

ing in his own person, is not responsible in himself for the sentiments placed in the mouth of the hero. To this confusion between the poet and the hero is due in great measure the misconceptions that have risen with reference to the poem. One can with as much justice attribute the opinions of the Duke in *My Last Duchess* to Robert Browning as those of the hero in *Maud* to Alfred Tennyson. And yet that is exactly what has been done over and over again, and is still being done. Even so sane and sympathetic a commentator as Mr. Stopford Brooke has fallen into this error, although he confesses that he suffers some uneasiness in his criticisms. Tennyson has, as far as possible, endeavoured to remove this misconception, even going so far as to add in later editions the sub-title *A Monodrama*. When reading *Maud*, as far as the development of the character of hero is concerned, and the opinions he expresses, it is not necessary even to think of the author.

In order to enter with any degree of interest or appreciation into the poem as a whole, it is necessary to have a clear conception of the events leading up to the beginning of the action. These may be picked up as the poem progresses, but so important did Tennyson consider this pre-knowledge that he was accustomed, we are told, to preface his own reading of the poem by an explanation somewhat similar to the following taken from the "*Maud*" *Vindicated* of Dr. Robert James Mann:—

"At the opening of the drama, the chief person or hero is introduced with scenery and incidents artistically disposed around his figure, so as to make the reader at once acquainted with certain facts in his history, which it is essential should be known. Although still a young man, he has lost his father some years before, by a sudden and violent death, following