive.” Arts and Crafts members would frequently use the word “unproductive” to describe the HAIA. William Morris’s biographer J.W. Mackail wrote that associations like the HAIA “had been formed chiefly by the energy or caprice of individuals. Some of them were direct attempts at following the teaching of Ruskin. Others represented a mixture of charity and patronage, and their only effect was to multiply the production of amateur incompetency... on the whole they were of little value either as productive or as educational agencies.”⁵ Mackail’s terms suggest a socialist craftsman’s indictment of individualistic voluntarism: caprice, individuals, amateur, incompetence, value, productive, agency. His notion of productivity is based on the production of objects of a certain quality made by organized/collective labour. In the counter-ideology of his time, voluntarism was linked with individualism. In philosophy voluntarism is the ability to act according to one’s own will, self-dependently, not determined by external causality. If Goodlad’s paradox was Victorian pastorship of autonomous individuals, the seeming paradox of cultural philanthropy was that its agents were voluntaristic or autonomous individuals while its recipients were part of their mission. Art education and appreciation were taught not only to civilise or subjugate the working classes but, more idealistically, to teach them to be free themselves, as the teachers were free – that is, within constraints. As Anderson says, Art allowed the upper classes to establish their own citizenship, by discharging their social obligations. She cites Arnold Toynbee’s view that the middle and upper classes had sinned against the poor by “offering charity not justice” and that it was their duty “to devote our lives to your service”⁶. The view was the basis of Ruskinian paternalism as critiqued by Wilde in “The Soul of Man under Socialism”: “Charity creates a multitude of sins,” and “The Poor should either steal or go on the rates, which is considered by many to be a form of stealing.”⁷

The most idealistic view was that the working classes were evolving. The working classes would grow more mobile, more rational, more able to acquire and conserve

property, even the beautiful property that was eeked out of the HAIA workshops. They would also feel the freedom that their economic conditions obscured. According to Walter Besant: “No life can be wholly unhappy which is cheered by the power of playing an instrument, dancing, painting, carving, modelling, singing... It is not necessary to do these things so well as to be able to live by them, but every man who practises one of these arts is during his work drawn out of himself and away from the bad conditions of his life.”⁸ Later on, in his Bloomsbury book *Civilisation* (1928), Clive Bell would also claim that the working-class pupil who may never return to leisure or freedom in her life would nonetheless be sustained by the “glimpse of paradise” that reading at school could offer.⁹ (And see Henry James’s *Princess Casamassima* (1886) for a thought-experiment on this premise.) Besant praised the “great voluntary movement of the present day: It is the noblest thing the world has ever seen”.¹⁰

The issue of cultural philanthropy is the relation of the self to the other with respect to possession of the good things of the world: it is by definition an ethical relation. So what were the ethics of the Kyrle and the HAIA? The Kyrle was fundamentally urban, with branches in the capital, Birmingham, Bristol, Leicester and Nottingham, and whose numbers were predominantly professional artists and architects. The HAIA was essentially rural and dominated by the landed elite. Both provided designs for the amateurs to execute; both were concerned with social regeneration, the HAIA particularly committed to stemming the depopulation of the countryside. The Kyrle was always solicitous for funds, blaming its genteel unobtrusiveness for its lack of support (it folded after the death of Octavia Hill in 1912). The HAIA had less trouble getting subscriptions. The goal of both, said Mrs. Eglantyne Jebb, the founder of the HAIA, was “to bring the joy and innocent recreation of art ... into the people’s lives, a splendid and priceless gift from the rich to the poor.”¹¹

The HAIA, in Jebb’s account, evolved from an earlier confederation known as the Cottage Arts Association. This smaller society had about forty classes in various parts of the country and it was the success of these classes that led to the formation of the HAIA. According to Jebb, writing in 1885, the Association began “through the efforts of a few individuals who, in different parts of the country, held classes on Saturday afternoons for teaching handwork of a recreative description to working boys”.¹² Tuition, first given to “provide a useful occupation for winter evenings”¹³ and a small extra income – which might have been better provided by raising wages – began by sending occasional beautiful

objects home, making goods for personal enjoyment, and then developed into a cottage industry, which revitalized the local economies. Anderson sees the doctrine of self-help in action, not only for the working participants but especially for “the way that art was used to legitimize the actions of women and to widen their own boundaries.” The benefits to the provider, in her view, “outweighed those of the recipients, allowing the upper echelons of society to claim their place as good citizens”.¹⁴

We begin to see here a differentiation between the philanthropic women’s work as the production of selves, and Mackail’s men’s work as the production of product, which tension focusses the dialogue between socialist Arts and Crafts, which produced beautiful objects,¹⁵ and women’s philanthropy, which produced beautiful Souls. The HAIA’s household products were not nearly so derisory as Mackail’s language would lead one to expect (see Anderson’s illustrations). The list of the Committee of the HAIA show the selves the women produced, including five Souls: the Countess Brownlow, the Countess Cowper, the Lady Elizabeth Cust, the Countess of Pembroke, and the Hon. Mrs. Percy Wyndham.¹⁶

The list of HAIA VIPs indicates how seamlessly they negotiated the making of beautiful artefacts, the making of working-class artisans, and the making of themselves as social guardian angels, or Souls. In addition to the Souls, the list includes among other patrons of art and philanthropy Alexandra, Princess of Wales and later Queen, Maurice B. Adams (architect for Bedford Park), Eustace Balfour of Holland Park, Joseph Comyns Carr (Director of the Grosvenor Gallery), Sidney Colvin (Keeper of Prints at the British Museum), T.C. Horsfall (organiser of public arts exhibitions in Manchester), Frederick Leighton (President of the Royal Academy of Art and the Kyrle Society), E. J. Poynter (PRA), Lady Stanley of Alderley (philanthropist), G. F. Watts (artist), and the Countess of Warwick (exhibitor).

Art and Design and other outlets of cultural philanthropy at the fin de siècle exhibited predictably diverse motives. Questions arising in the most recent research ask whether cultural philanthropy primarily offered vocational training or a liberal education, applied or high art, recreation or Taste?¹⁷ Recreation is an action of a builder or maker, and its result is a product or object; Taste is a capacity that distinguishes its bearer, and its result is a certain kind of person. Were the philanthropists offering working people vocations or cultivating in them middle-class Taste? Henry Cole established a training School (1852-1873) and introduced the language of Goals and Targets, culminating in the

famous Payments by Results, or what we call today Performance-Related Pay, whose object is productivity and product. Edward Bird supported fine arts ateliers for the industrial workforce, whose object was the elevation of Taste. G. F. Watts's refusal to individuate in his painting was matched by Mary Seton Watts forbidding the Compton Potters' Art Guild to carve signatures on their churches, supporting her idea of socialist anonymity.¹⁸ In work on the East End Missions, Meaghan Clarke has shown informal ethnography occurring in museums as the upper classes viewed the lower classes viewing the pictures.¹⁹ One clear function of philanthropy was social voyeurism as the classes learned to negotiate differences in tastes and responsibilities. The ethos of the New Education promoted by the Kyrle and the HAIA was to learn by doing, and the Philanthropists themselves were doing just that: learning. As the HAIA came to be more centralised in London, it turned away from the liberal ideals of educating children toward disciplined vocational training. Jebb left and her co-founder Charles Godfrey Leland went to study Gypsies in Eastern Europe.

That is, one of London's pillars of philanthropy abandoned the institutional apparatus to study Gypsies in Eastern Europe. Who was Charles Godfrey Leland?²⁰ One of the Unclassed²¹ figures of the Victorian Establishment, the case of Leland illustrates the strange tastes of these Unclassed as they commingled with outcasts. We now turn to some of the less explored sources of Victorian philanthropy.

II.

Gypsy Lorists: The Non-Christian Roots of Philanthropy

Charles Godfrey Leland was born in Quaker Philadelphia²² in 1824, the son of a rich commission merchant in the family that had settled Massachusetts, and, as well as being a distinguished charity organizer and educationist, was a master of folklore, student and friend of gypsies, and of Italian witches. Raised by Irish and black servants who taught him fairy lore and Voodoo, he entered Princeton in 1841. He and the university were mutually unimpressed, and he later considered that its failure to teach him contributed to his independence throughout life. In 1845, when he was 21 years old, he left Princeton for Europe. As a student at Heidelberg and Munich, he cultivated an affection for German philosophy, drinking, and pub life that would be life-long and that became the basis for his popular comic poetry in German patois, *Hans Breitmann's Ballads* (1869-71). Continuing his grand tour to France, he resided in the Hotel du Luxembourg, the headquarters of

revolutionaries and the original *vie de Bohème*, and he participated in the French Revolution of 1848, sending eye-witness accounts of the barricades on 24 February back home to the US. Returning home, he fought through his journalism for the cause of abolition in the US Civil War, and then fought physically in the Battle of Gettysburg. For a time he was Inspector of oil prospecting in Tennessee, Indiana, and West Virginia, travelling extensively in the wild – down wild rivers with post-war brigands and Southern guerrillas, where he was accepted among them, as he seemed to be accepted, throughout his life, among all marginal peoples. Wherever he went in canoe or on horseback, he promptly decorated his room with “crossed canoe paddles, hunches of locust thorn, or deerhorns on the walls.”²³

At forty-five, after he had worked continuously in paid employment for 21 years, his father and younger brother died and he was left wealthy but in a state of nervous collapse. He resigned his position on the Philadelphia Press and in 1870 he moved back to England and began his life-long study of the Gypsies. In Epping Forest, at Oatlands Park, at the Hampton races, he became intimate with those on the road, and, a dedicated amateur philologist, learned their language, Romany. With Matty Cooper, the then King of the English Gypsies, he went through Hindi and Persian dictionaries writing down every word that Cooper remembered or recognized. When Cooper proposed to Leland that they should set out “on the drum” together with donkey, cart, and tent, Leland browned his face and hands in order to be dark enough to pass. Cooper enlisted a Gypsy woman to cook and support them by telling fortunes. By the use of his newly acquired language, Leland could soon scarcely walk two miles without making the acquaintance of some wanderer on the highways. He would take his staff and sketch-book on a day’s pilgrimage and as he strolled by some grassy nook he would see the gleam of a red garment and find a man of the roads with wife and child. He would sit in their camp, hearing stories and talking familiarly in their language.

Leland found in the Gypsies a natural politeness that always showed itself when they were treated with respect – a cheerfulness, a gratefulness and an instinctive refinement. Skill in begging implied the possession of every talent they most esteemed: artfulness, cool effrontery, the power of arousing pity, and provoking generosity. We shall return to these skills.

Travelling in Wales with Gypsies, Leland discovered Shelta Thari, the so-called Tinkers’ language, an ancient bardic language based on pre-aspirated Irish Gaelic and

related to Romany. Leland collaborated with Cambridge professor Edward Palmer on a collection of English-Gypsy songs that seemed to him like the songs of Native Americans, with no form or meter perceptible to them. He felt that one who spoke Romany could never be a stranger, for he encountered English Gypsies in Egypt, Greek Gypsies in Liverpool, French Gypsies at Geneva, a Gypsy family in a beer garden in Hamburg, and so forth. These reminded him of the polyglot vagabonds of Philadelphia: Italians, Czechs, Croats who spoke the Slavonian languages; tinkers who spoke Shelta; Voodooists whose magic was similar to the pre-Christian magic practised by Gypsies. Simultaneously, Leland moved in society in London with Carlyle, Tennyson, Bulwer, Browning, Wilde and Caroline Norton, and founded the Rabelais Club with his close friend Walter Besant.

In 1879, Leland returned to Philadelphia, where he conducted an evening school for the teaching of the minor arts, embroidery, woodcarving, and decorative design to 200 children and women. He began to write educational works on incorporating hand work into schools and founded the Industrial Art School. He fell in now with Walt Whitman, who was also known to admire the Gypsies for their kindness and sympathy. He hosted Oscar Wilde, with whom he shared an enthusiasm for art schools, and Matthew Arnold, whom he thought the Prince of Prigs.²⁴ Following the success of his Philadelphia School of Industrial Design, Mrs. Jebb, who had read his books, and Leland co-founded in England the Cottage Arts Association. When it became bureaucratic, he went to Tuscany to study witches. Just as the respectable Philadelphians claimed not to have heard of the Voodoo sorcerers with whom Leland consorted, the educated Italians denied the witches of Tuscany with whom he lived. Initiated into Witch-lore of the Romagna by an informant called "Maddalena," he spent his last years obsessively collecting bric-a-brac from curiosity shops around Florence and "wrestling with problems of will and sex".²⁵

His book on hypnosis and self-hypnosis, *Have You a Strong Will? How to Develop Will-Power, or any Other Faculty or Attribute of the Mind, and Render it Habitual by the Easy Process of Self-Hypnosis* (1899), makes it clear that Leland did not believe in magic "if we mean by that an inexplicable contravention of law,"²⁶ and his references to witches, demons, and devilry in *The Gypsies* are what he calls "general and Oriental only. There is no Satan in India."²⁷ Leland believed in the powers of will, self-control, and sympathy, always stressing that hypnotism and "self-fascination" should not be deployed as a power over others but as a power to do things oneself.²⁸ In reflecting in his seventies on the subliminal Self and the training of the Will, he had found that by willing to be free from

vanity, envy and irritability, he had eliminated most bother from his mind. He attributed these powers of will, self-control, and sympathy to the Gypsies, and it is these that ally him with the Smilesian school of character-building. Leland glossed Arnold's poem "The Scholar-Gipsy" (1853), explaining how gypsy fancy bound that of others: "Following on thousands of years of transmitted hereditary influences," Gypsy chiromancy (*dukkerin* or telling the future) was no more or less than "instinctive intuitive perception" or sympathy with others, a highly developed skill in "reading" other people.²⁹ In both cases – of Arnold's Scholar-Gipsy and the Gypsies studied by Leland the scholar – the Gypsy represents imagination and sympathy, whole unfettered communicative interaction, knowledge before the rationalization of the disciplines, for Arnold at Oxford and for Leland in social welfare.³⁰

In mastering their language, lore, and music, Leland was, wrote his niece, "a mystery to the people of mystery." George Henry Lewes had said of Leland, "To tell fortunes to Gypsies is the last word in cheek."³¹ But the cheekiest thing Leland did was to use his knowledge of the wanderers' ways to support the outcasts of society. From his philology, his linguistics, his experience of a common language spoken across the nations, he came to believe in social harmony. Cosmopolitanism, or tolerance of difference and the possibility of communication across the nations, was a signal aspiration of the Victorian *fin de siècle*, and Leland saw the Gypsies and the Jews as the original cosmopolitans.³² From the Gypsy art of begging, he learned the arts of successful philanthropy. For they are the same skills: artfulness, cool effrontery, the powers of arousing pity, and provoking generosity. Yet Gypsy interdependence, which is absolute within the culture, was antithetical to the individualistically-motivated bureaucracy of organized charity, and so when the Cottage Arts Association turned into a bureaucracy, Leland fled. The significant point is that it was not Christian charity that led to Leland's philanthropy but the Gypsies' non-Christian performativity: artfulness, cool effrontery, the power of arousing pity and provoking generosity. My second point is that the Victorians, particularly the late Victorians of the *fin de siècle*, were stranger and more adventurous than our Weberian, Smilesian, or Fabian models. The late Victorian springs of action were more occult. Leland wanted to found a society for those who cultivated "all who form[ed] the outside class of creation" to be called The Gypsy and Wanderers' Society.³³

III.

Philanthropy's Other: The Persecution of the Gypsies

Leland's story is pleasing to a cultural historian and literary critic because it is a narrative, a narrative crowded, as Oscar Wilde would say, with incident. It is also an exemplum from the discipline of philology – the love of words that promoted especially during this period a dream of common languages. Leland was in fact delighted by all language, including natural signs and conventions communicating brotherhood and secret kinship: the blue smoke from the willow indicating hidden Gypsy camps, their red and yellow kerchiefs, their expressions of gratitude in little gifts, the first fixed look from the eyes that instantaneously identified to the Rye the gypsy or the witch. That a philologist and gypsiologist dreaming of a common language was one of the sources of late Victorian philanthropy adds a new perspective in the character-bureaucracy debate, one of the “cosmopolitanisms from below” that political theorists have identified.³⁴

Yet these narratives and exempla, so pleasing to critics and cultural historians, are stories that must be supplemented. Current gypsiology by historians, anthropologists, and sociologists puts this narrative in historical perspective and critiques it through the prisms of ethnic studies.³⁵ Leland conceived the idea of the Gypsy Lore Society in 1874 and finally founded it in 1888. Its membership included Leland's co-author Edward Palmer, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge; the Archduke Joseph of Austria, who had conducted experiments for the welfare of his Gypsy subjects; and the astonishingly erudite explorer and linguist Sir Richard Burton. Their mission was to collect songs and ballads before the Gypsies disappeared. For all their subjective love of their data as testified in Leland's philological and anthropological corpus, the Gypsy lorists participated in the extinction narratives that described the West's view of peoples who did not conform to Western ideas of progress. The Romany Rais, as they called themselves, saw themselves as friends of the Gypsies who wrote about what Arthur Symons called “the last romance left in the world” before their “race” would be disappeared forever.

From the first scholarly study, Henreich Grellmann's *Dissertation on the Gypsies* (trans. 1787), the Gypsies had been constructed as against Progress, especially economic Progress, true to their alleged roots among the northern Indian Jat tribe. The Gypsies were nomads, travellers, without land or property. As Patrick Brantlinger's *Dark Vanishings* (2003) suggests, little affronted advocates of Progress so much as nomads without property, whether they were hunter-gatherers abroad or Gypsy itinerants at home.³⁶ Yet for Leland and the lorists, their propertyless wanderings represented freedom, closeness to

nature, and generosity. Their language, Romany, was evidence of their racial purity, lack of assimilation, and ostensible endogamy. The Lorists' racial narrative was meant to counter a hegemonic discourse, as read in the vagrancy laws passed from the 14th through the 19th centuries, that combined Gypsies with vagrants and criminals and from which they were not distinguished in Britain until the Caravan Sites Act was amended in 1968. The race narrative of Leland and the lorists, confirmed through the discipline of philology, was specifically constructed to counteract the legal and criminological discourses of the State.

The first sixteen pages of Leland's *The Gypsies* (1882) includes some of the nineteenth century's most romantic writing, in which the Gypsies represent Nature at its most unselfconscious and most endangered. A few quotations show how Leland attributes to the Gypsies the very qualities that led to their persecution.

In Spain one who has been fascinated by them is called one of the *aficion*, or affection, or "fancy;" he is an *aficionado*, or affected unto them, and people there know perfectly what it means... He feels what a charm there is in a wandering life, in camping in lonely places, under old chestnut-trees, near towering cliffs, *al pasar del arroyo*, by the rivulets among the rocks. (9)

I find the wanderers who properly inhabit not the houses [in a picturesque painting] but the scene, not a part but the whole. These are the gypsies, who live like the birds and hares, not of the house-born or the town-bred, but free and at home only with nature. (10)

Leland returns repeatedly to the Unclassed attraction felt by himself and other *aficionados* of Gypsies: "It is apropos of living double lives, and playing parts, and the charm of stealing away unseen... to romp with the tabooed offspring of outlawed neighbors, that I write this" (274-5). Gypsies are a liminal race:

They are human, but in their lives they are between man as he lives in houses and the bee and bird and fox, and I cannot help believing that those who have no sympathy with them have none for the forest and road, and cannot be rightly familiar with the witchery of wood and wold. (12)

With Nature, Gypsies are in danger of being disappeared.

And it is gradually disappearing from the world... No doubt the newer tend to higher forms of culture, but it is not without pain that he who has been "in the spirit"... and in its quiet, solemn sunset, sees it all vanishing. It will all be gone in a few years. (13)

Gypsies are the human types of this vanishing, direct love of nature, of this mute sense of rural romance, and of *al fresco* life, and he who does not recognize it in them, despite their rags and dishonesty, need not pretend to appreciate anything... Truly [Gypsies] are but rags themselves; the last rags of the old romance. (13)

The day is coming when there will be no more wild parrots nor wild wanderers, no wild nature, and certainly no gypsies. Within a very few years in the city of Philadelphia, the English sparrow... has driven from the gardens all the wild, beautiful feathered creatures, whom, as a boy, I knew... So the people of self-conscious culture and the mart and factory are banishing the wilder sort, and it is all right, and so it must be... But as a London reviewer [Arthur Symons] said when I asserted in a book that the child was perhaps born who would see the last gypsy, "Somehow we feel sorry for that child." (15-16)

Is joyous and healthy nature to vanish step by step from the heart of man, and morbid, egoistic pessimism to take its place? Are over-culture, excessive sentiment, constant self-criticism, and all the brood of nervous curses to monopolize and inspire art? (77)

In his chapter on Welsh gypsies, Leland describes ideal types of natural selection, outside culture. The male is a *Gorgio*, not a Gypsy but an agricultural labourer who "went native":

He was by far the handsomest young fellow, in form and features, whom I ever met among the agricultural class in England; we called him a peasant Apollo. It became evident that the passional affinity which had drawn this rustic to the gypsy girl, and to the roads, was according to the law of natural selection, for they were wonderfully well matched. The young man had the grace inseparable from a fine figure and a handsome face, while the girl was tall, lithe, and pantherine, with the diabolical charm which, though often attributed by fast-fashionable novelists to their heroines, is really never found except among the low-born beauties of nature. It is the beauty of the Imp and of the Serpent; it fades with letters; it dies in the drawing-room or on the stage... the devil-beauty never knows how to read, she is unstudied and no actress... It is not of good or of evil, or of culture, which is both; it is all and only of nature, and it does not know itself. (190-191)

Leland comprehends that his *aficion* for the Gypsies is modernity's romance with its disappeared organic past. He describes the Cambridge don Edward Palmer in equally romantic terms, accepted among all cultures and hospices:

It is rumored that he has preached Islam in a mosque unto the Moslem even unto taking up a collection, which is the final test of the faith which reaches forth into a bright eternity. That he can be... a Persian unto Persians, and a Romany among Roms, and a professional among the [academics], is likewise on the cards, as surely as that he knows the roads and all the devices and little games of them that dwell thereon. Though elegant enough... when he kisses the hand of our sovereign lady the queen, he appears such an abandoned rough when he goes a-fishing that the innocent and guileless gypsies, little suspecting that a *rye* lies *perdu* in his wrap-rascal, will then confide in him as if he and in-doors had never been acquainted. (199)

The Gypsies represent the freedom that is gone: “In this book the gypsies, and the scenes which surround them, are intended to teach the lesson of freedom and nature. Never were such lessons more needed than at present” (14).

The “dark vanishings” Brantlinger studied are the presumed extinctions, especially self-extinguishings, of people not deemed to be, or to be capable of being, civilized, those who cannot participate in Western Progress. By focussing exclusively on extinction, Brantlinger makes clearer than most post-colonial critique since Fanon how closely extinction was the reverse narrative of Progress and civilization. The death of the primitive was as inevitable, as inescapable, as the Progress of the West. It also contributes a richer explanatory frame for race than colour. For the Victorians especially, “race” represented an aggregation of properties – nature, nomadism, propertylessness, relative absence of firearms and technology, and sex – that contradicted western notions of technological and economic progress. In this model, the superficially white, as in the Irish case, could be structurally primitive, and therefore as inevitably disappeared as aboriginals of colour in the colonies.

The most lethal aspect of extinction discourse, Brantlinger concludes (190), was probably its stress on the inevitability of the vanishing. The sense of doom was rendered all the more powerful by the belief that at least some (chosen) peoples might progress, that Progress was providential or natural, and that races were separated from each other by biological essences that translated as “fit” and “unfit” to survive. The dominant literary mode for this extinction discourse is elegy, or *Ubi sunt?*, as in *The Gypsies*. When the civilized bearers of Progress look at those whose disappearance they anticipate, they see, paradoxically, the last representatives of romance, of all that western man can no longer be. Such is the white man’s burden, the dialectics of enlightenment.

Brantlinger also shows that modernity (as a race) intermittently saw the ironies of Progress, and sometimes went native or regressed. In his *Autobiography* (1771), Benjamin Franklin noted that the Carlisle Indians must have been doing something right, because whites captured by them often did not want to return home.³⁷ In *Letters of an American Farmer* (1781), J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur pointed out that thousands of Europeans had assimilated into Indian families and refused to return, but he knew no examples of the reverse, a point subsequently confirmed by historians.³⁸ As late as Alfred Russel Wallace’s *Malay Archipelago* (1869), Wallace concluded, about an altogether different

population geographically, that “among people in a very low stage of civilization we find some approach to a perfect social state” (cited 186).

This discourse of inevitable disappearance before the force of modernity is an alternative context for Leland and the Lorists, and it exposes the desire and dread that haunt the fin de siècle. The Celtic Twilight of the Scottish Highlands, the decline of Welsh and Cornish languages and communities, and the Gypsies were part of a global demise of peoples who did not fit western notions of technological and economic development. Like the North American Iroquois, the African Bushmen, and the South Sea Islanders, the Gypsies also represented a kind of freedom, close to Nature, and a proverbially “fascinating beauty.”

Despite his personal affection for the land of Hans Breitmann, Leland had claimed that Gypsies were antipathetic to Germans, due to the latter’s self-consciousness and systematizing (*Gypsies*, 82). In time, his romantic stereotype was used against them. In 1903, the year after Leland died, the German state of Wurttemberg promulgated a Struggle Against the Gypsy Nuisance decree, followed by other states. A Conference of German States agreed that the Gypsy way of life – travelling – rather than racial purity defined them, but that their life-style was “work-shy” and therefore “asocial.” Travelling with children was forbidden in Bavarian law in 1926. In 1928, Frankfurt set up a concentration camp for Gypsies.³⁹ The Nazis came to power on an anti-crime wave that by 1935 targeted beggars, vagabonds, prostitutes, pimps and the “work-shy”. When Hitler became Chancellor of Germany, Bremen adopted the Law for the Protection of the Population against Molestation by Gypsies, Travellers, and Work-Shy, with the first round-up of beggars and vagabonds by Nazi storm-troopers in 1933. Ancient accusations of espionage based on itinerant lifestyles and intimate knowledge of the countryside were fully revived from the 1930s in restrictions on gypsy mobility and expulsions. The “asocial” were taken into preventative custody and placed in concentration camps. The first large-scale arrests of Gypsies destined for camps took place when Himmler ordered the Gestapo to take action against the “work-shy” (including, but not specifically directed against, Gypsies), who were sent to Buchenwald and Auschwitz to re-form their personalities and to provide slave-labour for the new SS economic enterprises. Other individual Gypsies were sent to the camps during the war years for various offences grouped under the name “asocial conduct.”⁴⁰ By 1938, “asocial” behaviour was defined as “not adapted to the life of the community” and “persons without a criminal record who sought to escape the duty to

work.”⁴¹ Shades of the prison house closed on the Gypsy rovers, for the very reasons that Leland had loved them.

In 1942 Otto Thierack, Nazi Minister of Justice, proposed the policy of “Extermination by Work” as a way to rid the German people of asocials unhampered by the necessity to pursue any legal criminal evidence (169), and from 1943 there followed a sharp increase in Gypsy sterilizations. Yet unlike Jews, Gypsies were allowed to stay together as families in the camps. In the Auschwitz family camp, Gypsies were tattooed with a number, shorn, disinfected, and forced to attach to their clothes a black triangle signifying “asocial.” Nazi racial hygienists were convinced of the ultimate genetic origins of social differences such as itineracy and “work-shyness”. Josef Mengele was chief physician to the Gypsy family camp, and studied twins from there and throughout Auschwitz. The stories were of Mengele as Vivisector, personally killing twins simply to resolve disputes over diagnoses and then dissecting the bodies while still warm. Survivors wrote of his “fascination” with human pain.⁴² “Fascination” now was in the hands of science, not the Gypsy’s eye.

In the most authoritative study to date, Guenter Lewy explains why the Nazi persecution of the Gypsies had not been treated heretofore:

Hardly any Gypsies belonged to the intellectual class. Moreover, some of the most basic taboos of Gypsy culture regarding ritual purity and sexual conduct had been violated in the concentration camps, and survivors therefore were reluctant to talk about what had happened. Subjects such as compulsory sterilization could hardly be discussed at all. Inquiries by outsiders were hampered by the suspicion with which Gypsies have traditionally regarded the non-Gypsy world – the result of centuries of harassment and persecution.⁴³

Lewy concluded that Gypsies were considered nuisances and a plague but not a major threat to the German people. Their “asocial” propertyless mobility was increasingly but not consistently treated as racial, which was why their treatment differed from that of the Final Solution to the problem of the Jews. Leland, however, often did treat Jews and Gypsies equally as the cosmopolitan races of greatest antiquity:

Among all the subdivisions of the human race, there are only two which have been, apparently from their beginning, set apart, marked and cosmopolite, ever living among others, and yet reserved unto themselves. These are the Jew and the gypsy... Go where we may, we find the Jew – has any other wandered so far? Yes, one. For wherever Jew has gone, there, too, we find the gypsy. (18)

Today historians and anthropologists as well as most Gypsies are inclined to see Gypsy as an ethnicity or identity rather than a race. For ethnic Gypsies, the main

component of the core culture remains travelling or nomadism. In England alone in 2004 the travelling community including gypsies, showpeople, and bargees (who live on canals) numbered 350,000.⁴⁴ Specialists now see heterogeneous groups of migrant workers with developed socio-economic contributions to the diverse societies in which they live. They speak of complex identities that partake of both traditional gypsy nomadism and the nationalities of their local habitations.

However, the racialism once hypothesized by the philologist-lorists has continued in the search for common origins in population genetics. Even today, some Gysiologists of the “racial” or “primordialist” persuasion seek to distinguish the Gypsies deriving from the great migrations or diaspora of 500 to 1000 AD from our mere New Age Travellers by their DNA. The social historian David Mayall concludes, “Issues relating to the nature of identity, identity formation and its development and evolution, counter-identities, change over generations, national differences, varied experiences and the elusiveness of self-identity are problems which cannot, indeed must not, be simply ignored or swept away in pursuit or defense of some mythical or mystical essential whole.”⁴⁵

After the holocaust of Nazi Science that burned away his world, it may be hard to conjure up the Romany Rye of Victorian philanthropy. Yet poor children in Philadelphia and rural workers throughout Britain lightened their labour and winter evenings learning applied arts because Leland had learned from the Gypsies. He did not have our hindsight on the extent of fears of extinction at the end of the century, and he could not have foreseen how threatening their precious freedom would be to modern efficiency and productivity. While he never liked the aesthetes, Leland aestheticised the living. In Venice, tiring of museums and galleries he wrote to his niece and biographer, Elizabeth Robins Pennell, herself an international art-critic of repute:

I don't care for endless repetitions of the Holy Wet Nurse Maternal idea... and as little do I care that this or that man attained to a greater or less degree of skill or inspiration. It is worth something to see and know it but it is not worth a thousandth part of what Ruskin and the aesthetes think it is. Suppose Raphael paint a Virgin... One can see many women as beautiful everyday... and I had rather see one of them than all the pictures in Italy... I see from afar, yet coming rapidly, a great new age when Humanity will be... the subject of Art – yea *Art itself*... Just imagine all the money and time and thought now given to Art directed to Education and Humanity! (Pennell II, 288, Leland's italics).

A connoisseur of the great Gypsy music of Eastern Europe, Leland repeatedly insisted that its pleasure lay in the musicians “being thoroughly delighted with themselves, which is all

that can be hoped for in art, where the aim is pleasure and not criticism.”⁴⁶ The art that gave the worker pleasure was the basis of Leland’s cultural philanthropy, as it was also the basis of William Morris’s socialism.

IV.

Interdisciplinarity as Collectivity

Leland as a philologist whose dream of a common language inspired concrete service to the poor (narratology, art history); Leland as a romantic aesthete whose stereotypes participated in global extinction narratives (demography, history); Gypsies as romantic rovers (poetics); as complex identities and histories (ethnic studies); as victims of persecution (ethics, politics). From these narratives and sources we draw our conclusions on interdisciplinarity. We cannot individually go back to a common language before the rationalization of knowledge. The academic disciplines have built up formidable detailed knowledges that we ignore or disrespect at our peril. On the other hand, Gypsies really were on to something that breaks down walls, boundaries, and institutional barriers. They were known for their sympathy and interdependence that made them figures of community to those who knew them best.

One uses other disciplines insofar as one needs them to solve the problem or tell the story that must be solved or told. Research that tries to do it all is hubristic at best and shallow or wrong at worst. But work that comes out of dialogue with specialists from a range of disciplines, and that comes out of a shared commitment across the disciplines to understand real problems like that of philanthropy in liberal societies, gender inequality, race or religious hatreds, or beauty in the built environment is the ideal form of scholarly engagement with the world. It is not clear how much of the transdisciplinary *theory* of the 1980s and 1990s will survive the tests of time. We might predict that the academic celebrities of those days will be remembered more for their charisma or identity politics than their contributions to knowledge. But the great transdisciplinary *movements* addressing themselves to shared commitments will provide lasting collective contributions: feminist studies, the Green or Ecology movement, postcolonial studies, comparative studies in race and ethnicity, literacy studies and history of the book, and, perhaps more needed now than ever, sophisticated Marxian studies. Such collective studies bring together scholars from across the disciplines to work on projects of common commitment. “Roaming the country-side, a truant boy,/ Nursing thy project in unclouded

joy... *one aim, one business, one desire*" (212-13) is the way Arnold described commitment in "The Scholar-Gypsy," and commitment may be our best counter to what he called the "strange disease of modern life" (213) that fragments, atomises, competes, over-produces and under-nourishes.

The *British Journal of Sociology* recently ran a symposium on Max Steuer's *The Scientific Study of Society* (2002), in which Robert A. Scott temperately described, after Dogan and Pahre, a "hybridization of specialties."⁴⁷

The term reflects a recognition of the fact that the most fruitful points of contact across disciplines are not along disciplinary lines per se, but between specific sectors of different fields. Hybridization entails an overlapping of segments of disciplines, a recombination of knowledge in new specialized fields involving the borrowing of concepts, theories and methods across multiple disciplinary sub-specialties. Thus, for example, political scientists specializing in the study of crime or urbanization have much less in common with political scientists studying voting than with geographers interested in the physical distribution of cities or with sociologists who study crime. This is why, in practice, many of the social scientists I know spend so much of their time talking to, reading and citing the works of people who are not members of their own disciplines.

Moreover, examples of hybridization are not difficult to find. Cognitive neuroscience, the study of emotions, voting behaviour, music cognition, crime, urbanization, culture, the family, human development and the life course are examples that come immediately to mind. (130)

One could add rational choice theory, game theory, behavioural economics, and genomics. Perhaps more to the present point, what would it mean for a journal called **19** to address certain topics in the nineteenth century?

One of the things it would mean is a dialogue on what counts as evidence, for to social and physical scientists, the arts and humanities focus on the particular rather than the general or statistical. While I believe that the story of Leland opens up whole new vistas on late Victorian philanthropy, in which Europeans and North Americans borrowed from Eastern peoples and non-Christian philosophies, nonetheless textual interpretation, exegesis, or *explication du texte* is not universally welcome in science seminars, at least not unless supplemented by more "robust" kinds of evidence. As we talk with the experts in the relevant disciplines, we learn what it means to communicate with them, to know, e.g., what counts as evidence and what is "merely anecdotal."

While I believe that the most significant interdisciplinary work will entail collaborations of experts across the disciplines on projects of common commitment, to the extent that a lone scholar trained well in a discipline can be interdisciplinary, she must

assume the empathetic skills of thinking *like* another discipline. Beneath the shared commitments that produce the lasting interdisciplinary projects is the gypsy empathy. Obviously one cannot keep up with the details or recent research across disciplines in the way that one is expected to keep up with details and research in one's primary discipline. However, one can think *like* an anthropologist in terms of kinship structures, or think like a sociologist in terms of status and institutions, or think like an economist in terms of less and more, maximization, risk, scarcity, and exchange. If we think like them we are more likely to say things of interest to them. In most cases, people trained in English Departments will predominantly think like literary critics, who think in terms of forms of expression, linguistic forms, but also rhetorical, generic, and syntactic forms. But we cannot just read large chunks of other disciplines as a critic reading figures, for a figure in physics or economics or biology has a deep history that often cannot be gleaned from the surface of the text. We shall inevitably combine our thinking about relationship, status, institutions, and exchange with our passion for forms of expression. But that may not be sufficient, if we are saying something about the world, to count as evidence.

And it is more than just *thinking* like an expert, for *disciplines* are more than ideas: they are institutionally embedded *practices*. The economist Myra Strober has studied these practices, to find that mathematicians do not give or receive papers like humanists; their professional behaviour is different in time and space. If we set up reading groups or conferences in which two or more disciplines actually have to talk to one another, the differences will go deeper than the words. Strober characterises disciplines as “distinct cultures” and multi-disciplinary seminars as “efforts at cross-cultural communication.”⁴⁸

In “Habits of the Mind: Challenges for Multidisciplinarity,” Strober reports on research that has been funded by foundations in the United States to foster interdisciplinarity, on the premise that creativity and breakthroughs are most likely at the intersections of disciplines. Her own method for defining a discipline is pragmatic: disciplines are fields that have attained departmental status in universities and grant new doctorates to reproduce their fields. She defines cross-disciplinary and multidisciplinary synonymously; both mean that two or more disciplines are being used but that they are not integrated. Interdisciplinary means that there is an integration of some aspects of the disciplines, but where, despite the integration, the separate disciplinary perspectives are still discernible. “Transdisciplinary” refers to such a degree of integration of disciplines

that tracing distinct disciplinary contributions is difficult. Strober refreshingly uses a culinary, rather than a sports, metaphor:

A disciplinary dish consists of only one type of food on a plate – a baked potato, for example. Cross-disciplinary and multidisciplinary dishes are more complex; they might consist of a series of vegetables placed next to one another on a plate. If we added to our lone baked potato some steamed carrots, and sautéed peas, we would have a cross-disciplinary dish. An interdisciplinary dish, on the other hand, might be a soup, where the potatoes, carrots, and peas had been cooked together and “integrated” into a liquid. A salad, where the tomatoes, lettuce, and avocados were tossed together and “integrated” by means of a dressing, would also be an interdisciplinary dish.

In an interdisciplinary dish, either soup or salad, although the vegetables are integrated, each is still clearly discernible. In a transdisciplinary dish, by contrast, individual vegetables can no longer be clearly perceived. A vegetable soup where the ingredients have all been put through a blender so that no particular vegetable is distinguishable in the resultant puree would be transdisciplinary. (Ms. pp. 8-9)

Strober reports on her project, funded by Atlantic-Philanthropies and the Ford Foundation, to create broad (not problem-specific) seminars to encourage dialogue across academic disciplines. While she reports on the problems they had talking with one another – different levels of civility, degree of democratic decision-making, style of presentation, style of discussion, style of leadership – she rarely addresses why we *ought* to talk to one another across disciplines. Because her study funded *institutions* to foster interdisciplinarity, she asks what institutions *want* from it. “What are they seeking to maximise?” in recommending that about 1/5 of all research should be interdisciplinary. Her answer is from the perspective of the maximising institution. It wants “prestige” among its competitors. It will be interesting to see whether such external pressures on academics will actually be able to surmount their “cultural” differences and foster the dialogue. It is certain that common commitments to feminism, anti-racism, environmentalism, etc. engender precisely the “mutual respect” and “wilful suspension of participants’ own concepts of rigor” that were lacking in Strober’s experiment. Indeed Strober’s final example is an appeal to empathy rather than critique in the first instance of contact between disciplines.

While research councils in the UK are also pushing universities toward interdisciplinarity, my own sense is that for now commitment to common goals provides more incentive than external pressures. However, everything we know about institutional regimes suggests that what begin as coerced practices end as internalized ones. Whether

committed or coerced, the kinds of academics we are making are likely to be interdisciplinary.

¹ I am grateful for a travel grant from the British Academy, which allowed me to complete research for this article.

² Lauren M.E. Goodlad, *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State: Character and Governance in a Liberal Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003). Goodlad's excellent elaboration of Victorian pastorship is complicated by her expressed need to begin and end in Foucault (she is providing a critique of early Foucault's panopticon in favour of Foucault's later essays on governmentality). If it had not been for a reduction to disciplined power on the part of some of Foucault's followers, we would not have needed Goodlad's corrective. This two-steps-forward-two-steps-back, theoretical-reduction-and-corrective is one of the hazards of disciplinary internalism. Two recent reinterpretations of Bentham that counteract the panopticon are Kathleen Blake's forthcoming book *Pleasures of Benthamism: Victorian Literature, Utility, and Political Economy*; her "Bleak House, Political Economy, Victorian Studies" in *Victorian Literature and Culture* 25: 1-21; her "Bentham, Utilitarianism, Pleasure," at the Locating the Victorians Conference (London, July 2001); and "Pleasures of Benthamism: 'Panopticon' and 'Sextus'", MLA Annual Meeting, Washington D.C. 2000; and Stephen G. Engelmann, *Imagining Interest in Political Thought: Origins of Economic Rationality* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). In many ways, the paradox was less of a contradiction than Goodlad suggests: throughout *All Sorts and Conditions of Men* (1882), the cultural philanthropist Walter Besant preached self-help, but because he believed in the power of 'culture' to reform the individual, self-help was not to interfere with the more important guidance offered from above. See Chris Waters's "Philanthropy and the Social Utility of Free Time", Ch. 3 in *British Socialists and the Politics of Popular Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990): 65-96.

In some ways, my more occult excavation of Victorian springs of action is closer to the ideas of another recent book on Victorian society, Pam Morris's *Imagining Inclusive Society in 19th-Century Novels*. Although Morris does not deal with the fin de siècle, her argument that between 1846 and 1867 social inclusiveness changed from an abstract political idea to one central to popular consciousness is even more applicable to the end of the century and to philologists like Leland in search of a common language. See Pam Morris, *Imaging Inclusive Society in 19th-Century Novels: The Code of Sincerity in the Public Sphere* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

³ Anne Anderson, "Victorian High Society and Social Duty: the Promotion of Recreative Learning and Voluntary Teaching" *History of Education* vol. 31, no. 4: 311-334. P. 333.

⁴ See Diana Maltz, *British Aestheticism and the Urban Working Classes, 1870-1900: Beauty for the People* (Basingstoke: Palgrave 2005).

⁵ Anderson, "High Society and Social Duty", p. 317.

⁶ Anderson, p. 312.

⁷ Oscar Wilde, "The Soul of Man Under Socialism", *The Artist as Critic: Critical Writings of Oscar Wilde*, ed. Richard Ellmann (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), p. 259.

⁸ Cited in Anne Anderson, “Queen Victoria’s Daughters and ‘the Tide of Fashionable Philanthropy,’” *Women’s History Magazine* 41 (June 2002): 10-15. P. 13.

⁹ Clive Bell, *Civilization: An Essay* (London: Pelican, 1938), p. 87.

¹⁰ Anderson, “High Society and Social Duty”, p. 316.

¹¹ Anderson, “Queen Victoria’s Daughters”, p. 13.

¹² Anderson, “High Society and Social Duty”, p. 321.

¹³ Anderson, p. 331.

¹⁴ Anderson, “Queen Victoria’s Daughters”, p. 14.

¹⁵ This is Mackail’s distinction. It can be argued that Morris himself emphasised the aesthetic process – the sensuous activity of making – over the finished product (although Morris was not always charitable toward charity products).

¹⁶ Ian Fletcher, who taught many of the best critics of the fin de siècle, was in love with the Souls as the apex of Aestheticism: flower maidens, he called them, lost in timeless reverie, as though they only lived as part of the design of an oriental carpet. “Not since the Heian world of Japan in the tenth century, and not for a long time to come, is such a circle likely once more to cohere... For twenty years the women moved, part of society, yet superior to it; the men were continuously and conspicuously in government, but their male children in particular were shadowed by their splendid mothers.” Ian Fletcher, “Some Aspects of Aestheticism,” *Twilight of Dawn: Studies in English Literature in Transition*, ed. O. M. Brack, Jr., (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987), p. 33. For all their altruism in the HAIA, the Soul Mothers killed their children with their kindness, never bestowing on them autonomy, never seeing them as ends in themselves but as means to their own splendid self-development. Their boys learned duty to family, school, college, country, and never learned to differentiate themselves for themselves, until the last mass they submerged themselves in was the War. “Well, if Armageddon is *on*,” said Rupert Brooke laconically to J.D. Squire in August 1914, “I suppose one should be there” – as if it were one of their mothers’ garden parties. See Jeanne MacKenzie, *Children of the Souls: A Tragedy of the First World War* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1986), p. 144. The private sensibility and public urbanity that constituted the Souls’ ethic is captured by the Secretary of State George Wyndham’s phrase that he possessed a “power to bring happiness and their hearts’ desire to those I am fond of. I have that power because I have no great wishes for myself” (p. 10). Thus Hugo Charteris of the Elcho family could write home after his younger brother was mowed down in the trenches, “The only sound thing is to hope the best for one’s country and to expect absolutely nothing for oneself in the future ” (p. 210). The Soul Fathers wanted nothing for themselves for they had everything already; the Soul Mothers basked in the reflected glory of their sons; the sons died to a man in the trenches, publicly out of duty to country but in fact out of habit to their families. It was the soldiers’ sweet acquiescence as sacrificial victim, not as masculine victor, that made one of the first reviewers of Wilfred Owen write that their “sacrificial love passes the love of women.”

¹⁷ Some of these issues arose at the “Art for Life’s Sake” Conference at the Southampton Institute 16-17 November 2002, organizers Anne Anderson and Diana Maltz.

¹⁸ See Regenia Gagnier, “The Law of Progress and the Ironies of Individualism in the Nineteenth Century,” *New Literary History: Special Issue on Economics and Culture: Production, Consumption, and Value* 31:2 (Spring 2000), esp. pp. 331-32.

¹⁹ Meaghan Clarke, *Critical Voices: Women and Art Criticism in Britain 1880-1905* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

²⁰ I am especially grateful to Anne Anderson and Shelagh Wilson for igniting my interest in Leland.

²¹ Gissing used the term Unclassed for those, like himself, whose tastes and sentiments were incongruous with their environments. Most of the Unclassed were torn between the Fine (aesthetics) and the Good (ethics).

²² Leland’s niece, Elizabeth Robins Pennell, points out, in establishing the exceptional individuality of Leland, that Philadelphia had been founded by William Penn that his people might follow “the inner light” and freedom of belief. What follows is from Pennell, *Charles Godfrey Leland: A Biography* 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906); Van Wyck Brooks, “Charles Godfrey Leland” in *Fenollosa and his Circle* (New York: Dutton, 1962): 217-247; from Leland’s own writings, especially *The Gypsies* of 1882 here cited in the 5th edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1888). Other significant books by Leland include *The Egyptian Sketch Book* (1873), *The English Gypsies* (1873), *The Book of English Gypsy Songs* (1875), *The Algonquin Legends* (1884), *The Gypsy Lore Journal* (1887-1892), *Gypsy Sorcery and Fortune Telling* (1891), *Legends of Florence* (1895-96), *Aradia or the Gospel of the Witches* (1899). His last book, published in the year of his death, was *The Alternate Sex; or Female Intellect in Man and the Masculine Intellect in Women* (1902; cited from London: Philip Wellby, 1904), in which he argued that biological sex difference in humans could be influenced by culture towards equality. Leland may be traced (misleadingly) through the Internet today by his works on Witchcraft and Wicca. See www.controversial.com/Charles%20Godfrey%20Leland.htm and www.sacred-texts.com/pag/aradia.

²³ Pennell, *Biography* I, p. 285.

²⁴ Pennell, *Biography* II, p. 100

²⁵ Pennell, *Biography* II, p. 340.

²⁶ Charles Godfrey Leland, *Have You A Strong Will?* (London: Redway, 1899), see esp. 186-88.

²⁷ Leland, *The Gypsies*, p. 127 and passim

²⁸ See especially *Have You a Strong Will?*, p. 212. In *The Alternate Sex*, Leland’s final word on the subject, he wrote that “hypnotism is the absolute obedience to suggestion. It may be exercised by one mind upon another, or even by the mind upon itself” (67). “Religion is the combination of a sense of dependence on a master allied to a sense of mystery... Hypnotism is the same thing” (76).

²⁹ Leland, *The Gypsies*, p. 225. Matthew Arnold began contemplating his poem “The Scholar-Gipsy” (1853) as early as 1848. The story, as he took it from Joseph Glanvill’s *The Vanity of Dogmatising* (1661), was that a boy is forced by his poverty to leave Oxford and at last to attach himself to a company of “vagabond” gypsies. After he had lived with them long enough to know their ways, he meets by chance a couple of his former classmates. He “told them that the people he went with were not imposters as they were taken for,

but that they had a traditional kind of learning among them, and could do wonders by the power of imagination, their fancy binding that of others: that himself had learned much of their art, and when he had compassed the whole secret, he intended, he said, to leave their company, and give the world an account of what he had learned.” Matthew Arnold, *Matthew Arnold: The Oxford Authors*, ed. Miriam Allott and Robert H. Super (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 545. Arnold glossed his completed poem as contrasting an ideal life of the mind to the actual (institutional) life at Oxford from which the students – himself, his brother Tom, and Arthur Clough – periodically escaped into the Cumnor Hills (Ibid. notes 545-47). Arnold’s Scholar-Gipsy had “*one aim, one business, one desire*” [Arnold’s italics] (212), while Arnold, the institutionalised scholar, had “the infection of our mental strife.” Arnold’s “Scholar-Gipsy” represented “a criticism of Victorian civilisation which is also a Romantic criticism of life for its failure to match expectations” (546).

³⁰ See Deborah Epstein Nord, “‘Marks of Race’: Gypsy Figures and Eccentric Femininity in Nineteenth-Century Women’s Writing,” *Victorian Studies* 41:2 (Winter 1998): 189-210 and Nord’s forthcoming *Gypsies and the British Imagination 1807-1930* (Columbia University Press). In the article Nord traces the way that the Gypsy figure was deployed in fiction from Austen to Eliotto test the limits of femininity. IN the forthcoming book she continues this theme through the female lorist Dora Yates in a chapter on the Gypsy Lore Society. See also Paul Vita (St. Louis University, Madrid), “George Borrow, Spain and the Genre of Travel-Writing”, paper presented at Victorian Europeans Conference, Royal Holloway, 23-24 June 2005.

³¹ Pennell, *Biography* II, p. 131; Leland, *The Gypsies*, p. 63.

³² In *The Gypsies* he contrasted some Gypsy visitors with his native bourgeoisie, to his own chagrin: “Amid the inquisitive, questioning, well-dressed people, the Gypsies bore the pressure with the serene equanimity of cosmopolite superiority, smiling at provincial rawness. I confess that I was vexed, and considering that it was in my native city, mortified” (93).

³³ Pennell, *Biography* II, p. 367.

³⁴ I have developed this notion of “cosmopolitanisms from below” in relation to the Victorian fin de siècle in a number of presentations in 2004-2005 and a book ms. in progress. See R. Gagnier, “Morris’s Ethics, Cosmopolitanism, and Globalisation,” *Journal of the William Morris Society* Winter 2005 (forthcoming January 2006).

³⁵ For the most up to date archive, see “Gypsies, Roma and Travellers: The Interface Collection” of the University of Hertfordshire Press, which publishes leading scholarship as well as Roma memoirs and life writing. See www.herts.ac.uk/uhpess.

³⁶ Patrick Brantlinger, *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800-1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).

³⁷ Roland Brinkworth of Yardley, Pennsylvania, has informed me that of the whites captured by the Carlisle Indians, many who remained were women who had been captured as children and had married Indians and had children with them. They would not leave their husbands and children upon their release in 1764. Private correspondence, 6 June and 8 July 2005. Brinkworth cites William H. Egle, *History of the Commonwealth and Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1883).

³⁸ Brantlinger, p.48.

-
- ³⁹ Guenter Lewy, *The Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- ⁴⁰ Lewy, p. 167.
- ⁴¹ Lewy, p. 25.
- ⁴² Lewy, p. 161.
- ⁴³ Lewy, p. viii.
- ⁴⁴ Michael North, "Talented, Articulate, Bullied, and Fobbed Off," *Times Higher* Feature (20 August 2004), p. 18. Lewy's most recent estimates were 100,000 in Germany and 25,000 in Austria in 1996 (Lewy, p. 213). As this article goes to press, the European Union is rife with racism, against Muslims, Turks, Jews and Gypsies. Gypsies currently face mass deportation in Germany, forced sterilization in the Czech Republic, and eviction from their largest community site in Britain, Dale Farm near Billericay. See Corin Redgrave "Britain's Gypsy Shame," *Guardian* (8 June 2005), p. 23.
- ⁴⁵ David Mayall, *Gypsy Identities 1500-2000: From Egipcians and Moon-men to the Ethnic Romany* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 245.
- ⁴⁶ Leland, *The Gypsies*, p.44. For some of the most stunning descriptions of music in prose, see *The Gypsies* chapters I and II on the musical Gypsies.
- ⁴⁷ "Book Review Symposium: The Scientific Study of Society, *British Journal of Sociology* (2004) 55:1, pp. 123-35, esp. 130.
- ⁴⁸ Myra H. Strober, "Habits of the Mind: Challenges for Multidisciplinarity," Meeting of the Social Sciences in Higher Education Network (Sponsored by the Ford Foundation), June 29-July 1, 2005, Herencia, Ciudad Real, Spain.