The Defence of Yseult
Swinburne's *Queen Yseult* and William Morris

Richard Frith

On 13 December 1857, Algernon Charles Swinburne, twenty-year-old under-graduate of Balliol College, Oxford, wrote to his friend John Nichol about a poem on which he had been working. 'I read it one evening to Morris and the others. […] They all […] praise the poem far more than I (seriously speaking) believe it deserves. Morris says it is much better than his own poem, which opinion I took the liberty to tell him was absurd'.[1] Swinburne's poem was called *Queen Yseult*, and the 'others' to whom the letter refers probably included Edward Burne-Jones and other members of the group of artists whom Dante Gabriel Rossetti had assembled in 1857 for the purpose of decorating the ceiling of the Oxford Union debating hall. Swinburne had been introduced to Morris and Burne-Jones just six weeks earlier, on 1 November, by Edwin Hatch or George Birkbeck Hill, depending on which account one follows.[2] On 10 November, Hill reported that he had heard part of *Queen Yseult*.[3] By mid-December, Swin-burne had apparently written the six cantos that were all he was to complete of the poem.[4] *Queen Yseult* was Swinburne's first poetic work of any considerable length or importance; it was heavily influenced by Morris, was begun within ten days of meeting him, and was, if not finished, then brought to an end a little over a month later. These are striking facts, as critics have occasionally remarked;[5] and the purpose of this article is to consider Swinburne's youthful effort in the light of them.

We do not know which of Morris's poems it was that its author thought inferior to *Queen Yseult* (though, in the light of the correspondences which I will highlight, I would suggest 'The Defence of Guenevere' as a possible candidate); but his generous opinion testifies to the close relationship which seems to have existed between the two young men at this period of their lives. The evidence, which Peter Faulkner has marshalled very ably in this *Journal*, suggests that as an undergraduate Swinburne hero-worshipped Morris.[6] In the words of Swin-

burne's first biographer, Edmund Gosse, 'he was [with Morris] on the footing of a devoted younger brother' (Morris was twenty-three). Swinburne was certainly in awe of Morris's poetry: according to Gosse, when he first heard Morris read 'The Haystack in the Floods', 'the poignancy and splendour of the ending caused him an anguish which was more than his nerves were able to bear'. It would appear that Morris was more than ready to reciprocate Swinburne's enthusiasm for his new friend's work. Gosse also gives a suggestive indication of the shared pursuits which fuelled their early friendship, saying that it was to Morris's conversation that Swinburne 'owed the opening of new fields of intellectual pleasure, and particularly an introduction to the romance of medieval France'.[7] Swinburne's decision to begin an extended poetic narrative on the subject of Tristram and Iseult only days after this friendship was initiated suggests that Morris's conversation, and no doubt Morris's readings of his own verse, had struck him with the force of a revelation.[8] It also suggests that Swinburne's mind was fertile ground for such an influence.

Queen Yseult is a fragmentary retelling of the Tristram legend. Only six of the projected ten cantos were completed. They tell of Tristram's parentage and birth; of his voyage to Ireland to win Yseult as a bride for his uncle, King Mark of Cornwall; of the drinking of the love potion; of Tristram's exile to Brittany and his unconsummated marriage; and of Yseult's loneliness at Tintagel in her lover's absence. The main source for the plot, which Swinburne simplifies considerably, is the Middle English metrical romance *Sir Tristrem*. This is regarded today as a rather minor version of the story, but in the nineteenth century it had a certain cachet, thanks largely to the patronage of Sir Walter Scott, who published the poem for the first time in 1804.[9] Swinburne also seems to have been familiar with the various metrical fragments of the Tristram legend in French and Anglo-Norman, which had been collected and published in 1835 by Francisque Michel.[10] It is thus clear that Swinburne's interest in the Middle Ages was already well-established by the time he met Morris. In fact, his medieval studies had begun during childhood, in the library of his uncle, the Earl of Ashburnham. The Earl was a keen collector of medieval manuscripts and early printed texts, and it is very likely that he would have possessed copies of both Scott's and Michel's editions. In later life Swinburne told a correspondent that the Tristram legend had been 'my delight (so far as a child could understand it) before I was ten years old'.[11] Swinburne was clearly also familiar with Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, the golden book of 1857 for Morris, Burne-Jones, and Rossetti. Like Malory, but unlike most of the metrical romances, he has Tristram visit Camelot; and one of the incidents which was to have been included in the later cantos of the poem, Tristram and Yseult's stay at Joyous Gard, is found in Malory but not in any of the metrical versions which Swinburne could have consulted.[12] Yet the fact that the *Morte* is such a relatively minor influence on Swinburne's poem emphasises just how

highly developed were the undergraduate's medieval interests by the time he met Morris. It also reminds us that, however derivative it may be in some respects, *Queen Yseult* is a precocious literary experiment. In demonstrating the breadth of his source knowledge (which may well have exceeded Morris's at this date), Swinburne was seeking to compete with Morris even as he paid homage to him.

Queen Yseult's debt to Morris's poetry is undoubtedly huge. It is evident first of all in the verse form. *Queen Yseult* is written in catalectic tetrameter tercets; so the first stanza of the poem runs:

> In the noble days were shown
> Deeds of good knights many one,
> Many worthy wars were done.[13]

Swinburne took this form directly from two of Morris's early compositions, 'Blanche' and 'Twas in Church on Palm Sunday', neither of which was included in the *Defence of Guenevere* volume of 1858. It is worth noting that this precise stanza form is not (to my knowledge) found anywhere in medieval English literature; however, the early twentieth-century Swinburne scholar Georges Lafourcade suggested that Morris may have derived it from the Middle English romance *Sir Perceval*, where such tercets are followed by a fourth line which rhymes with the eighth, twelfth, and sixteenth lines, rather like an extended version of the stanza of 'The Lady of Shallot'.[14] The metre of *Queen Yseult* and of Morris's two short poems is vaguely balladic, though it bears no real resemblance to the ballad-metre of Swinburne's main source, the Middle English *Sir Tristrem*. This is not the only example in the poem of an apparently medieval feature deriving actually from Morris.

In thematic terms, the most important Morrisian influence is unquestionably the poem 'The Defence of Guenevere'. Swinburne's poem and Morris's share certain basic concerns, as is clear even from their titles. Each focuses on one of the major sexually transgressive women of the Arthurian cycle. In Swinburne's case especially, the fact that he has transformed a work called *Sir Tristrem* into one called *Queen Yseult* is eloquent in itself. The two poems also share, to a large extent, a common attitude towards their subject matter. Readers of Morris such as Virginia S. Hale and Catherine Barnes Stevenson have demonstrated, convincingly in my view, Morris's highly sophisticated appropriation of what the twentieth century would come to call the 'courtly love' ideology of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, to create in his Guenevere 'a fully sexual woman who makes no apology for her adulterous love but rather celebrates herself and her status as loyal Queen'.[15] These two writers in particular have argued that Morris in 'The Defence of Guenevere' employed his already prodigious knowledge of the Middle Ages to mount a thoroughly medieval defence of King Arthur's adulterous

consort. This expertise, they suggest, included not only 'courtly love' ideology, but also medieval legal, theological, and scientific discourses. This general attitude was not peculiar to Morris, of course, but was rather to a large extent the informing ideology of the whole Oxford Union enterprise – though Morris's detailed knowledge of medieval literature and culture enabled him to create a more sophisticated and historically tenable defence of Guenevere than could, say, Rossetti or Burne-Jones. Yet it is important to bear in mind that, in their emphasis on the female characters of the Arthurian legends, the Pre-Raphaelites were essentially innovators. Morris, famously, was putting into Guenevere's mouth a self-vindication that is never heard in Malory.

Morris lost his religious faith during his time at Oxford, as is well known; and the moral heterodoxy of 'The Defence of Guenevere' has perhaps some of the youthful fervour of a recent convert from Christianity. Swinburne underwent a similar 'unconversion' experience as an undergraduate, and as a result conceived a violent anti-theism which would prove to be lifelong. The young Swinburne found the code of 'courtly love' to be an agreeably anti-Christian philosophy, and he was evidently stimulated by the way in which Morris, in 'The Defence of Guenevere', effectively uses 'courtly love' ideology to justify romantic passion outside of wedlock. In *Queen Yseult* Swinburne appropriates this idea and takes it to extremes. He uses the simplicity of the verse form of his poem to suggest that the code of morality which he is implying is in fact self-evidently correct. This is seen most clearly in the first canto, which tells the story of Tristram's parents Roland and Blancheflour. Here Swinburne is compressing and simplifying his medieval source even more radically than he does in the remainder of the poem. Swinburne presents the relationship of Tristram's (unmarried) parents as something not just morally neutral, but laudable:

> For long since Queen Blancheflour
> Took a knight to paramour,
> Who had served her well of yore. […]
>
> 'Lo!' she said, 'I lady free
> Took this man for lord of me
> Where the crowned saints might see.
>
> 'And I will not bid him go,
> Not for joyance nor for woe,
> Till my very love he know.'[16]

The implication is apparently that in medieval romance, such unions are so universally accepted as not to require extended comment. The purity and nobility of Roland and Blancheflour are emphasised throughout.

The relationship of Tristram and Yseult is treated in a similar way. Swinburne includes the incident of the love potion, but he does not dwell on it, for the physical love of a noble man and woman is presented as an edifying thing in itself, needing no external stimulus to justify it. Significantly, Tristram falls in love with Yseult at first sight: the narrator tells us that he 'knelt with heart aflame' before her, and 'thought it very good | He should perish where she stood | Crowned upon with maidenhood.'[17] In the passage which describes the drinking of the potion, the supernatural exoticism evoked by the love drink is quickly succeeded by other, more earthy, concerns:

> So the chaliced wine was brought,
> And the drink of power that wrought
> Change in face and change in thought.
>
> And the wine was fierce and sweet,
> But the lady, drinking it,
> Shuddered to her hands and feet. […]
>
> At their hearts it stirred and crept,
> Round their hearts it grew and leapt,
> Till they kissed again and wept.
>
> So was their great love begun,
> Sitting silent in the sun,
> Such a little thing was done.
>
> And Queen Yseult, weeping still,
> Tristram had to do his will
> That his list she should fulfil.
>
> Tristram had her body fair,
> And her golden corn-ripe hair,
> And her golden ring to wear.[18]

The uncanny effects of the potion, the shuddering, weeping, and the 'hot and bitter drouth'[19] which it engenders, are almost undercut by the rather flat statement that the fatal deed was done 'sitting silent in the sun', and by the subsequent emphasis on its carnal outcome: 'Tristram had her body fair, | And her golden corn-ripe hair.' The natural is emphasised at the expense of the supernatural.

Yseult's golden hair is the central image of the entire fragment, symbolising her beauty and her purity. As with Rossetti's 'The Blessed Damozel', which is verbally echoed in the term 'corn-ripe', there must here be intended a profane

analogy with traditional representations of the Virgin Mary.[20] Yseult is the first of many Swinburnian *femmes fatales*, and the young poet repeatedly lingers over descriptions of her beauty, while Tristram's knightly adventures are passed over briefly. He devotes an entire canto to Yseult's distress in her lover's absence. This is an aspect of the story which held little interest for medieval writers, including the author of *Sir Tristrem*, but it is of course a clear parallel to Morris's attempt to give a voice to the accused Queen Guenevere. This canto is the last that Swinburne wrote, and in some respects it provides a fitting end to the fragment. Yseult's final speech, spoken by moonlight in her chamber at Tintagel, constitutes a defiant valediction of her love for Tristram, in a series of stanzas into which Swinburne inserts parenthetical, quasi-religious descriptions of her beauty:

> And she said, 'This love put by
> (In a holy voice and high)
> Shall not perish tho' I die.
>
> 'And when men shall praise him dead
> (Both her cheeks flushed royal-red)
> All my story shall be said.
>
> 'For I shall not blush to know
> (And she rose up, speaking so)
> That men speak of this my woe.
>
> 'For that I love Tristram well
> (And her voice rang like a bell)
> Is no shame for them to tell. […]
>
> For the wars he warred of old
> (Straight she drew the hair of gold)
> In all people will be told.
>
> 'So by Tristram the good knight
> (All her face was full of light)
> Shall I stand in all men's sight.[21]

In this speech, the haughty tone of which echoes that of Morris's Guenevere, it is notable that Yseult defends her passion not on the grounds that it has been induced by a philtre, but rather on the basis that it will become the subject of a great romantic story. This is in marked contrast to some of Swinburne's medieval sources: in Béroul's version of the legend, for example, the love potion wears off after three years, and the lovers immediately set about attempting to reconcile

Iseult with King Mark. Swinburne clearly believes that the courtly tradition vindicates the adulterous woman, and where his sources disagree with him, he selectively ignores them (perhaps assuming that they represent Christian 'pollutions' of the original story) and substitutes a justification that better suits his own sexual and artistic ideas. Morris's poem, as well as the Oxford murals themselves, must have been influential on Swinburne's interpretation.

For all the parallels between Swinburne's poem and Morris's, however, there are also contrasts which highlight the differences in temperament between the two men. It is necessary to be careful here, because some of the most striking features of *Queen Yseult* must be attributed, at least in part, to its author's inexperience. Even in the December 1857 letter to John Nichol already cited, Swinburne was admitting that, while canto I might stand well enough on its own, the rest were 'too imperfect, feeble and unfinished to publish for a year or two'.[22] The first canto was therefore printed in *Undergraduate Papers*, the little magazine with which Swinburne was involved at the time, but the rest remained among his private papers, only to be discovered after his death.[23] In later years he described the poem as 'some awful doggerel on the subject of Tristram and Iseult', and compared it unfavourably with the work that Rossetti had produced by the same age.[24] Certainly there is a good deal of youthful crudity about *Queen Yseult*, in spite of Morris's initial admiration (which probably owed much to the temporary influence on Morris of Rossetti's habit of thinking well of his friends' work whatever its merits). The tercet stanzas, which work well enough in Morris's short lyrics, become decidedly monotonous when stretched out over six cantos, and they have the inherent drawback that an idea can often be expressed adequately over two lines, rendering the third line of the stanza redundant. As a result, there are moments when the poem verges on the unintentionally humorous: it is perhaps difficult to suppress a smile at Swinburne's description of the reaction of a hall full of feasting knights when the young Tristram bursts in to avenge his father's murder: 'A great laughter laughed they all, | Drinking wine about the hall, | Standing by the outer wall.'[25] Furthermore, even though (as I have suggested) Swinburne often appears to be using the simplicity of the verse form to suggest the naturalness of the code of 'courtly love', it is true that there is a lack of sophistication in his articulation of that code which is perhaps surprising from a writer of Swinburne's powers, who had evidently been studying it since childhood.

In some respects, though, *Queen Yseult*'s manifest juvenility makes even clearer the divergences between Swinburne's aims and methods and those of Morris, for it presents some of Swinburne's most important and lasting concerns in a rather bald form. I have already touched on the poem's strident anti-Christian polemicism. Swinburne appropriates the exaltation of erotic love which Morris sometimes in *The Defence of Guenevere* presents as characteristic of medieval

romance, but he removes the element of ambivalence that saves Morris's volume from becoming simplistic. The poem 'The Defence of Guenevere' has of course a pendant piece, 'King Arthur's Tomb', which presents a markedly different view of the love of Launcelot and Guenevere. Swinburne's poem has no such sense of balance, nor would his work ever develop it. Already for him in 1857, there is absolutely no question that the erotic is intrinsically superior to the ascetic, and *Queen Yseult*'s occasional shrillness can even be seen as an attempt by its author to outdo Morris in the sincerity and fulsomeness of his praise of courtly love.

This points to a second, though related, difference between the two works. Morris's Guenevere is very much a human being, whose depiction shows to its best effect the psychological penetration that is one of the strengths of Morris's verse (and one of the qualities that he himself most underrated). Guenevere 'wrung her hair, | [and] Spoke out at last with no more trace of shame, | With passionate twisting of her body there', and her rhetoric is characterised by a corresponding 'passionate twisting', which conveys vividly the mixture of anger, fear, and pride driving forward her discourse.[26] Swinburne only rarely achieved such convincing characterisation. His Yseult is very much a symbol, far more like Rossetti's women than like Morris's. Swinburne's apparent lack of human fellow-feeling seems to have been one of the aspects of his personality that made Morris inclined to keep his distance in later life. It is perhaps in this context that we can best understand Morris's later opinion that Swinburne's poetry was 'founded on literature, not on nature' – a view that might otherwise seem slightly odd as a judgement of the author of such important Victorian nature poems as 'By the North Sea' and 'The Lake of Gaube'.[27]

Queen Yseult, as we have seen, was abandoned in mid-December 1857, but Swinburne's interest in the Arthurian legends continued unabated, as did Morris's influence on how he approached them. In the late 1850s, Swinburne composed four further Arthurian poems. Three of these are dramatic monologues, which borrow Morris's trick of exploring the thoughts of Malory's characters. These are 'King Ban'; 'Lancelot' (a poem based on Rossetti's Oxford Union mural *Sir Launcelot's Vision of the Sanc Grael*); and, most pointedly, 'The Day Before the Trial', a kind of short prelude to 'The Defence of Guenevere' in which King Arthur reflects bitterly on his wife's betrayal. These poems suggest that Swinburne may have been contemplating a full Arthurian cycle, like the one that Morris had in mind when he composed the Arthurian poems of the *Defence of Guenevere* volume – another indication of Swinburne's urge not just to emulate Morris but also to compete with him.[28] The fourth poem is 'Joyeuse Garde', a vignette of Tristram and Iseult's interval of rest and happiness at Launcelot's castle. This poem, the remains of which appear to be only a fragment, may have been intended as part of the same planned cycle, or perhaps even of a new full-length treatment of the Tristram story.[29]

It is possible, however, that the influence was not all in one direction: Morris's oil painting of 1858, now in Tate Britain, which has most often been known by the name *Queen Guenevere* but which Morris himself seems to have called *La Belle Iseult*, may well have taken *Queen Yseult* as its immediate inspiration.[30] It depicts a tall, powerful, erect woman (modelled by Jane Burden, as she then was) in the act of dressing. The small dog on the bed behind her, symbolising fidelity, is probably Tristram's dog Houdain. Since the linen on both sides of the bed has been disturbed, perhaps Tristram has just departed; or perhaps, given Iseult's melancholy expression and the presence of Houdain (whom Tristram, according to *Sir Tristrem* and other medieval versions, left with Iseult during their separation), the picture represents Iseult at Tintagel during Tristram's exile. One thinks of Yseult's soliloquy in the sixth canto of Swinburne's poem, during which she 'rose up, speaking so'.[31] If Morris did indeed think *Queen Yseult* 'much better than his own poem', such a pictorial interpretation (rather like the ones he made in poetry of Rossetti's paintings *Arthur's Tomb*, *The Blue Closet*, and *The Tune of Seven Towers*) would have been an appropriate tribute.

Over the years, critics have perhaps been more alive to the differences between Morris and Swinburne than to the similarities, despite the fact that the two men maintained a steady if not intimate friendship throughout their lives. What is most striking from works such as *Queen Yseult* and Morris's *La Belle Iseult*, however, is how much they had in common, not only during the heady days of the late 1850s but also long afterwards. Both were strongly drawn to the profound eroticism which they found in what they would have seen as the greatest literature of the Middle Ages. Swinburne in particular came to identify a rebelliously pagan strand within the medieval imagination, among the results of which he numbered works as diverse as Villon, Troubadour poetry, and the border ballads, as well as Arthurian literature. This emphasis, present in embryonic form in *Queen Yseult*, was eventually to become one of the great informing ideas of *Tristram of Lyonesse*, Swinburne's later and immeasurably better version of the legend, begun in 1869 but not completed and published until 1882. A similar emphasis on the 'pagan' elements of medievalism can also be found in *The Earthly Paradise* and, to a much greater extent, in *Sigurd the Volsung*. It is possible that Swinburne's meeting with Morris in November 1857 suddenly confirmed this conviction in his mind, and it may have been this which impelled him to start work so furiously on *Queen Yseult*. It was ultimately a belief in the importance of art, not only for art's sake, but also for life's sake; and this ideal, which brought Swinburne and Morris together in their youthful studies of the Middle Ages, was ultimately much more important to both of them than anything which later drew them apart.

NOTES

1. Cecil Y. Lang, ed, *The Swinburne Letters*, 6 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959–62, vol. I, p. 13. (Afterwards *Swinburne Letters*.)

2. Cormell Price noted in his journal on 1 November: 'To Hill's, where were Topsy, Ted, Swan, Hatch, Swinburne of Balliol (introduced I think by Hatch) and Faulkner.' In December 1895, however, Swinburne told William Michael Rossetti that 'an Oxford friend, Hill, who knew Jones and Morris and through them Gabriel, introduced me to them.' See J. W. Mackail, *The Life of William Morris*, 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1899, vol. I, p. 127 (afterwards Mackail); *Swinburne Letters*, VI, p. 92. In the light of his subsequent career, Hatch would make an unlikely catalyst for Swinburne and Morris's friendship: he later took holy orders and became Professor of Classics at Toronto University, and is best known today as the author of such staple Victorian hymns as 'Breathe on me, breath of God'.

3. *Swinburne Letters*, I, p. 12n.

4. Georges Lafourcade, *La jeunesse de Swinburne*, 2 vols. Paris: Faculté de Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1928, vol. II, p. 40. (Afterwards Lafourcade.)

5. See Lafourcade, II, pp. 40–41; David Staines, 'Swinburne's Arthurian World: Swinburne's Arthurian Poetry and its Medieval Sources', *Studia Neophilologica* 50, 1978, pp. 53–70 (pp. 54–55); Antony H. Harrison, *Swinburne's Medievalism: A Study in Victorian Love Poetry*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1988, p. 80.

6. Peter Faulkner, 'Morris and Swinburne', *Journal of William Morris Studies* 15(3), winter 2003, pp. 4–26 (pp. 4–6).

7. Edmund Gosse, *The Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne*. London: Macmillan, 1917; repr. in Edmund Gosse & Thomas James Wise, eds, *The Complete Works of Algernon Charles Swinburne*, 20 vols. London: Heinemann, 1925–27, XIX, p. 42 (afterwards *Complete Works*).

8. Throughout this article I will use the forms 'Tristram' and 'Yseult' when referring specifically to Swinburne's poem, but the more generic form 'Iseult' when referring to the legend more generally.

9. Walter Scott, ed, *Sir Tristrem: A Metrical Romance of the Thirteenth Century, by Thomas of Ercildoune, called The Rhymer*. Edinburgh: Constable, 1804, cxxvii, 353, xxiv pp.

10. Francisque Michel, ed, *Tristan, Recueil de ce qui reste des poèmes relatifs à ses aventures composés en François, en anglo-normand, et en grec dans les XII et XIII siècles*, 3 vols. London: Pickering, 1835–39. See Lafourcade, II, pp. 45–47.

11. *Swinburne Letters*, III, p. 332.
12. See Lafourcade, II, p. 43.
13. *Complete Works*, I, p. 9.
14. Lafourcade, II, pp. 47–48.
15. Virginia S. Hale & Catherine Barnes Stevenson, 'Morris' Medieval Queen: A Paradox Resolved', *Victorian Poetry* 30, 1992, pp. 171–78 (p. 177).
16. *Complete Works*, I, pp. 9–10.
17. *Complete Works*, I, p. 24.
18. *Complete Works*, I, pp. 28–29.
19. *Complete Works*, I, p. 28.
20. In the version of 'The Blessed Damozel' published in *The Germ* in 1850, the Damozel's 'hair that lay along her back | Was yellow like ripe corn' (ll. 11–12); Jan Marsh, ed, *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Collected Writings*. London: Dent, 1999, p. 8.
21. *Complete Works*, I, pp. 57–58.
22. *Swinburne Letters*, I, p. 13.
23. For a modern reprint, see Francis Jacques Sypher, introd., *Undergraduate Papers: An Oxford Journal, 1857–58, Conducted by A. C. Swinburne, John Nichol, T. H. Green and Others. A Facsimile Reproduction*. Delmer, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1974, pp. 41–50.
24. *Swinburne Letters*, V, p. 235.
25. *Complete Works*, I, p. 16.
26. May Morris, ed, *The Collected Works of William Morris*, 24 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910–15, I, p. 2.
27. Norman Kelvin, ed, *The Collected Letters of William Morris*, 4 vols in 5. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984–96, II, p. 119.
28. For Morris's plans for an Arthurian cycle, see Mackail, I, p. 134.
29. Lafourcade (vol. II, pp. 49–50) prints another fragment that he takes to be a continuation of 'Joyeuse Garde'. It was also Lafourcade who published 'The Day Before the Trial' for the first time (vol. II, pp. 52–53). 'Joyeuse Garde' and 'Lancelot' can be found in volume I of the *Complete Works*, and 'King Ban' in volume VI.
30. In a letter to May Morris of 7 June 1901, Jane Morris states: ' "La Belle Iseult" is what the dear Father always called the picture and I think we ought to keep to that'; cited in Christine Poulson, *The Quest for the Grail: Arthurian Legend in Victorian Art*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1999, p. 163n.
31. *Complete Works*, I, p. 57.