THE "CAMBRIDGE OBSERVER" QUESTION[1]

Anonymous, and even pseudonymous, publication was a widespread practice a century ago. The collective voice or "personality" of the periodical or newspaper was emphasized, not the individuality of the contributors to it. *The Times Literary Supplement* serves as an example of a periodical that, as late as the 1970s, preferred the institutional voice over that of the individual. Now that reviews in the *T.L.S.* are signed, their judgments carry rather less weight than in the past, when the practice of anonymity suggested that the judgments expressed were those of the *T.L.S.* itself.

Pseudonymous publication was a little different. Articles were signed with false names such as "Philalethes", "O. B. E", "F. R. S." or "X."—to take examples from pseudonyms employed by Russell in 1916–20. Sometimes only the author's initial or initials were used to sign articles. Several articles signed merely "B. R." or "R." have been identified as Russell's in *The Nation* and *The Athenaeum* of 1919–20. The identifications are explicit in the annual indexes to these papers, or in the editor's marked copy of the *Athenaeum* in the offices of *The New Statesman*. (A marked copy of the *Nation* has not been located.) The purpose of pseudonyms seems to have been twofold: the article was identifiable to those who know the editors and contributors of the periodical, and a contributor could state in later years that certain articles were his because they bore his initial or pseudonym.

The object of a bibliography is to list all of an author's writings, and the object of a collected works is to publish all of those writings. Sometimes it is suspected that some of the author's writings were published anonymously or pseudonymously, and there is no corroborating evidence of his authorship in other documents. Bibliographers and editors will then, should the evidence warrant it, ascribe the suspected writings to their author on the basis of style and content alone. For example, Karl Marx wrote frequently for the *New-York Tribune* in the 1850s, and his own record of articles written and payments received is missing for a certain part of that decade. The editors of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels have not hesitated to include as Marx's a number of articles on the basis of style and content.[2] This practice is supported by users of scholarly editions because of the belief that their editors have become so familiar with their author's thought and mode of expression that they can detect the presence of his writings by these characteristics. Computerized word-frequency studies aside, there is good reason for the belief that outstanding authors attain unique modes of expression as well as sets of opinions and characteristic ways of arguing them. I would not, however, go so far as to claim that ever writing by Russell bears the unmistakable stamp of his individuality. Nor is that the issue when the question of his contributions to *The Cambridge Observer* is considered. The issue is whether a certain pair of articles is by him, not whether we can recognize every contribution he may have made to that paper.

Russell's bibliography in the Archives contains thirty-nine unsigned articles. Eighteen of these are at present ascribed to him on the basis of external evidence—letters, a tear sheet with "By Bertie Russell" written on it in Alys Russell's handwriting, editors' and publishers' account books, and file copies of the periodicals in question. The remaining

[1] For advice, encouragement and help in researching this paper I am grateful to Andrew Brink, Catherine Funnell, Paul Gallina, Nick Griffin, Barbara Halpern, John G. Slater and Carl Spadoni, in addition to the editors of this newsletter (especially Dr. Moran). None of them, however, is to be implicated in the conclusions I draw.

[2] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, vol. 14: *1855–56* (New York: International Publishers, 1980): xxxi.

twenty-one articles are ascribed to him on the basis of style and content. It is true that for some of these Russell's record of payments received for his writings shows a payment from, say, the *Nation* during a period in which no signed articles by him appeared. The problem remains one of identifying—on the sole basis of style and content—the article by him published during that period. My point with these statistics, however, concerns not so much the twenty-one, but the eighteen ascribed on the basis of external evidence. For most of these articles were originally (in 1966–67) ascribed by me to Russell solely on the basis of internal evidence, that is, before I had the opportunity of examining the corroborating evidence of the correspondence. And it is not the case that, in addition to most of these eighteen, there were many or even several others that I identified as Russell's and which external evidence has since shown to be by other authors. In other words, one has developed a certain record of success in detecting the presence of Russell's style and content that is difficult to disregard.

On two occasions known to us Russell reminisced about his first publication. In 1914, when his student Norbert Wiener published his own first article, Russell wrote Lady Ottoline Morrell: "One's first publication is rather an event. I well remember my first ... a review of a Dutchman."[3] The Dutchman was Gerardus Heymans, whose *Die Gesetze und Elemente des wissenschaftlichen Denkens* Russell had reviewed in an 1895 issue of *Mind*.[4] Nearly thirty years later he repeated the claim in an interview on his bibliography with Lester E. Denonn. He told Denonn that the review of Heymans was the first time his name had appeared in print as an author.[5] There is a slight difference between the two accounts. The remark to Denonn would allow for the possibility of prior, unsigned publications, while the comment to Lady Ottoline would seem to deny such a possibility. Whether or not Russell meant to distinguish between signed and unsigned publications, he may well have been distinguishing between professional publications and the sort of student journalism which many authors would rather forget when they become established. There is, in fact, a case to be made for student journalism on Russell's part. In this article I shall examine the possibility that Russell,

[3] Letter 976, *c.* 21 Jan. 1914, original in Morrell papers, Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

[4] *Mind*, n.s. 4 (April 1895): 245–9. Reprinted in *Cambridge Essays, 1888–99*, Vol. 1 of *The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell*, edited by K. Blackwell, A. Brink, N. Griffin, R. A. Rempel and J. G. Slater (London: Allen & Unwin, forthcoming 1982?): 251–5.

[5] "Recollections of Three Hours with Bertrand Russell", *Correct English*, 44 (Dec. 1943): 15.

while an undergraduate at Cambridge in the early 1890s, contributed to *The Cambridge Observer*.

Cambridge, at this time, was rich in administrative, scholarly and student periodicals. On the administrative side, *The Cambridge University Reporter* provided tripos lists and information on courses, examinations, prizes and much else concerning the official life of the university. The scholarly journals were the customary publications edited by Cambridge academics. Student periodicals included the well-established *Cambridge Review* and *The Granta* and magazines such as *The Tennyson*, *The Whirlwind* and *The Houyhnhnm*.[6]

As an undergraduate Russell had several friends who were interested in student journalism. If we knew nothing of their involvement with the *Cambridge Observer*, we would still know that they considered writing for the student press. As C. P. Sanger disclosed in a letter to Russell, he (Sanger) and another friend of Russell's, A. G. Tansley, had decided not "to write papers for the *Tennyson*."[7] Sanger would hardly have informed Russell of this decision if it had not concerned a matter of interest to him. We do, however, know that Russell was involved with the *Cambridge Observer*, and from the beginning. He wrote his Grandmother Russell on 1 May 1892:

> We have been quite busy getting ready the first number of the *Cambridge Observer*, though I personally have done little beyond discussing a prospectus and sundry articles written by other people. I will certainly order it to be sent to you, and as it will very likely not run more than a term you will not have much time to bear it.

We cannot tell what "little" Russell did beyond discussing the prospectus and contributions written by other people—perhaps he wrote some of the editorial comments. The prospectus Russell mentions is a valuable declaration of intentions:

> *April, 1892.*
>
> A New Magazine called "THE CAMBRIDGE OBSERVER" will appear on *Tuesday, May 3rd*, and on succeeding Tuesdays during term time.
>
> A feeling that the whole literary power of Cambridge Students does not find a Representation in the existing periodicals has led to the formation of "THE CAMBRIDGE OBSERVER."

[6] In later years Russell wrote for such Cambridge magazines as *The Cambridge Review*, *The Cambridge Magazine* (edited by his friend C. K. Ogden), and *The Trinity Magazine*.

[7] Sanger to Russell, 16 July 1892.

This Magazine will be governed by no conventions; it will aim at thoroughness, and will endeavour to avoid flippancy. It will direct a great deal of attention to criticism, and this criticism will always attempt to go to the root of the subject in hand.

A detailed account of what has occurred in Cambridge will not be considered a necessary part of the Magazine: University Sermons, Union Debates, Meetings of Societies, etc., will be noticed if they are of general interest.

"THE CAMBRIDGE OBSERVER" will have Oxford correspondence. Here again details of facts will not necessarily be given, but readers of this Magazine may expect to find a true idea of what is interesting Oxford week by week.

"THE CAMBRIDGE OBSERVER" will keep in touch with the town of Cambridge.

There will be Girton and Newnham notes written by Girton and Newnham Students.

Due prominence will be given to University Athletics.

"THE CAMBRIDGE OBSERVER" pledges itself to no party: but contemporary politics will be treated of by contributors who are in sympathy with the various movements of the day.

Contributions of every kind will receive a careful consideration.

"THE CAMBRIDGE OBSERVER" will be managed as far as possible by a Committee, and it is hoped that by this means the Magazine will retain breadth and life.

The tone of the magazine did not avoid flippancy entirely. Indeed, the response to the first number drew an editorial note in the second on the need for flippancy[8]:

> We repeat the fact "that a sense of humour is a most valuable possession." We, too, have a sense of humour, or we should not have made the remark. We feel the humour of our position. Here we are, a serious Committee, with laudable aims, trying to find a somewhat serious audience. If we cannot find it,—who knows?—we may launch out into more amusing articles, we may line our wholesome cup of seriousness with honey on the brim. We have said, in our historic prospectus, that we should endeavour to avoid flippancy. Surely this is the duty of a human being. But, of course, flippancy will refuse to be avoided altogether. It is in the air; we breathe it, though we breathe it with reluctance. At our editorial meetings, a smile occasionally passes round. We smiled as we drew up our prospectus. We take in the *Granta*, and we enjoy it. The *Idler*, we confess that we cannot read, suitable as it may be to amuse the vacant hours of laborious dullness.[9]

[8] On going up to Cambridge Russell noted in his diary his horror at the widespread "flippancy" there, one of the major sins of university life. See "'A Locked Diary'", 20 Nov. 1890, *Cambridge Essays*, p. 57.

This note conveys the tone of the magazine: sophisticated, witty, moral, independent—and occasionally flippant. Zola in literature and socialism in politics indicate the *avant garde* interests of the editorial committee, though more established interests are also reflected. Philosophy is rarely represented.[10]

The first issue was published on 3 May 1892. The *Cambridge Observer* ran longer than Russell expected. Altogether twenty-one numbers were published, over three Cambridge terms, ending with the issue of 7 March 1893. The issues were twelve pages in length (plus covers and including advertisements), professionally printed, and cost sixpence. The printing of the first fourteen issues was done at Cambridge, according to the following note in the first issue: "Printed and Published for the Proprietors by Messrs. Sheldrick & Lewty, Printers, Publishers, etc., 10 and 11, Bridge Street, Cambridge, Tuesday, May 3rd, 1892."[11] Complete runs of the magazines are extremely rare; the Archives has a microfilm of one in the Cambridge University Library. This run seems to be a composite of copies sent originally to J. W. Clark and F. J. Jenkins, for their names are written on the covers of most issues. The advertisements are of interest. They seek to vend such wares as typewriters, Canadian canoes and corsets for men, and such services as training in journalism and preparation for examinations.

Russell's letter to his grandmother goes on to provide tantalizing information about his role in the magazine:

> Yesterday afternoon I went to town with Sanger and Tansley to see Ibsen's *Doll's House*, ostensibly for the purpose of criticising it in our paper. I was prepared to dislike the play, but in spite of very bad acting I thought it powerful though full of faults.—A joint-stock criticism will probably be found in our second number.

Clearly Russell considered himself a potential contributor, if only, at this time, in collaboration with two of his friends. A review of the *Doll's House* did appear in the next issue. Moreover, the review is a favourable

[9] Vol. 1, no. 1 (10 May 1892): 1.

[10] A review (by "X-B.") of Bernard Bosanquet's *History of Æsthetic* is one exception. See 1, no. 17 (7 Feb. 1893): 2.

[11] P. 12.

one, and (following Russell's opinion) it chides the performance of the actors. Because of these characteristics and the fact that Russell wrote about doing such a review so close to its appearance, it has been a possible candidate for inclusion in Russell's canon. The difficulty in regarding the review as partly Russell's is that it is signed "M." This initial might stand flippantly for something like "the Three Musketeers", but there is a better hypothesis. Before investigating the identity of "M.", however, it will be best to consider who was editing the *Cambridge Observer*.

There is another reference in Russell's writings to the *Cambridge Observer*: in a footnote to the following letter of 24 November 1892 from Logan Pearsall Smith printed in Russell's *Autobiography*:

> Steevens wrote to me, asking me to send something to the *Cambridge Observer* and, prompted by Satan (as I believe) I promised I would. So I hurried up and wrote an article on Henry James, and when I had posted it last night, it suddenly came over me how stupid and bad it was. Well, I hope the good man won't print it.[12]
>
> There are good things in the *Observer* he sent me. I was quite surprised—it certainly should be encouraged. Only I don't go with it in its enthusiasm for impurity—its jeers at what Milton calls "The sage and serious doctrine of virginity". It is dangerous for Englishmen to try to be French—they never catch the note—the accent. A Frenchman if he errs, does it "dans un moment d'oubli", as they say—out of absent-mindedness, as it were—while the Englishman is much too serious and conscious. No, a civilization must in the main develop on the lines and in the ways of feeling already laid down for it by those who founded and fostered it. I was struck with this at the "New English Art Club" I went up to see. There are some nice things, but in the mass it bore the same relation to real art—French art—as a Church Congress does to real social movements.
>
> So do show Sickert and his friends that a gospel of impurity, preached with an Exeter Hall zeal and denunciation, will do much to thicken the sombre fogs in which we live already.[13]

The tone and content of his letter suggest that, in Smith's view, Russell

[12] Logan Pearsall Smith's article appeared as "The Novels of Henry James", 1, no. 13 (29 Nov. 1892): 2–4. Three other contributions appeared, as this one did, over the initials "P. S." They were published under the series title "Stories of an Oxford College" as: "I. The Sub-Warden's Temperance Meeting", 1, no. 16 (31 Jan. 1893): 3–5; "II. A Student of Browning", 1, no. 18 (14 Feb. 1893): 10–12; "III. In the Chapel", 1, no. 20 (28 Feb. 1893): 5–6.

[13] *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 1 (London: Allen & Unwin, 1967): 92. Corrected against the holograph in the Russell Archives.

was still associated with the editors of the magazine. The letter mentions the names of two others connected with the magazine. The first one —incorrectly printed in the *Autobiography* as "Stevens"—is nowhere to be found in lists of Cambridge graduates, but the magazine's advertisements include one from "G. W. Steevens, B.A., late Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford, First Class in Classical Mods. and Greats, University Scholar in Classics at London, [who] will be happy to read with Gentlemen in Classics, Ancient History and Philosophy for Cambridge, London or India Civil Service Examinations."[14] The other person named by Smith is identified by Russell in a footnote to Smith's allusion to the *Cambridge Observer*. Russell noted: "This was a high-brow undergraduate magazine, mainly promoted by Oswald Sickert (brother of the painter), who was a close friend of mine." The painter was Walter Sickert, whose drawings often appeared in the magazine.

So far, we have the following names associated with the magazine: Oswald Sickert, G. W. Steevens, C. P. Sanger, A. G. Tansley, L. P. Smith and Russell. As the prospectus indicated, the editing was to be managed by a committee. In each issue there was a notice such as the following:

> The Committee will give a careful consideration to all contributions, which should be addressed to the *Cambridge Observer*, 10, Bridge Street. Rejected contributions can only be returned if accompanied by stamped addressed envelopes.
>
> No notice can be taken of any correspondence unless the name and address of the writer accompanies it.[15]

The editors are never identified in the magazine; indeed, even contributors are seldom named, the fact which gives rise to the mystery concerning contributions by Russell.

There is only one other source known to me singling out Sickert as chief editor (if we may infer this office from Russell's phrase "mainly promoted by"): in a book on Walter Sickert's art, the *Cambridge Observer* is said to have been "edited by his brother Oswald".[16] Oswald Valentine Sickert (1872–1923) is an enigmatic figure. He is a man who, one thinks, ought to have accomplished much more than he did in a literary way. He

[14] See the *Cambridge Observer*, 1, nos. 9–14 (1 Nov.–6 Dec. 1892), back covers.

[15] 1, no. 12 (22 Nov. 1892): back cover.

[16] Wendy Baron, *Sickert* (London: Phaidon, 1973), p. 35.

published only one book, *Helen*, in the Pseudonym Library in 1894.[17] This novel helps us, however, in identifying the initial Sickert used to sign his articles. The issue of 8 November 1892 had a short story called "Helen",[18] about a young man who is in love with a childhood friend of that name. The story was an episode Sickert decided to omit from the novel. In the final issue a story called "At Last" is reprinted in the novel (pp. 164–70). And two other stories—"A Tragedy of Success" (10 May 1892) and "Adverse Fate" (31 Jan. 1893)—make use of the same character names and some elements of the final story-line. Since all four stories are signed "O.", we know that "O." was Sickert's pseudonym. A little more is known from letters Russell wrote to Stanley Makower, who must have been another member of the editorial committee. Writing from Pembroke Lodge, Russell was expecting a visit from Makower and Sickert:

> I am very glad Sickart [*sic*] is coming as my people say All my friends are ugly and this being a proposition in A is disproved by O which does not mean Oswald but means One of my friends is not ugly. This however is formal logic.[19]

"O" here is probably an allusion to Sickert's way of signing himself in the *Cambridge Observer*, where many articles of a literary nature are signed "O." Presumably he did not use "S." because Steevens used it, and the editors wished to avoid ambiguity in their initials.

Although Sickert may have been editor at the beginning, Steevens was, by authoritative accounts, the editor of the last seven issues. George Warrington Steevens (1869–1900) became a highly successful journalist for the London press after he left the *Cambridge Observer*, publishing ten volumes of journalism and essays between 1895 and 1900. He was killed while covering the South African War. His entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* states:

> At the beginning of Lent term, 1893, some friends at Cambridge who since the preceding May had conducted a weekly periodical called *The Cambridge Observer*, invited Steevens to edit it. He edited the last seven numbers, and these evinced unmistakable talents for vivid journalism of literary quality.

[17] Oswald Valentine [pseud.], *Helen* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1894). Read by Russell in May 1895 and noted by him as Sickert's in "What Shall I Read?"; copy in Russell's library. The novel is worth reading for its account of post-Cambridge explorations of socialism and of the literary life in London. There is even an account of starting a weekly paper!

[18] 1, no. 10: 4.

[19] Letter in possession of Mr. Quintin Bridge, Makower's son-in-law.

When his collected works were published in 1900–02, W. E. Henley commented on his work in the *Cambridge Observer*:

> ... at Cambridge he wrote and edited the *Cambridge Observer*: a journal very plainly modelled (but with improvements!) on an older *Observer*, in which latter he was afterwards to print his one serious contribution to English letters. I have read his *Cambridge Observer* work, and it is enough that none of it has seemed worth reprinting in this volume either to my colleague, Mr. Street, or to myself. It showed, however, that here was somebody with a pen....[20]

The mystery about this information is the ability of Steevens' editors to identify which articles in the *Cambridge Observer* were his. Only three are signed "S."—one in No. 2, one in No. 10, and one in No. 15; there is also a letter to the editor signed "S." in No. 5.[21] Perhaps they had a marked copy of the magazine identifying unsigned articles. Steevens left a wife, but apparently no children. The whereabouts of his papers, if any, are unknown.

The only other person associated with the editing is "M." He is the author of much more besides the review of Ibsen: other dramatic criticism, literary criticism (especially of Continental authors), and poetry. His poetry appears as early as the first issue, and there is a comment in No. 2 on its reception: "Our poet has naturally borne the brunt of the attack, though a great London paper [*The Daily Chronicle*] consoles him with the epithet of 'respectable'". "M." must be Stanley Victor Makower (1872–1911), mentioned in the new printer's notice of No. 15: "Printed by Messrs. Unwin Brothers, 27, Pilgrim-street, Ludgate-hill, London, E. C., for Stanley Makower, Trinity College, Cambridge."[22] His brief obituary in *The Times* stated that his "first effort appeared in the *Cambridge Observer*". He wrote several books of criticism, one of which, *The Mirror of Music*, Russell read in August 1895. His last book, an anthology called *A Book of English Essays* (1912), was completed after Makower's death by Sir Basil Blackwell, who informs me: "I never met

[20] G. W. Steevens, *Things Seen: Impressions of Men, Cities, and Books*, edited by G. S. Street, with a memoir by W. E. Henley (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1900), p. xiv.

[21] The articles are, respectively: "Sex in Education", "Anti-Vivisection", and "English Gambling".

[22] No. 15 (24 January 1893) began the third term of the *Cambridge Observer*, i.e. the period of Steevens' editorship.

or had any contact with Makower. He had done most of the work in collecting the volume of essays and the book was ready for press when he died."[23] That Russell regarded Makower as a member of the editorial committee is shown by a letter he wrote to Makower some months after the *Cambridge Observer* ceased publication:

> I made the acquaintance the other day of a man who seemed to me one of the most delightful I had ever met: Young the musician. He is very anxious to get back an article he wrote for the *Observer*, which was too late for the last number. If you can lay hands on it will you send it him? I promised to stir you up about it.[24]

Makower left four children, one of whom, Ursula Bridge, was in correspondence with Russell in the early 1960s. He wrote her that Makower "was a man for whom I had considerable affection and I particularly liked his devotion to music, but I lost sight of him when we both left Cambridge."[25]

Russell's name is mentioned once in the pages of the *Cambridge Observer*. His rooms were the site of a talk on Toynbee Hall, of which a report was published. It is reproduced below because Russell may have been its author. Since he surely attended the meeting, there would not have been any need for another "reporter" to have been present, although the possibility of someone else doing the job cannot be discounted and there is nothing particularly Russellian about the style. Even if the report was not a product of Russell's mind, it adds to our knowledge of what went into it.

> Mr. Nunn, as University representative of Toynbee Hall, addressed a meeting in the Hon. B. Russell's rooms on Sunday evening. His speech, which lasted a long time, was an attempt to give the audience some idea of the history of Toynbee Hall and of the present scope of its work. He noticed, as a particular feature, that the philanthropic work was absolutely unsectarian, and pointed out the numerous advantages resulting from this basis.
>
> What seemed, perhaps, the worst attitude of the enterprise, as explained by him, was that it embodied an attempt on the part of University men to reproduce in the heart of the East-end the refinements of University conversation and intercourse. Mr. Nunn boasted of starting a "Wordsworth" Club, as a freak, in Switzerland. It seems a pity to identify philanthropic work of this kind with what is an essential characteristic of University life. If there are objections to this culture in the University, they must surely be increased tenfold when transported to the East-end of London. Of course, Mr. Nunn suggested the influence of the East-end on the University men as an equally strong factor, but this is scarcely probable.
>
> While it is impossible to regard Toynbee Hall with any other feeling but respect, we may be allowed to suggest that what is most fatal in the University Extension movement is equally pernicious in the work at Toynbee Hall. Subjects are taught which are eminently unsuited to the pupils, and this ceases to be philanthropy.[26]

[23] Blackwell to Blackwell, 26 Oct. 1981.

[24] Russell to Makower, 8 Dec. 1893, courtesy of Quintin Bridge, who identifies the musician as Dalhousie Young.

[25] Russell to Mrs. Bridge, 15 April 1963. See also his letter of 31 March 1952 to her, and her replies.

The fact that this report appeared during Steevens' editorship is some indication that Russell's association with the paper—or at least its editors—was continuing.

Other contributions to the *Cambridge Observer* include a number of signed articles by persons associated with Russell: Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, Arthur Benson, [Maurice] Sheldon Amos and A. W. Verrall. Edmund Gosse was also a contributor. The editorial notes mention others associated with Russell: Oscar Browning, C. F. G. Masterman, and A. J. Balfour (the latter gave a talk to the Ethical Club that met with criticism from Henry Sidgwick and J. M. E. McTaggart). There are regular columns on Oxford, Newnham College, rowing and other sports, drama, music, and "the town" that are unsigned, as well as other signed articles. None of the unsigned articles seems to fall within Russell's special range of interests—though he was then only twenty, had not started the formal study of philosophy, and the full range of his interests at the time is not known to us. There remain the articles signed with initials. I have identified "M." with Makower, "S." with Steevens, and "O." with Oswald Sickert. There are fifteen brief stories—usually vignettes of travels and conversations—signed "C. S." Probably "C. S." is Charles Sanger, Russell's life-long friend and, as we may infer from the letter to Countess Russell, probably one of the originators of the *Cambridge Observer*. There are three pieces signed "A. G. T.", who would be Arthur George Tansley (1871–1952), later Sherardian Professor of Botany at Oxford. A. G. T.'s contributions include two letters on the

[26] 1, no. 17 (7 Feb. 1893): 1.

biology of sex and an article on heredity.[27] "J. N. F." would be J. Neville Figgis, whose full name appears below another article. "G. L. D." and "P. S." are Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson[28] and Logan Pearsall Smith. There are several sets of initials that I have not been able to match with names.

There remains the question of contributions by Russell. There are no articles signed by him as such, and no "B.A.W.R."s or "B.R."s. But there are two articles signed "R."[29] This initial would have acted as a signal to Russell's grandmother (if she was still a subscriber), as well as to others who, like Logan Pearsall Smith, associated Russell with the *Cambridge Observer*, that the articles were by him. The first one, "The Day of Judgment" (reprinted below as (1)), appeared on 24 January 1893.[30] It is a polished piece of satire, a moral condemnation of those who need externally imposed ethical standards. It is also anti-religious, cynical about the motives of most men's behaviour, but respectful of those of a small group of the enlightened—in this case, those who look inward for their standard of justice. Sardonic wit is in abundance, and the phrasing and prose rhythm are often reminiscent of Russell's. Consider the following:

> So the weak had respite from the strong, the sweater ceased to sweat, and the husband to beat his wife; and many other quaint things that men had done ceased to be done because the Day of Judgment was at hand.
>
> ... many millionaires and a few bishops offered their services as common labourers on the job....
>
> Most people ... had tender consciences which made them do many foolish and virtuous things that they had never thought of doing before. The eminently pious sang....

But read the whole story. Its moral, in which the mistakes of the past are condemned to be repeated, is a recurrent one in Russell. See, for example, his later story "Zahatopolk" (1954).[31]

The other contribution signed "R." is a review of a play, *The Strike at Arlingford* by George Moore (reprinted below as (2)), concerning the conflict of capital and labour. The review appeared on 28 February 1893.[32] We know that Russell was, by this time, very interested in socialism. The review is much less concerned with the aesthetic merits of the performance than it is with the ethical and political implications of the play. Still, there are two aesthetic points of interest. First, "R." praises the author for putting political questions "with the impartiality of the true artist", for representing the struggle of labour and capital "without bias". Attainment of impartiality was always extremely important to Russell, who considered it an ethical matter. Second, "R." declares himself personally interested in the questions "whether its [the play's] types .. are drawn in the fewest possible strokes, and whether the essential qualities are clearly accentuated." One character, John Reed, is said in Russellian phrase to be "a man of refined and poetical instincts, who is attracted to Socialism rather as a field for chivalrous self-devotion...." There are, finally, several comments about the excellence and tightness of the play's construction, a feature of drama that Russell remarked upon when he reminisced about reading the plays of Ibsen.[33]

What, then, can be concluded about the question of Russell's contributions to the *Cambridge Observer*? I am myself convinced (though not beyond a *shadow* of doubt), on the basis of its content and style, that Russell was the author of "The Day of Judgment". I am less convinced about the review of *The Strike at Arlingford*, not because I find in it definitely non-Russellian elements, but rather because of its greater neutrality on questions of content and style. In other words, he could have written it, though we lack internal evidence for knowing that he did. However, we do have the attribution to "R." The *Cambridge Observer* shows little sign of playing games with its attributions; indeed, there is a remarkable consistency of interests collected under the same initials. We must, I think, for this reason, conclude that the review is by the same

[27] His letters were in response to Steevens' article "Sex in Education". His article "Heredity" appeared in no. 17 (7 Feb. 1893): 6, 8.

[28] Dickinson's two articles are listed in his bibliography. The articles were: "Peer Gynt", 1, no. 9 (1 Nov. 1892): 2–3; and a review (signed "G.L.D.") of George Meredith's "The Empty Purse", 1, no. 18 (14 Feb. 1893), 3–4. See R. E. Balfour's bibliography of Dickinson in E. M. Forster, *Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson* (London: Edward Arnold, 1962; 1st ed., 1934). An unsigned review of Dickinson's *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France* appeared in 1, no. 12 (22 Nov. 1892): 11–12.

[29] There is one other use of "R."—a curious one. In the second number the usual note from the editorial committee included this message: "We wish to thank various contributors, and 'R' especially; we regret that we cannot print his verses" (10 May 1892, p. 11).

[30] *Cambridge Observer*, 1, no. 15 (24 Jan. 1893): 3. No doubt there is no connection, but at the time of his affair with Lady Ottoline Morrell Russell was known as "The Day of Judgment".

[31] *The Collected Stories of Bertrand Russell*, edited by Barry Feinberg (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972).

[32] *Cambridge Observer*, 1, no. 20 (28 Feb. 1893): 9–10.

[33] "Revolt in the Abstract", *Fact and Fiction* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1961), pp. 27–8.

author as the little morality-tale. While there are still some avenues left to explore which may turn up an editor's copy of the *Cambridge Observer*, or other suitable documentation, we are well warranted, in this continuing investigation, in disregarding Russell's statements to the effect that he did not publish anything before 1895.—Kenneth Blackwell