

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 11



SPRING, 1957

Edited by the English X Group of MLA by William E. Buckler
737 East Building, New York University, Washington Square, New York 3, New York

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Dwight N. Lindley (*Hamilton College*)
Sol Liptzin (*City College of New York*)
Oscar E. Maurer (*University of Texas*)
Frederick P. W. McDowell (*State University of Iowa*)
Charles Richard Sanders (*Duke University*)
Martin J. Svaglic (*Loyola University, Chicago*)
Francis G. Townsend (*Florida State University*)
René Wellek (*Yale University*)

METHOD IN THE STUDY OF VICTORIAN PROSE: ANOTHER VIEW

In "Method in the Study of Victorian Prose," an address delivered at the 1955 meeting of English X and later published in the *Victorian Newsletter*, Professor A. Dwight Culler has raised questions of the first importance to all of us which have long been overdue for serious discussion. In brief he argues that the study of what he calls "non-imaginative" or non-creative literature has tended to disappear from our reviews and our courses, and this primarily because for dealing with the work of philosophers, divines, historians, and essayists, we lack an appropriate method such as the "new criticism" has provided for the study of poems. Mr. Culler then examines and terms incomplete and reductive and wrong the type of approach illustrated by John Holloway's *The Victorian Sage*. And finally he offers suggestions toward and a plea for the construction of a "broadly humanistic" method of analysis steering a middle course between "the bald paraphrase of doctrine," which he says was the older method of criticism, and the "empty analysis of form," which he considers the chief failing of the new. As it happens, I find myself in disagreement with Mr. Culler at various points in his argument, and I have misgivings about the general approach to a solution of the problem that he has outlined. Nevertheless, with his serious concern for improving the study of prose and with the humanistic intent of his remarks, I feel sure that most of us deeply sympathize; and I hope that what follows may serve to promote, if only in the manner of Hegelian dialectic, the aim he has so well described. In any event, I would much rather agree than disagree with Mr. Culler, from whose fine book on Newman I have greatly profited. [Reviewed p. 22, *infra*.]

Though I am not convinced that the situation of non-imaginative prose in our college courses is quite as dark as Mr. Culler paints it, still it must be admitted that the student (in many schools a sophomore non-specialist) who once worked his way through a book of essays described as ranging from Bacon to James Thurber does seem to be a dying species; and I think it is a fact that even the English major or minor, though he is probably reading substantially the same material as his predecessor of twenty years ago, has been unfavorably affected in his response to the prose works by the lack of a commonly accepted procedure capable of lending to the study of the essay the intellectual stimulation and the sense of reward which the new critics often gave to the analysis of poems. The question is, can we come to an agreement on anything like such a procedure and so begin to redress the balance of our present situation?

Solutions to the problem like that offered by Mr. Holloway in *The Victorian Sage*—involving merely the analysis of imagery, of devices for controlling tone and creating a persona, and of forms of argument—will not do, says Mr. Culler. His main objection is that by treating such techniques and devices independently of the truth or falsehood of the opinions they are employed to express, Mr. Holloway has relegated to a secondary status what should be the major province of rhetoric, which lies in "a metaphysical rather than a verbal world." Holloway is not only incomplete, however. Mr. Culler feels, if I understand his words, that in giving the impression that the sages need not always have been sincere in their methods, or believed in what they were saying—that somehow their significance does not depend upon

their truth, Holloway has lessened the stature of the writers he is discussing. Despite its general freshness and attractiveness, his book is reductive, in other words; and it is so, says Mr. Culler, "because its method is wrong."

Now I wonder if Mr. Holloway deserves quite this. His book is not exactly what we are looking for here, I suppose, since it does not analyze particular texts as wholes. But that it is incomplete in Mr. Culler's sense, Holloway would surely be the first to agree, since he tells us in the opening chapter (esp. pp. 8-10) that he is dealing with a certain kind of "organic thinking" in which exposition and proof become uniquely one, but that before one can consider the unduly neglected question of the fallacy or validity of such thinking, one must first discover the methods "whereby the sage gives expression to his outlook." In other words, his book on these writers is offered largely as prolegomena to what he calls on page ten "their proper study as writers of literature," which clearly includes for Holloway the question of substantive truth, whatever his philosophical criteria for deciding that question may be. Unless, then, we are to deny an author the right to limit his province to such an area as that of prolegomena, we can reasonably criticize his book only in the light of its fidelity to such an intention.

Nevertheless, I would certainly agree with Mr. Culler that *The Victorian Sage*, whose very title seems a bit ironic, has a reductive effect, though my reasons for thinking so are not the same as his. That, however, is another question. In spite of a certain skepticism about a theory of "the sage" like Holloway's, which lumps together writers like Carlyle, Arnold, George Eliot, Newman, Disraeli, and Hardy, as if their similarities were more telling than their differences, I should by no means deny that these writers do bring to bear on every argument they advance a large measure of conscious rhetorical skill. Mr. Culler, I am sure, would not deny this either; but for no good reason that I can discover, he does virtually deny the feasibility and the value of analyzing their rhetorical techniques. Thus, he finds it a "radical difficulty" in Holloway's method that "it tends to assume a rhetorical character." To study the techniques of persuasion, he feels, you need an intimate knowledge of the character of the audience to be persuaded; and this can only be obtained, "if at all," he tells us, "by historical research." However, "most of the critics" who consider these techniques, he maintains, deduce the audience from the rhetoric employed and then congratulate the speaker for employing a rhetoric so suitable to his audience, thus reasoning in a circle.

It might help to resolve the issue here if Mr. Culler were to tell us just what critics he is talking about and also the pages on which Holloway himself is guilty of the circular reasoning and the lapse of scholarship he has attributed to him. Meanwhile, I should say that Mr. Culler's argument confuses the requirements of critical reasoning with those of historical scholarship. It is simply not true that to study with profit the techniques of a rhetorician, you need an intimate knowledge of the audience he was trying to persuade, however desirable such a knowledge might be for many reasons. A critic can make helpful discriminations of technique if he knows the character of the audience as the writer conceived it (whether truly or not), something he usually and properly infers without any circular reasoning from the words of the essay itself, not merely from "the rhetoric employed."

It is true, as Mr. Culler points out with reference to Newman, that a writer may have great difficulty in learning the character of his audience. After all, of how many of our contemporaries can any of us claim that we have "an intimate knowledge"? Nevertheless, the writer or speaker must finally come to some decision and frame an hypothesis about the tastes and habits of the people he is addressing; and it is on this hypothesis that he selects his rhetorical devices. What the analyst of rhetoric seeks to discover is the relation and appropriateness of such devices (e.g., Newman's appeal to patriotism in the last chapter of the *Apologia*) to the arguments they subserve and to the hypothetical audience at which they are directed. Even if a writer should fail to reach a clear-cut decision about the character of his audience, the fact would be evident in the uncertainty or ambivalence of his approach, and hence an instructive topic for discussion. How successful a writer's techniques proved in practice with any given audience would, of course, be a matter of history; but with such variable and unpredictable matters, however important in their own right, literary criticism as such is not concerned. To judge the rhetoric of *Sartor Resartus*, we do not have to learn first how it was received by the readers of *Fraser's Magazine*, much less acquire an intimate knowledge of their character.

Another argument Mr. Culler advances against the feasibility of studying rhetorical techniques, one creating a problem he describes as "of even greater difficulty than the one we have just examined," is that even when dealing with the timeless rhetoric appealing to readers of every age, "the critic who analyzes means of persuasion is obliged to assume that everyone else in the world will be persuaded by things to which he alone is immune. In his clear, piercing intelligence he sees through what the author is doing, but it must be presumed that

no one else does, or the rhetoric would be unsuccessful." This remark seems so gratuitous that I can only presume I have misunderstood it badly. Yet the words seem to bear no other than the obvious interpretation, and in the latest *Victorian Newsletter* Mr. Culler affirms against another objector his belief in their validity. But why must the critic who analyzes means of persuasion assume that "everyone else in the world will be persuaded by things to which he alone is immune"? Some people may be persuaded; some may not be. He himself may be immune, or he may not be. Depending on their own experience and the writer's subtlety, some readers may "see through" a rhetorician's technique, and some may need a critic to point it out. The phrase "see through" is, after all, only an unpleasant way of saying "appreciate" or "understand"; and like the reference to the clear, piercing intelligence of the critic, it is a rhetorical device of Mr. Culler's, if not, to be sure, one we should need a very subtle critic to point out. Is Mr. Culler suggesting that if you once "see through" what an author is doing, you will not be persuaded by him? This would be true only if his argument were dishonest or unsound. Many a well-schooled Englishman must have seen with pleasure through the techniques of Winston Churchill's wartime rhetoric without being any the less moved and persuaded by it.

Good rhetoric works hand in hand with logic and with style in the narrower sense—the persuasive effect depends on all three. All three factors, therefore, should be considered in our discussion and no one of them dismissed as a process of reducing literary criticism to "stratagems." After all, with the possible exception of the *Nichomachean Ethics*, there was hardly a more important book in the old Oxford curriculum than the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, which exerted a profound influence on some of the greatest Victorian writers. We might do much to improve the reading and writing of our students today, I have often felt, if we still required them to read this book with care.

At the same time, however, I would certainly agree with Mr. Culler that our interest in the great Victorians stems chiefly from our feeling that these writers have something of continuing value to say about the problems of modern life. Whatever the deficiencies of Ruskin's aesthetics, we are probably more inclined to accept his belief about the relation of great art to great ideas than the notion of Whistler or Wilde that in art subject matter is nothing and technique everything. The question remains, how do we talk about the "substantive truth" of an essay? No more than Mr. Culler do I have a method of analysis completely formed; but in the process of saying why I find his suggestions unsatisfactory, I will hazard a few of my own.

The first is that since we are looking for a method of analyzing particular prose works for the sake of whatever they can reveal to us, we should be wary of any schematism or formula that might lead us to substitute our own way of thinking for that of the text in question. Mr. Culler tells us that his survey of early nineteenth-century literature has shown him three great permanent and universal ways of life contending with each other: "the Romantic, which is the way of poetry; the Utilitarian, which is the way of science; and the Christian-humanist, which is the way of practical wisdom." Each has its characteristic form of expression, he says, the Romantic's being poetry, the Utilitarian's scientific prose, and the Christian-humanist's "the mediatorial form of critical prose," which is that of the great Victorian critics. The Christian-humanist even "created" a "form" which expressed precisely what he was trying to do, since (we are told) he was "not concerned simply with creating an inner world of value, nor simply with ascertaining an external world of fact, but with bringing fact and value into some kind of meaningful relation."

Would one have to be a sheer positivist or nominalist, I wonder, to be made rather uneasy by some of this? It would commonly be agreed, I suppose, that Shelley was a type of romantic *par excellence*; but what student of Shelley today would agree that he was concerned "simply with creating an inner world of value"? Shall we include Carlyle among the Romantics, as Professor Bernbaum and others do; or do the transcendental principles to which he appealed entitle him to a place in Mr. Culler's joint group of Christians and humanists? Assuming that John Stuart Mill belongs with the Utilitarians, can we say of him that he was concerned "simply with ascertaining an external world of fact"? I wonder how Shelley and T. H. Huxley would have reacted to the notion that they were unconcerned, or even relatively unconcerned, "with bringing fact and value into some kind of meaningful relation," which activity was held to be the distinguishing aim of the Christian-humanist?

How do you prove that poetry is the characteristic mode of expression for the romantic and mediatorial prose for the Christian-humanist? In the long history of English literature (or even in the shorter perspective of the nineteenth century), one can find a good many more famous distinctively Christian poets than critical essayists. Is what Mr. Culler calls mediatorial prose in any demonstrable way the province of any one kind of thinker? Is Shelley's *Defense of Poetry* or Mill's "Utility of Religion" or Huxley's "Science and Culture" any less mediatorial prose than Arnold's "Literature and Science," Newman's "Tamworth Reading Room," or

Ruskin's "Traffic"? Whatever their stylistic differences, are they not all, in fact, works of argument which require initially the same kind of analysis? Even if Mr. Culler's historical formula were developed to a point where it more nearly corresponded with the complexities of reality, it is not clear how it would help us to analyze any of these essays. Instead, I fear, it might have a tendency to make us read an essay not primarily in its own terms but rather as a sign of the assumed historical pattern. Even before our students start worrying about the patterns of history, they must learn to read the serious prose which helps to establish them; and unless my own experience has been singular, they need a good deal of help in reading people like the great Victorians.

Professor Culler takes a more direct road to our common goal, it seems to me, when he says of the critical essay that it "both exists as a formal structure and it refers to something which exists independently of that structure." But is it true, as he goes on to say, that "what Ruskin *believed* about economics, architecture, and morals constitutes the totality of his essay, both its substance and its form"? If it is true, of course, you will not have any formal analysis to bother about but, having placed Ruskin in his proper class among the three main types, you can devote yourself to a more or less elaborate summary and criticism of what appear to be his views, being careful all the while not to make your summary too bald, lest it seem indistinguishable from the "older method" of criticism. But I think that in any sense which is not the barest truism, it is decidedly not true; and this is my second and chief objection to Mr. Culler's method of approach.

No text that involves argument can be comprehended simply in terms of its author's beliefs considered apart from the rational structure of the argument which justifies them. If I wish to talk about an essay as a whole and not merely as a totality, I have to seek out the factors which organize it into a whole. These include the assumptions about the nature of the good life or of poetry or what have you from which the argument starts out but which may be only implicit in the essay to be analyzed. Many a dispute, for example, about Arnold's ranking of Chaucer below Shakespeare, Milton, and Wordsworth in "The Study of Poetry" might have been quickly resolved if the debaters had realized that given Arnold's conception of the nature and end of poetry, the ranking of Chaucer was inevitable and even irrefutable.

We must also discover the places to which and the order in which the argument moves. Carlyle's "Characteristics," for example, moves from a statement of the ideal harmony through a description of the actual dissonance to the indication of a program for restoring harmony. The same thing is true of Ruskin's "Traffic." In fact their similarity in this respect may be another instance of the older man's pervasive influence on the younger. Emerson's Divinity School address illustrates the same kind of movement. It is, indeed, a frequent pattern in essays whose philosophic orientation is Platonic.

We should know, too, the mode of reasoning by which the essay gets from place to place. For example, the structure of some of Arnold's works, like "The Study of Poetry," is the result of a dialectic constructed by analogy with Aristotle's definition of virtue in the *Nicomachean Ethics*: i. e., two extremes of some kind are set up—in this case, an historical estimate of poetry and a personal estimate. A mean is then established and illustrated—here a *real* estimate—which avoids the errors of the extremes. Again, the argument of Ruskin's "Traffic" is controlled by a dialectic opposing the spiritual to the earthbound, the heroic to the selfish, which Ruskin owed ultimately, it would seem, to Plato, a significant passage from whose *Critias* concludes his essay.

Finally, all of these factors are governed by the specific purpose and problem of the essay in question, as the writer conceives it. The analyst of "The Study of Poetry," for instance, would do well to remember that it was originally written to justify Arnold's selections for an anthology.

If what I have been saying makes sense, it should be clear that a student might list every opinion which Ruskin expresses about economics, architecture, and morals in the essay "Traffic" and still not perceive the structure or form of the whole—still not understand, much less be in a position to evaluate the truth of, the argument of the essay. If you want him to do that, try asking him first, not whether he thinks Ruskin was a Romantic or a Utilitarian, nor even what Ruskin believed about English church architecture; but simply ask him, "Into how many parts does the essay appear to fall—and why?" The rest should gradually follow if the *why* is fully explored. In attempting to justify his answer, he will be led to reconstruct it easily, and decide what value it still has for his own life.

In the summer of 1955, at Indiana's School of Letters, Mr. Philip Rahv contended that we need a distinctive method for criticizing works of fiction, not one borrowed from the new critics' models for poetry, and not one exalting technique at the expense of the more deeply human values. More recently, Mr. Culler has said much the same thing regarding works of critical

prose. Both are right, I think, and deserve our thanks. But in feeling our way toward these more appropriate methods, we shall make faster and surer progress, I venture to say, if we avoid even such initial preconceptions as that we already possess the definitive method for analyzing poems, as if there could be no others; or that the methods for analyzing stories, poems, and essays must always be completely distinct from one another, as if the structure of "Rugby Chapel," say, were utterly different from that of "The Study of Poetry"—or as if any procedure you develop for fiction will be quite inapplicable to poems like *The Eve of St. Agnes* or *Isabella*. And finally, as teachers of English, with a debt to and an unashamed love for the arts of language, let us avoid that needlessly disjunctive frame of mind which asserts, for instance, that if we go to the great Victorian critics "at all," we go not to see how they could adopt a persuasive manner but because they did some hard thinking about the world's troubles. We go for both reasons, and undoubtedly for others, too. And unless we encourage the discussion of a work of art from every angle of interest, it is hard to see how we can reasonably call our methods humanistic at all.

Loyola University, Chicago

Martin J. Svaglic

TENNYSON AND THE HUMAN HAND

Willa Cather, in one of her most delightful stories, "Neighbor Rosicky," gives considerable attention to farmer Rosicky's hands. His was a "warm, broad, flexible brown hand," with perhaps a touch of the gipsy in it, "alive and quick and light in its communications." There was cleverness in it and a great deal of curiosity. But most important of all there was love in it. It expressed Rosicky's special gift for loving people, "something that was like an ear for music or an eye for color." It was quiet, unobtrusive, and always there.

Such a treatment of the human hand is by no means typical of modern literature. Miss Cather, we say, was a traditionalist among modern writers of prose fiction, somewhat inclined to deal in the sugary beautiful and the almost unbelievably admirable and good. We turn away from her to a writer who, we believe, is one of us, living in our world in our way. And the hands which we find in Hemingway are likely to be either rapacious hands, hotly clutching a woman's body, or the hands of soldiers, huntsmen, and fishermen, hands which have learned to adjust themselves to the contours of guns and the barbs of giant fish-hooks. Or perhaps we may prefer the marvellously skillful, dexterously mechanical, dehumanized hands grasping the test-tubes in science fiction or, even more horribly, in documentary scientific pictures. But if we wish to consider some hands which will be completely adequate in representing our age, we may turn to those which T. S. Eliot's J. Alfred Prufrock speaks of wishfully:

I should have been a pair of ragged claws
Scuttling across the floors of silent seas.

Borrowing from the New Critics the techniques of explication which are almost guaranteed to draw rich clusters of meanings from certain poetic contexts, let us briefly interpret these lines from Eliot in terms of what is characteristic of our age. First, Prufrock thinks that he should have been an animal which has virtually become all hands, with no soul, no mind, and almost no body except for hands. He lives in a dynamic age of mighty events, when much is done and little is understood, when, as Einstein has said, the means have been perfected but the ends are confused. Second, the claws of the animal are extremely ugly and a striking symbol of what is inhuman. Third, the claws "scuttle," that is, they rush about hither and thither. Being the claws of a crab or lobster, furthermore, they dart backward more often and in a greater hurry than they move forward; and, whatever the direction, they are guided only by uncertainties and the improvised decisions of the moment as they proceed by zig-zag paths. And fourth, they live in darkness on the floors of seas which permit their existence but tell them nothing.

Now Eliot himself, we know, is in considerable part a traditionalist fully aware of what human life and literature have been in past centuries. If he considers ragged claws the best symbol for Prufrock and for us, we must, I fear, assume that he has chosen the symbol knowingly and deliberately. The human hand has always been a mighty instrument and a powerful symbol, lending itself to many various situations, purposes, and needs. Chaucer's references to it are numerous and highly interesting to study. Shakespeare's plays have many references to hands. Lady Macbeth grieves because all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten her little hand. Hamlet, borrowing a phrase from the Church Catechism, speaks of his hands as pickers and

stealers. He also tells the players not to saw the air too much with their hands but to use all gently. Emilia in *Othello* would

Put in every honest hand a whip
To lash the rascals naked through the world.

Othello declares Desdemona's hand "a good one, a frank one"; and she replies prettily:

You may, indeed, say so;
For 't was that hand that gave away my heart.

And Othello does not wish to be

The fixed figure for the time of scorn
To point his slow and moving finger at.

Gloucester begs to kiss King Lear's hand, and the old King replies: "Let me wipe it first, it smells of mortality." When King Lear finally wakes from his long, confused, and troubled sleep, he will not swear that his hands are his own and pricks them with a pin to make sure. In Milton there are comparatively few references to hands, and these tend to be rather general. In Sonnet 22, for instance, he will not argue against Heaven's hand or will; and at the end of *Paradise Lost*, Adam and Eve

Hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,
Through Eden took their solitary way.

Boswell tells us that Dr. Johnson, even though he lived in the age of Garrick and Siddons, detested gesticulation in ordinary talk and once actually reached out, caught, and firmly held the hands of a man who would not keep them still. Keats, with a somewhat different idea in mind, tells us to imprison the soft hand of our beauty and let her rave. The references to hands in Wordsworth are rich and various.¹ Coleridge's Ancient Mariner grips the wedding guest with a skinny hand. Rossetti places three lilies in the hand of the Blessed Damozel. A minor poet of the nineteenth century declares that

Nature's own Nobleman, friendly and frank,
Is a man with his heart in his hand.²

Another minor poet of that century is equally sure that "The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world."³ Walter Savage Landor, who was not a minor poet or a restrained one, warmed both hands before the fire of life.

Among the greatest English poets, Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Wordsworth have given most attention to hands. And the hands in their poetry are not like the ragged claws in Eliot's poem. In their writings the hands, even when covered with blood or smelling of mortality, reflect the broad, deep, and warm humanity of the poets themselves. These were poets who had faith in human nature and even some critical affection for it. To their tradition belongs the poetry of Tennyson, whose treatment of the hand is possibly the most ingenious and delightfully various of any poet in our language. A brief examination of selected passages from his works may reflect credit on the art of a poet who today is too often associated with rose-water and sugar.

Let us omit the hundreds of lines in which Tennyson uses the word *hands* idiomatically, as he does when he tells Lady Clara Vere de Vere that if time be heavy on her hands she might do something about the beggars at her gates and the poor on her lands. Yet these lines are not unimportant, for a poet's command of idiom is not unimportant. It is more interesting, however, in the work of a poet famous for his verbal pictures to study Tennyson's use of the hand for the purposes of description.

In "The Princess" we see King Gama "Airing a snowy hand and signet gem." In the same poem we have in an amusing context the Amazon bodyguard of Princess Ida:

Those eight mighty daughters of the plow...
On my shoulders hung their heavy hands,
The weight of destiny.

In "The Princess" we also find this picture:

Then took the King
His three broad sons; with now a wandering hand
And now a pointed finger, told them all.

After the battle in "The Princess" the wounded are taken care of in a place where
Low voices with the ministering hand
Hung round the sick.

When we go from this poem to "The Eagle," a bird which "clasps the crag with crooked hands," we are struck by the contrast between Eliot's Prufrock and Tennyson's eagle. In the one a man feels that he should be claws; in the other even an eagle has hands. Perhaps we had better close our

eyes to the grim implications of the contrast. In "Maud" Tennyson speaks of the "mattock-hardent hand" of the laborer. In "Merlin and Vivien" Merlin makes the big mistake of teaching Vivien his mighty charm, "Of woven paces and of waving hands." Then there is the last wish which Elaine, in "Lancelot and Elaine," expresses to her brothers:

Lay the letter in my hand
A little ere I die, and close the hand
Upon it; I shall guard it even in death.

In "Guinevere" King Arthur's hands play a part in expressing the forgiveness which he bestows upon the contrite Queen:

And while she grovell'd at his fe
She felt the King's breath wander o'er her neck,
And in the darkness o'er her fallen head,
Perceived the waving of his hands that blest.

In "Queen Mary" Cranmer remembers the dying King Edward with

His frail transparent hand,
Damp with the sweat of death, and gripping mine.

Frequently, however, the hands in Tennyson's poetry are not merely pictorial but are primarily intended to communicate or suggest emotion, either lyric or dramatic. It is here, to be blunt, that we may encounter Tennyson at his worst. We may encounter pretty-pretty verses which are nothing if not silly, as in the early "Lilian":

Airy, fairy Lilian,
Flitting, fairy Lilian,
When I ask her if she love me,
Claps her tiny hands above me,
Laughing all she can;
She'll not tell me if she love me,
Cruel little Lilian.

Not much better than the hand-clapping of airy, fairy Lilian is the unmitigated bathos in another early poem, "My life is full of weary days":

And now shake hands across the brink
Of that deep grave to which I go;
Shake hands once more; I cannot sink
So far — far down, but I shall know
Thy voice, and answer from below....
Then let wise Nature work her will,
And on my clay her darnel grow;
Come only when the days are still,
And at my headstone whisper low,
And tell me if the woodbines blow.

We are more inclined to laugh than to weep when we encounter the sentimentalism in the following passage from "The May Queen":

But sit beside my bed, mother, and put your hand in mine,
And Effie on the other side, and I will tell the sign.

Nevertheless, when the lady-proprietor of "The Palace of Art" claps her hands with delight as she gazes upon the glories of the place, cultured people can share her feelings. In many contexts the feeling may be Tennyson's own, as it is in "The Bridesmaid" (1872), recording his experience when he attended Emily Sellwood at the wedding of her sister to his brother in 1836. She was her sister's bridesmaid.

And all at once a pleasant truth I learn'd,
For while the tender service made thee weep,
I loved thee for the tear thou couldst not hide,
And prest thy hand, and knew the press return'd,
And thought, "My life is sick of single sleep;
O happy bridesmaid, make a happy bride!"⁴

Many of the references to hands in "In Memoriam" are, as we shall see, intensely personal ones based on actual experiences with Arthur Hallam. But the emotions conveyed or suggested by the hands in Tennyson's poetry are often dramatic and are highly various in the wide range which they cover. In "Hands All Round," a drinking song, the hands upon the wine-glasses pledge their

loyalty to the Queen and their belief in Imperialism. In "Dora" when William refuses to marry Dora, his old father is "wroth" and doubles up his hands. Another old man, the fierce one in "Aylmer's Fields" in uncontrolled anger

Under his own lintel stood
Storming with lifted hands.

The cynical old man in "The Vision of Sin" thinks of the time of youth:

When thy nerves could understand
What there is in loving tears,
And the warmth of hand in hand.

In "Edwin Morris" a lover is confronted with "hands of wild rejection." And after the lover in "Maud" has struck down Maud's brother, he gazes down with remorse at his "guilty hand." One of the most effectively dramatic scenes in Tennyson is that where Guinevere, jealous because she fears that Lancelot has found a new mistress in Elaine, flings herself down upon the King's great couch,

And clench'd her fingers till they bit the palm,
And shriek'd out "Traitor" to the unhearing wall.

Particularly interesting is the use of hands to express various emotions in "Enoch Arden." When Enoch leaves his home for the long voyage, he does not linger or draw out the farewell but

hastily caught
His bundle, waved his hand, and went his way.

He fails to return after a long time, and his old rival Philip generously offers to put Annie's boy and girl in school.

She rose, and fixt her swimming eyes upon him,
And dwelt a moment on his kindly face,
Then calling down a blessing on his head
Caught at his hand, and wrung it passionately.

Convinced that Enoch will never return, she finally marries Philip. But she is not happy and cannot throw off her uneasiness and misgivings:

But never merrily beat Annie's heart.
A footstep seem'd to fall beside her path,
She knew not whence; a whisper on her ear,
She knew not what; nor loved she to be left
Alone at home, nor ventured out alone.
What ail'd her then, that ere she enter'd, often
Her hand dwelt lingeringly on the latch,
Fearing to enter.

The hands in Tennyson's poetry may also indicate character. The idle, frustrated, unsuccessful poet in "Will Waterproof" sits with his

empty glass revers'd,
And thrumming on the table.

In "Edwin Morris" we have these lines:

I call'd him Crichton, for he seem'd
All-perfect, finish'd to the finger-nail.

And here is how Tennyson deals with a boring, self-satisfied orator whom he had known in the Cambridge Union:

With a sweeping of the arm,
And a lack-luster dead-blue eye,
Devolved his rounded periods.⁵

He gives similar treatment to a fanatical preacher in "Sea Dreams":

A heated pulpiteer
Not preaching simple Christ to simple men,
Announced the coming doom, and fulminated
Against the scarlet woman and her creed;
For sideways up he swung his arms, and shriek'd.

Then there is the horrible new doctor of "In the Children's Hospital":

Fresh from the surgery-schools of France and of other lands —
Harsh red hair, big voice, big chest, big merciless hands!
Wonderful cures he had done, O yes, but they said too of him
He was happier using the knife than in trying to save the limb.⁶

We may remember, too, that the "grim Earl," husband of Tennyson's Godiva, has a heart "as rough as Esau's hand." Tennyson's Isolt of the White Hands is quiet, lovely, and submissive, very much as he had found her in medieval romance. But his treatment of some of the other characters in *The Idylls of the King* shows a real talent for characterization in which his interest in the human hand may play its part. There is a delightful passage, for instance, in which Lancelot rebukes Sir Kay, who has been mistreating Gareth, for not knowing how to tell a good man when he sees one:

A horse thou knowest, a man thou dost not know:
Broad brows and fair, a fluent hair and fine
High nose, a nostril large and fine, and hands
Large, fair and fine.

And certainly we all remember how the dying King Arthur, his strength almost spent, says to Bedivere after he had twice failed to throw Excalibur back into the lake that if he fails again, "I will arise and slay thee with my hands." The style here has something of the Biblical in it, something of an epic ring, and something that echoes King Lear's invincible "I kill'd the slave that was a-hanging thee."

To our age, however, with its delight in the metaphysical poetry of Donne, Hopkins, Eliot, and Yeats, probably the most interesting use to which Tennyson puts the human hand is as an image to express concepts, ideas, and abstract entities which may appear to be inexpressible. And here is precisely where Tennyson's chief strength lies. He had his metaphysic, not an original one perhaps but one which has proved itself to be of universal significance throughout many centuries and which has always had a marked affinity for new facts, problems, and ideas. Complementing this metaphysic in Tennyson is a marked instinct and respect for the concrete, the physical, the intimate, and the human. He is, like Wordsworth's skylark, true to the kindred points of heaven and home. The hand image, therefore, serves him well here. In his well-known early poem "The Poet," he tells us, for instance, as he echoes Shelley:

No sword
Of wrath her right arm whirl'd,
But one poor poet's scroll, and with his word
She shook the world.

In "A Dream of Fair Women," the poem which gave us the phrase "The spacious times of great Elizabeth," we have these lovely lines:

In every land
I saw, wherever light illumineth
Beauty and anguish walking hand in hand
The downward slope to death.

Princess Ida tells women students under her, as women students should be told by their deans today, that she does not want them to be

Laughing-stocks of Time
Whose brains are in their hands and in their heels.

And there is a more general philosophy in "The Princess":

This fine old world of ours is but a child,
Yet in the go-cart. Patience! give it time,
To learn its limbs: there is a hand that guides.⁷

In "The Lover's Tale" folded hands become an ironic symbol of the futile advice which the smugly successful are ready to give to those who have met bitter failure:

Like a vain rich man,
That, having always prosper'd in the world
Folding his hands, deals comfortable words
To hearts wounded forever.

In "Lucretius," in which the philosopher had thought that there would be

Nothing to mar the sober majesties
Of settled, sweet, Epicurean life,

the hand image is one of great power:

But now it seems some unseen monster lays
His vast and filthy hands upon my will
Wrenching it backward into his; and spoils
My bliss in being.

In the lines "To the Queen" at the end of *The Idylls of the King* we have this well-known passage:

Or him
Of Geoffrey's book, or him of Malleor's, one
Touch'd by the adulterous finger of a lime
That hover'd between war and wantonness,
And crownings and dethronements.

In "The Higher Pantheism," a poem almost ruined by Swinburne's parody, we have this perfect line:

Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

Tennyson's skill in using the human hand for the purposes of poetry cannot, however, be adequately demonstrated by references to lines from many widely scattered contexts. To see how variously, extensively, and ingeniously Tennyson uses the human hand for the purposes of achieving continuity, development, artistic unity, and accumulated power, let us therefore make a rapid examination of two of his most substantial poems, "In Memoriam" and "The Passing of Arthur."

In a sense the whole of "In Memoriam" is an expansion and development of the fine lines in "Break, Break, Break":

But O for the touch of a vanish'd hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still.

Behind both of these poems dealing with the death of Arthur Hallam, were a real hand and voice, specific and individual, and actual experiences associated with these, remembered and cherished.⁸ Tennyson could not forget, and did not want to forget, the qualities of Hallam's hand-clasp—quick, direct, masculine, vigorous, firm, affectionate, warm and human, the clasp of a man who was in every respect manly and who had been touched by no ascetic gloom. The man whom Tennyson admired and loved most was no Galahad. Yet "In Memoriam" is not merely a personal poem but one which, though always consistently human, has universal elements and metaphysical ideas. The hand thus may serve well here to express the personal and particular and to embody ideas which require an appropriate image for their expression. It may also bind all these component elements into one whole. As we work rapidly through the poem we find:

But who shall so forecast the years
And find in loss a gain to match?
Or reach a hand thro' time to catch
The far-off interest of tears?

The reaching hand provided Tennyson with one of his favorite images, as it did his contemporary who wrote:

Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
Or what's a heaven for?

Early in Tennyson's poem, also, Sorrow, a priestess in the vaults of death, is represented as a hollow form with empty hands. Farther along a little way we find these lines:

Dark house, by which once more I stand
Here in the long unlovely street,
Doors, where my heart was used to beat
So quickly, waiting for a hand,
A hand that can be clasped no more.

In lyric 10 the poet's morbid and grotesque imagination places Hallam's corpse at the bottom of the sea:

And hands so often clasp'd in mine
Should toss with tangle and with shells.

In lyric 13 the bereaved one finds

Where warm hands have prest and clos'd,
Silence, till I be silent too.

A little later, he conceives an idea which, though impossible, has a gleam of cheerfulness in it:

And if along with these should come
The man I held as half-divine;
Should strike a sudden hand in mine,
And ask a thousand things of home; ...
I should not feel it to be strange.

In lyric 21 we have some familiar lines on science:

When Science reaches forth her arms
To feel from world to world, and charms
Her secret from the latest moon.

In number 33 we have praise for what embodies the ideal in human form:

Her faith thro' form is pure as thine,
Her hands are quicker unto good:
Oh, sacred be the flesh and blood
To which she links a truth divine!

In number 40:

But thou and I have shaken hands,
Till growing winters lay me low.

In lyric 55 Tennyson's desperate search for spiritual strength is near its nadir:

I falter where I firmly trod,
And falling with my weight of cares
Upon the great world's altar-stairs
That slope thro' darkness up to God,

I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,
And gather dust and chaff, and call
To what I feel is Lord of all,
And faintly trust the larger hope.

In lyric 69, after the poet questions whether the springtime of his soul will ever return, an angel of the night "reach'd the glory of a hand" that seemed to touch his nature "into leaf."

In number 70, full of ghostly details, a mysterious "hand that points" directs the poet's eyes to where, beyond a confused jumble of spectral faces, they come to rest upon the fair face of Hallam. Grim also is lyric 72:

When the dark hand struck down thro' time,
And cancell'd nature's best.

In number 75 more than a spark of faith and courage appears:

But somewhere, out of human view
Whate'er thy hands are set to do
Is wrought with tumult of acclaim.

In lyric 80:

Unused example from the grave
Reach out dead hands to comfort me.

Number 84:

And He that died in Holy Land
Would reach us out the shining hand
And take us as a single soul.

Number 85 has the familiar lines on Hallam's death:

In Vienna's fatal walls
God's finger touch'd him, and he slept.³

The same lyric touches upon the difficult problem of uniting the ideal with the practical:

Yet none could better know than I,
How much of act at human hands
The sense of human will demands
By which we dare to live or die.

In lyric 87 Tennyson revisits Hallam's old room at Cambridge, where the joyful noises of young students strike upon his ears with a pathetic irony:

Another name was on the door;
I linger'd; all within was noise
Of songs, and clapping hands, and boys
That crash'd the glass and beat the floor.

And in the great New Year lyric the poet prays:

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand.

Hallam is praised thus in lyric 109:

And manhood fused with female grace
In such a sort, the child would twine
A trustful hand, unask'd in thine,
And find his comfort in thy face.

In lyric 119 the memory is one that emphasizes the warm intimacy of Hallam's hand clasp:

Thy lips are bland,
And bright the friendship of thine eye;
And in my thoughts with scarce a sigh
I take the pressure of thine hand.

In 124 we have these famous lines:

And out of darkness came the hands
That reach thro' nature, molding man.

And finally in lyric 129 we find these lines reassuring:

Known and unknown; human, divine;
Sweet human hand and lips and eye;
Dear heavenly friend that canst not die,
Mine, mine, for ever, ever mine.

Much of the essential thought of "In Memoriam" is gathered into these lines and finds its fitting sign and token in a hand which is known and unknown, human and divine, lost and found, dead and immortal.

Even more memorable and vividly, hauntingly imaginative is the use of hands in "The Passing of Arthur" (1869), which, we know, incorporates most of the lines of the "Morte D'Arthur" (1812). Tennyson owes something, of course, to his sources here; but his images far surpass anything to be found in any source. This idyll begins with King Arthur's last great battle in the west in which he slays Modred but receives from him the wound from which he later dies. The battle had taken place beside the sea, and many of the slain are in the surf up and down the beach. Atmosphere counts for much:

Only the wan wave
Brake in among dead faces, to and fro
Swaying the helpless hands.

King Arthur, attended by Sir Bedivere, thinks of his good sword Excalibur and recalls the way in which the sword came to him in happier days:

For thou rememberest how
In those old days, one summer noon, an arm
Rose up from out the bosom of the lake,
Clothed in white samite, mystic, wonderful,
Holding the sword.

Then follows the familiar scene in which Bedivere has to be commanded three times to throw the sword back into the lake. When he fails the first time and lies about what he had done and seen, the King is disappointed and suspicious:

For surer sign had follow'd, either hand,
Or voice, or else a motion of the mere.

After the command is given the second time, the intensity of the debate in Bedivere's mind over whether he should obey it is indicated in part by the behavior of his hands:

But when he saw the wonder of the hilt,
How curiously and strangely chased, he smote
His palms together, and he cried aloud:

....
"The King is sick, and knows not what he does."

After Bedivere's second failure, the King threatens, as we have already seen, to rise and slay him with his hands if he fails again. All of this, of course, is excellent dramatic build-up for the third try, which is successful; and Tennyson meets the dramatic expectation of the reader with a picture which is completely adequate and satisfying. Bedivere, running and leaping lightly down the ridges, plunges into the bulrush-beds. He clutches the sword; he gets a strong grip on it with both hands; he wheels like an Olympic champion throwing the hammer;⁹ and he flings the sword out into the space over the lake. As Sir Bedivere says, "Then with both hands I flung him, wheeling him." And the mysterious hand clothed in white samite receives the sword just before it descends into the water:

So flash'd and fell the brand Excalibur:
But ere he dipt the surface, rose an arm
Clothed in white samite, mystic, wonderful,
And caught him by the hilt, and brandish'd him
Three times, and drew him under in the mere.

But this is by no means the last we hear of hands in the poem. Bedivere lifts the wounded, dying King to carry him through the place of tombs:

Kneeling on one knee,
O'er both his shoulders drew the languid hands.

When the two reach the sea, they find a black funeral barge and on it three Queens dressed in black waiting for the King:

There those three Queens
Put forth their hands, and took the King, and wept.
But she that rose the tallest of them all
And fairest, laid his head upon her lap,
And loosed the shatter'd casque, and chafed his hands,
And called him by his name, complaining loud,
And dropping bitter tears against his brow
Striped with dark blood.

In his famous farewell words, Arthur admonishes human beings to pray:

For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend.

He also suggests that he is going a long way to the island-valley of Avilion where he hopes to be healed of his grievous wound. As the barge moves farther and farther out to sea until it is merely a "black dot against the verge of dawn," Sir Bedivere stands gazing intently upon it from the highest point along the beach. As he grieves for the departing King and longs for his return, the position of his hand here helps to provide a perfect ending for the poem:

And saw,
Straining his eyes beneath an arch of hand,
Or thought he saw, the speck that bare the King.

The implications of this evidence from many poems are so clear that few comments are needed, and these may be brief. We should certainly not assume that Tennyson had an obsession for the human hand. There is plenty of evidence, even in the quotations above, that he does not neglect the other parts of the body—the tongue, the lips, the ears, the hair, the knees, the feet, and so on. A paper could be written to show that the connotation of *voice* in "The sound of a voice that is still" is almost as rich and significant as that of *hand* in "But O for the touch of a vanish'd hand." Tennyson works in the humanistic tradition which gives the whole human body due respect and adequate attention.¹⁰ On the other hand we must not dismiss the many references to the human hand in his poetry as merely casual or as details introduced incidentally as he concentrates his talent upon other matters. The abundance and nature of the evidence will not permit such a conclusion. Tennyson was an artist, conscious of his craftsmanship, much greater and more deserving of serious study than Swinburne, or the art-for-art's-sake school at the end of the nineteenth century, or the Edwardians at the beginning of this, or even some critics of our own day have been willing to allow. He was capable of writing passages and poems of such haunting power and beauty that, once we have read them, they remain with us the rest of our lives. He was, moreover, a master spirit, if not a respectable philosopher. Certainly we should not reject him entirely because he liked sweet melody or even because he occasionally lapsed into sentimentalism. But the point is that we are giving too little consideration to the remarkable quality of Tennyson's imagination and to the artistic gifts and the insight into life which are related to it. Only when we learn again to do this will we be able to judge such an important work as *The Idylls of the King* with some degree of validity, or even read it with pleasure. Our brief examination of the human hand in Tennyson's poetry has provided us with a simple device by which we may get glimpses into the workings of that imagination, assay some of its products, discover some of the springs from which life flows into Tennyson's poetry, realize more fully the extensive range of experience, thought, and feeling from which he wrote, and reconsider an idealism which whether embodied in the laboring hand, the praying hand, or the Divine Hand reaching downward, may still give comfort to the human body and strength to its spirit. Perhaps we may have been also led into a clearer apprehension of the brooding sense of humanity, with all its tangibilities and all its mysteries, that gives a peculiar value to his poetry:¹¹

Duke University

Charles Richard Sanders

¹Wordsworth gives us, for instance, "A sleepy hand of negligence," the "kindly warmth from touch of fostering hand," and a careful hand, wilful hand, eager hand, lavish hand, venturesome hand, dutiful and tender hand, practiced hand, dying hand, sparing hand, industrious hand, slack hand, unknown hand, magical hand, tremulous hand, and a withered hand. In Tennyson as in Wordsworth this eye for the human hand is related to an ear for the "still sad music of humanity."

²Martin Tupper, "Nature's Nobleman."

³William R. Wallace, "The Hand That Rules the World."

⁴Compare these lines from "The Sisters":

Till that dead bridesmaid, meant to be my bride,
Put forth cold hands between us.

⁵From "A Character."

⁶The lines suggest Henley's "In Hospital" and his good luck in being saved by Dr. Lister from the hands of such a doctor as Tennyson describes. They also suggest that Henley's diction is not one whit firmer or more realistic than Tennyson's here.

⁷A figurative application of the concept of "What does little birdie say?"—that much maligned poem that has been derided as serious poetry intended for adults although Tennyson introduces it as a cradle song in "Sea Dreams."

⁸Note these fragmentary lines from Tennyson's notebook, winter, 1833-34, concerning Hallam:

Where is the voice I loved? ah where
Is that dear hand that I would press?

Tennyson could be almost theatrical in the significance which he attached to the handshake: "I would pluck my hand from a man even if he were my greatest hero, or dearest friend, if he wronged a woman or told her a lie." Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Memoir* (London and New York: Macmillan, 1897), I, 107, 250.

⁹There are two wheelings here: Bedivere wheels his whole body as he throws the sword, and the sword wheels through the air after it leaves his hands.

¹⁰To Tennyson as to Browning, the ideal was not spirit discarding body but spirit and body joined. Hence Tennyson's praise of Hallam as

High nature amorous of the good,
But touch'd with no ascetic gloom.

The character of Galahad, therefore, confronted him with a formidable artistic problem. Galahad, the ideal knight of medieval asceticism, never really won Tennyson's sympathy; and he should be studied in conjunction with "St. Simeon Stylites," in which the poet condemns an arrogant, snobbish asceticism. The Round Table is destroyed by corruption of the flesh on one hand, and by an impractical, inhuman, impossible ascetic idealism on the other. See Hallam Tennyson, *op. cit.*, 265.

¹¹Tennyson's friend Dakyns, we are told, always stressed "the width of his humanity," *Tennyson and His Friends*, ed. Hallam Tennyson (London: Macmillan, 1911), p. 202. And Sir Charles Tennyson wisely concludes his recent biography of his grandfather with the opinion of "an acute young critic" of our time that Tennyson is "the most human of the great poets," *Alfred Tennyson* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), p. 541. This sense of humanity, which we too often think of merely in its emotional manifestations, is one of the chief bonds connecting such major Victorian writers as Dickens, Carlyle, Tennyson, Thackeray, Trollope, George Eliot, Ruskin, Arnold, and Hardy.

THE ENGLISH RECEPTION OF HEINE

The present year [*Paper read at 1956 meeting of MLA*], the centenary of Heine's death, has witnessed intensification of interest in this German poet throughout the world. Stress has been laid upon his timeliness, the meaningfulness of his life, the beauty of his lyrics, the importance of his ideas.

Heine is one of the few German poets who has made a deep impress upon the English mind. His reception by the English has been almost uniformly favorable throughout the past century. While in Germany the Heine-controversy between his admirers and his detractors has raged on and on, in England this controversy came to an end about the time of his death. But even before 1856 the voices of his English detractors, who had echoed conservative German critics in pre-Victorian days, were already muted.

It is true that in the 1820's and 1830's there was an anti-Heine attitude among English reviewers who took their cue from Wolfgang Menzel but, as early as 1828, the *Quarterly Review* and the *Athenaeum*, prominent organs of opinion, were prophesying Heine's coming greatness. The *Athenaeum* even contracted to publish a series of articles by him. But when these articles arrived, it found them sarcastic, appalling, unpublishable. It informed its readers that Heine was undoubtedly a genius but a satanic genius, a creator of perfect works of art and immorality, a singer of songs simple in texture but harboring subtle poison. Other journals of the pre-Victorian decade depict him as an apostate, a Jacobine propagandist, a blasphemous unbeliever, a literary outlaw, a hyper-ultra-revolutionist. Carlyle, who was in the 1830's the chief English interpreter of German letters, refused to rank him with Jean Paul or Novalis, and berated visitors who dared to plead Heine's cause. Carlyle throughout his long life remained the English champion of the Weimar tradition and the foe of Young Germany. Once he called Heine a blackguard. On another occasion he referred to him as a filthy sausage of spoiled victuals. He raged at Matthew Arnold for esteeming obscene, impudent, untruthful Heine the continuator of

Goethe. Under Carlyle's influence, Charles Kingsley speaks of Heine as "that wicked man."

The early hostile approach ebbed after Queen Victoria came to the throne in 1837. It ebbed but it did not disappear. There were three distinct avenues through which Heine's influence made itself felt. In the first place, there were the English reviews and English translations, which increased in number and depth of insight from year to year. In the second place, there were Englishmen, such as George Meredith and Julian Fane, who studied or travelled in Germany at a time when Heine's literary star was in the ascendancy and his songs were captivating the hearts of his countrymen. In the third place, there were Englishmen, such as Colonel John Mitchell and Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton, who stayed in France and who came in contact with the exiled German poet and his circle of Parisian admirers. By 1847 Heine had become the living shade of the Champs Elysees. In that year the false rumor of his death went the rounds of the press, and the premature obituaries were not unfriendly. His long illness and the fortitude with which he bore his misfortunes won him much sympathy in England. If the *Reisebilder* and the political tracts of young Heine had outraged English public opinion, *Romanzero* and the *Confessions* of the dying Heine effected a lasting reconciliation. The martyr of Montmartre spoke to the hearts of readers who had failed to react to the political pamphleteer.

George Eliot's apotheosis of Heine in 1856 ushered in the mid-Victorian era of Heine-worship in England. With the poet's death in that year, the tradition of Heine as the brilliant continuator of Goethe gained a lasting foothold. Arnold's essay of 1863, followed by his Heine-poem, was the highest crest of the wave of adoration that surged over England. To Arnold, Heine was the most important successor of Goethe, the critically-minded Goethe, the liberator from ancient dogmas and inherited traditions, the dissolvent of the old European system, the awakener of the modern spirit, the enemy of Philistinism—a term which Arnold took over from Heine and popularized in England.

According to Arnold, Heine sought to rouse Germany from the drowsiness of Philistinism. He did not succumb to the lure of medievalism as did his Romantic contemporaries who came to ruin, dreaming vainly of renewing the past. He did for German letters what Byron and Shelley had attempted for English letters; he was more successful than they, because of his greater creative ability.

By 1870 the battle for Heine had been won. He had entered into the English cultural stream. He had become as much a part of Western literary tradition as had Voltaire or Goethe or Byron. His authority was frequently quoted in justification of certain ideas or in opposition to others. Thackeray enjoyed him in translation, while John Addington Symonds and Havelock Ellis gained mastery of German by becoming absorbed in him in the original text. Maurice Hewlett, A. E. Housman, and Robert Bridges echoed him in their verses. Heine's Hellenism influenced Walter Pater and Robert Buchanan, James Thomson and Swinburne. His authority was frequently quoted in the struggle between Christ and the Gods of Greece, a struggle which led, on the one hand, to a revival of religious mysticism and, on the other hand, to a poetic idealization of ancient paganism during late Victorian decades. Heine's study of the *Gods in Exile* is the basis for several of Walter Pater's best essays, beginning with *Pico della Mirandola* in 1871. The rehabilitation of the old gods was a passion with Pater as it had been with Pico and with Heine. In *Apollo in Picardy*, 1893, Pater told of the reappearance of the sun-god in medieval disguise on a morastic farm in France. Pater in *Aucassin and Nicolette* also coupled the Heloise and Abelard story with the legend of Venus and Tannhäuser, as told by Heine. The goddess who was once the world's delight again charmed the imagination of poets—and not she alone. Christ, "the leavings of racks and rods," was contrasted with Apollo, the lord of light. As in ancient days there had reverberated the lament that the great god Pan was dead, so in late Victorian days there often arose in literary circles the triumphant shout of the coming end of the Nazarene's rule. Under the influence of Heine, James Thomson called for the overthrow of the celestial dynasty that had ruled for eighteen hundred years. Heine, the cultural pessimist, appealed to the darker side of Thomson. Heine, the spiritual brother of Leopardi and the scouter at all things traditional, confirmed the gloomy English bard in his despair and disgust amidst the noisy solitude of London. Heine, the sardonic seer of a coming apocalypse, supplied literary weapons to Thomson, the political nihilist. Heine, the modern satyr who gloated because the death of all the gods was at hand, spurred the English radical and atheist on to greater extremes of blasphemy. Seeking solace in drink and in poetry, Thomson often quoted the martyr of Montmartre who questioned fate and who finally concluded that the only answer which ever came was a handful of earth that stopped up the mouth of the questioner.

Emphasis upon Heine's Hellenism added lustre to his kaleidoscopic personality as reinterpreted by the late Victorians, but there was also emerging at the turn of the century an equally important evaluation of Heine as the champion of democracy. The Irish poet William Sharp depicted him in 1888 as a fighter for the liberation of humanity, as a drummer for a new democratic order, waking Europe out of its sleep. Havelock Ellis hailed him as the brilliant

leader of a revolutionary movement aiming at world-wide emancipation. His vision was directed towards a democracy of gods, all equally holy, blessed, and glorious. Others might be content with simple clothing, ascetic morals, unseasoned enjoyments. Heine desired for all mankind nectar and ambrosia, purple robes, costly perfumes, pleasures and splendor. To the English of the early twentieth century, such as Edward Dowden, H. W. Meyinson, Arthur Ransome, Heine was the aristocrat of democracy, a European cosmopolitan. On the eve of 1914, his popularity exceeded that of Goethe. During the First World War, Heine did not suffer from the hostility directed at all things German. There was general disapproval of a proposal in 1917 to remove the Heine tablet in London, since he was a pioneer of the democratic tradition for which young English and American idealists were dying on the battlefields of Europe. Between the two World Wars nine full-length biographies of Heine appeared—so great was his vogue in England.

Since the Second World War, the aspect of Heine which has been most stressed in England and America as well as in Russia and on the European Continent has been that of Heine as a Citizen of the World, as a prophet of the unity of man when all national boundaries will have lost their exaggerated importance and the oneness of humanity will have been proclaimed.

In the past decade Heine has been rehabilitated in Germany, a rehabilitation which reached its climax in the Heine Congress at Weimar in October 1956, when scholars of Eastern Germany and Western Germany joined hands with scholars of sixteen nations in honoring his memory. Amendments were made for all the filth with which he had been besmirched during the preceding years and a definitive, critical edition of all his works was projected as a common venture of scholars the world over and as a tribute to his enduring vitality. In England no amendments were necessary, for England has throughout the past century granted his spirit and his ideas refuge and hospitality, warmth and fruition, understanding and affection. Heine has definitely entered into the cultural stream which irrigates England's intellectual life.

The City College of New York

Sol Liptzin

VICTORIAN SHAW

In studying St. John Ervine's *Bernard Shaw: His Life, Work and Friends* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1956) and Archibald Henderson's *George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), one is struck anew by the number of Shaw's activities, by the distinction he attained in each, and by the fact that he reached full expression by 1901 in some of them—as a Fabian thinker, art critic, music critic, and drama critic. Shaw's prophetic seriousness, his iconoclastic view of current social modes, his vitalist philosophy, his didactic theory of art, and his concept of the drama as intellectual discussion had achieved definition before *Man and Superman* (1903), though that play is unique both in summing up the Shaw of the thirty years preceding and in indicating Shaw's course in the forty some years to follow. One half of the space in each of these centenary biographies and much of the new material in them concerns the Shaw who lived during Victoria's reign. Through access to the shorthand notebooks of the late eighties and nineties, Mr. Ervine has fully presented Shaw's love affairs in these years and made more vital the writer who, at that time, was chiefly the dynamic socialist and critic. Other new items in this book comprise letters to the Charringtons and to the Ervines themselves. In Mr. Henderson's book, documentation in detail of Shaw's activities in the Shelley, Browning, Shakespeare, and Hampstead Historical Societies is especially valuable in revealing Shaw's protean interests during the eighties and nineties. Other hitherto unused sources in Mr. Henderson's book—the letters to the Webbs, to the Mansfields, and to Mrs. August Belmont, and the materials on the Shaw-Wells controversy—deal in part with the nineteenth-century Shaw, though more fully with the Edwardian and later Shaw.

As Shaw recedes into the past, what he owes both to the forces which shaped the Victorian Period and to Victorian critics of these forces becomes steadily more apparent. In prose and drama down to *Man and Superman* (1903)—and after—Shaw revealed a vibrant interest in all that went on in "that benighted period" of the nineteenth century: the expansion of industry, the aggrandizement of capital, the poverty and insecurity of Labor, the domination by the middle class of business and social morality, the widespread demands for political freedom and social improvement, the unsettling of belief in moral and religious absolutes, the revolutionary effect of Darwinism upon the bases of thought, the impact of Manchester laissez-faire upon economics and politics, the restrictive influence of evangelicalism, and the transcendentalist and aesthetic reaction against a rationalism based upon science and utilitarianism. On the one hand, while protesting at the Browning Society in 1888 over the easy optimism expressed in "Saul" ("all is love and all is law"), Shaw could call the nineteenth century "the most desperately mean, sordid, selfish, rascally, dastardly century that any one could wish to live in"; on the other hand, he could not have become so imbued with the idealism of most Victorian

artists and social critics—which was expressed not only as moral indignation toward a constricting materialism in philosophy and present social injustices but also as a confident affirmation of the reality of man's spirit—if he had not been so immersed in the culture of the age.

In the conflict between the rationalistic and the transcendental approach to reality, Shaw was on both sides. If in origin Shaw's basic values were intuitive, he also emphasized the importance of a clear intelligence. As a playwright, Shaw became a "scientific natural historian," aiming to arrive experimentally at ethical principles instead of a moralist arguing from already deduced principles. Through his early association with the Zetetical Society, this "rationalist" Shaw was formed by the influences of Mill, Malthus, Ingersoll, Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, and George Eliot; he remained faithful, until its last days, to the Dialectical Society founded by John Stuart Mill; with Sidney Webb and other Fabians, he embraced the gradualist socialism envisaged by Mill and the inductive approach to social questions enjoined by Bentham. Among other influences upon the Fabians and Shaw were Comte, Cairnes, Ricardo, Buckle, and Proudhon. Shaw's common sense led him, moreover, to distrust as impractical the visionary socialism of Owen, Fourier, Comte, Tolstoi, and even of Morris. In his own social philosophy, Shaw was essentially pragmatic and revealed his affinity with the Victorian spirit of compromise, the hypocritical manifestations of which, however, Shaw continually attacked. His practicality made him impatient of the unrealities which obscured social institutions at the same time that it made him reluctant to discard them, once needed reforms had been secured. In *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* (1891) and in *Getting Married* (1908), for example, Shaw held that marriage was necessary to insure "the continuity of society" because sexual love is too unstable to do so. From Mill—as well as from Plato—Shaw derived his pragmatic view that truth emerges from the interplay of conflicting points of view, a concept underlying the dialectical ingenuity of most of his plays.

With Shaw, thought became a passion and more, therefore, than an intellectual process: he was one for whom "subjective volition, passion, will make intellect the merest tool." In *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, he declared that "materialistic" science had only "isolated the great mystery of consciousness" just as rationalism had only "isolated the great mystery of the will to live." Like Arnold in his humanism, Shaw thought that right reason is indistinguishable as the critical faculty but that it does not give us that insight into ultimate reality provided by the naked consciousness. Like Butler and Meredith, Shaw started with the Darwinian hypothesis, but modified it—with help from Schopenhauer—into a philosophy of evolutionary dynamism, with its prime emphasis upon the individual's creative energies. In conceiving life to be "the satisfaction of a passion in us of which we can give no account whatsoever," Shaw rejected the materialistic implications of much popular Darwinism and the Utilitarian emphasis upon the logical intellect, and became—with Carlyle, Arnold, Ruskin, and the Pre-Raphaelites—one of the most trenchant critics of Victorian rationalism as it expressed itself in the ethics of the "moral calculus," in the soulless scientific treatise, in the "liberal" political economy of Cobden and Bright, and in the Philistine devaluation of the arts, of culture, and of the religious impulse.

"Metaphysical vitalism," so strongly a part of Shaw's philosophy, underlay his political and social thinking. References to Carlyle, Ruskin, and Morris are far more frequent in Shaw than those to Mill, Ricardo, and Bentham. Carlyle's concepts of hero as vital leader and of society as organically cohesive, Morris's concentrated fervor, and Ruskin's "vital economy" appealed to Shaw's imagination far more than did the dry logic of the Utilitarians. Ruskin was the chief influence. More than any other nineteenth-century thinker, Ruskin gave to politics and economics a humane relevance, Shaw maintained, by insisting that its basis become moral rectitude rather than commercial expediency. Like Ruskin, Shaw repudiated Manchester laissez-faire and urged that cooperation rather than competition be made the chief operative principle in economics. With Ruskin, Shaw felt that the great economic and social problem was to improve methods in the consumption of wealth rather than in the production of it. Shaw also embraced the Toryism of Ruskin in declaring that Ruskin—like Dickens—believed in government of the people for the people but not by the people. That the captain of industry—or "boss"—had to be a responsible social servant rather than "a hopelessly private person" exploiting society for his own advantage, Shaw, like Ruskin in "The Roots of Honor," emphasized from the beginning. Most elaborately, this concept was developed in Shaw's late play, *The Millionairess* (1936). Like Ruskin in *Fors Clavigera*, Shaw believed that the manifestations of man's mind and spirit were social wealth just as much as the goods for which a cash return could be expected. The revolutionary zeal of Marx and Morris—held in abeyance in Shaw until after World War I—exerted greater ultimate pressure upon Shaw, however, than did the aristocratic feudalism of Ruskin. After the first World War, Shaw reached the dubious conclusion that the "leader" may have to impose a new social order through force and that catastrophic revolution may at first be necessary to inaugurate the socialist bureaucracy. In the 1940's, Shaw recognized the superiority of

the upper five per cent to the great man *per se*, and called for a democratic aristocracy culled from all the classes—a modern version of Arnold's "saving remnant." Another parallel between Arnold and Shaw suggests itself: both were critical of the middle class yet both felt that in the awakening of this class lay the hope for the future.

Shaw's emphasis upon vitality determined his views upon Victorian social morality. For the conventional, tepid thinking of the age, Shaw had the same scorn as Carlyle, declaring in *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* that the humane artist always penetrates to "the reality beneath the clothes." "Laws, religions, creeds, systems of ethics," Shaw declared in *The Sanity of Art*, are too often out of date and must be altered to ensure the health of society. Shaw, like Carlyle, was impatient with the mistaken illusions which impede clear thinking, and condemned the hypocrisies of a "bourgeois morality" which was, he felt, "a system of making cheap virtue a cloak for expensive vices." Anathema then to Shaw were those popular playwrights who poured water "on the exhausted tea-leaves of idealism and romanticism." In wishing comedy to be a means for "the destruction of old-fashioned morals," Shaw wrote out of the same anxious impulse which caused Carlyle to expose bourgeois complacency in *Sartor Resartus* and *Past and Present*. Along with Ruskin and Carlyle, Shaw was iconoclastic rather than anarchistic; and along with Matthew Arnold, he preferred the solidarity conferred by culture to the irresponsible individualism encouraged by modern libertarian movements in politics. For telling the unillusioned truth about the Victorian Age, Shaw praised Thackeray, though, as an "insider," he did not fully attain, Shaw felt, the outsider's dispassionate view of his own society, as Dickens was to do in his great "third manner." The debt to Dickens was aesthetic as well, for Shaw admits to "lifting characters bodily out of the pages of Charles Dickens" and refers to him more than to any other novelist, despite the fact that he was no "artist-philosopher." An even stronger realist is Ibsen, who, in his plays, Shaw held, "exalts not the ideal at the expense of life, but life at the expense of the ideal."

Philosophically, Shaw is typical of the Victorian Age, revealing the conflicts between the absolute and the relative points of view. Typical absolutes from tradition like "honor, duty, justice," Shaw in *Man and Superman* called "the seven deadly virtues" and asserted that "all the wickedness on earth is done in their name." Like Pater, Shaw wished to undermine absolute categories in speculative and ethical thinking; and like another Victorian modernist, Samuel Butler, Shaw tried to discredit entities he thought outworn by inverting their accepted valuation. Under some circumstances, Shaw maintained that selfishness could become virtue and apparent goodness a vice—thus Don Juan's egocentric quest for self-realization is heroic, whereas Doña Ana's chastity on earth lacked the vital warmth to become true virtue. In *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, Shaw presented Ibsen in his own image as an ethical relativist who attacked as "man-eating idols red with human sacrifice" abstractions like Society, the People, Democracy, "the compact Liberal Majority," "the Authority of the Law," Womanly Duty, Self-sacrifice, Goodness and so on. In his own plays, Shaw shows that completely good and bad men are rare: in *Widower's Houses* (1892), Sartorius is an opportunist with some intelligence while Harry Trench is a high-principled youth without moral courage; in *Captain Brassbound's Conversion* (1899), the Captain is as mistaken in pursuing a vengeance for lofty reasons as his antagonist, Hallam, is in literally interpreting the law as a retributive agency.

If Shaw looked beyond the Victorian Age in his iconoclasm, he was yet of this period in his affirmations. Like the other critics of the Victorian social scene, Shaw felt that "the man of letters... is a prophet or nothing" and proclaimed, accordingly, his own vitalist faith which recognized an ultimate reality in the spirit and its attributes. Like Shelley, Shaw was responsive to "beautiful idealisms of moral excellence," and spoke in "The Preface" to *The Doctor's Dilemma* (1906) of "the great vital dogmas of honor, liberty, courage, the kinship of all life," and in "The Impossibilities of Anarchism" (1893) of "Justice, Virtue, Truth, Brotherhood, the highest interests of the people," as the concern of all political parties. In other words, absolutes can secure men's allegiance, so long as they are more than mere words and remain vitally infused with spirit.

Shaw's views on art illustrate the provenance of the absolute and the relative in his thought. Granted that a dramatist is to be a natural historian analyzing with his intelligence the hypocrisies of his age, he ought also to regard himself as, potentially, a powerful ethical force. To Shaw, the theater was to become a Church, "a temple of the Ascent of Man," and to Shaw, as to Arnold, the greatest art was a force religious in its ultimate influence. As a result, Shaw regarded modern European literature and music as a Bible surpassing, in immediacy to the modern spirit, the importance of the Hebrew scriptures. That great art induces such spiritual exaltation was a view previously set forth by Carlyle, Ruskin, and Arnold, among others. Accordingly, Shaw agreed with Carlyle that art can excite to spiritual heroisms, with Arnold that "the noble and profound application of ideas to life is the most essential part of

poetic greatness," with Ruskin that the greatest art "conveys...the greatest number of the greatest ideas," with Ruskin and Morris that the quality of a nation's art determines its degree of civilization, and with Pater that "great art" surpasses "good art" by bearing upon "the great structure of human life":

art, should refine our sense of character and conduct, of justice and sympathy, greatly heightening our self-knowledge, self-control, precision of action, and considerateness, and making us intolerant of baseness, cruelty, injustice, and intellectual superficiality or vulgarity. The worthy artist or craftsman is he who serves the physical and moral sense by feeding them with pictures musical compositions, pleasant houses and gardens, good clothes and fine implements, poems, fictions, essays, and dramas which call the enlightened sense and ennobled faculties into pleasurable activity. The great artist is he who goes a step beyond the demand, and, by supplying works of a higher beauty and a higher interest than have yet been perceived, succeeds after a brief struggle with its strangeness, in adding this fresh extension of sense to the heritage of the race. This is why we value art: this is why we feel that the iconoclast and the Philistine are attacking something made holier, by solid usefulness, than their own theories of purity and practicality: this is why art has won the privileges of religion...

The originality of Pre-Raphaelitism and French Impressionism Shaw appreciated and defended against Nordau and other conservatives. Shaw felt, however, that ethical content made Morris, especially in his prose work, a greater writer than Swinburne, who, once a diabolian, ended as a "Shakespeare-fearing man." Though undoubtedly influenced by the emphasis upon wit, paradox, startling statement, and self-advertisement in the 1890's, Shaw, as befitted a Puritan in art, condemned art for art's sake ("for art's sake' alone I would not face the toil of writing a single sentence.") In "The Preface" to *Three Plays for Puritans* (1901) he declared that were the arts to become "instruments of a systematic idolatry of sensuousness," and to interfere with "intellectual activity and honesty," he would have less compunction than Cromwell in eradicating them. "An artist to his finger-tips," Shaw yet believed that art should disseminate the higher propaganda.

In the drama, Shaw broke with the fashionable theater of the day which featured extrapolated Shakespeare and the "well-made" plays of Sardou, Augier, and their imitators. The latter works, Shaw held, were morally frivolous, exalting adultery, for example, at the same time that they failed to deal honestly with sex. Idealism and romance pervaded the stage, and had to be supplanted, Shaw insisted, by realistic drama which would use the techniques of "rhetoric, irony, argument, paradox, epigram, parable, the re-arrangement of haphazard facts into orderly and intelligent situations." Discussion was to become an organic part of the play, even pervade the whole play if necessary, as in Shaw's *Getting Married* and *Heartbreak House*. Henry Arthur Jones in the English theater—like Dickens in the novel—approximated such a healthy realism in being a critical outsider in his relation to society; Pinero—like Thackeray—was an insider who lacked critical power to deal quite objectively with his milieu. Shaw appreciated the originality of Wilde and Gilbert, who saw convention from a new angle, but he felt that they were temperamentally too superficial to have lasting influence in the theater.

Beneath his surface iconoclasm, the prevalence of Victorian attitudes in Shaw is marked. Nowhere is this more pronounced than in his ethical seriousness and in his consciously proclaimed spiritual dedication as a writer. In 1905 Shaw was to describe himself in these terms, "I have honour and humanity on my side, wit in my head, skill in my hand, and a higher life for my aim"; and in 1910, he declared that "conscience is the most powerful of all instincts and the love of God the most powerful of all the passions." What do such assertions reveal but the moral idealism of the great Victorians expressed in scarcely different terms from their own? It was Shaw's great distinction to make assertions like these once more meaningful by clearing away their frequent basis in hypocrisy or in devitalized abstractions.

State University of Iowa

Frederick P. W. McDowell

LESLIE STEPHEN'S STATURE AS A LITERARY CRITIC

Leslie Stephen wished that "injudicious admirers might always abstain from acting as resurrection-men" (*Hours in a Library* 1, 177). Mr. Ullmann (in Leslie Stephen, *Men, Books and Mountains*. Essays. Collected, and with an Introduction, by S. O. A. Ullmann. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956) is such a "resurrection-man." He has collected eleven essays which Stephen never reprinted. Most of them should have been left in their burial places: a trivial essay on "Vacations", some sensible reflections on national prejudices, a squib suggesting that Shakespeare wrote Bacon, some commonplace remarks on biography, an easy demolition of Bulwer-Lytton's novels and a descriptive piece about Mont Blanc from the *Alpine Journal*. Still,

students of criticism will be grateful to Mr. Ullmann for the careful checklist of Stephen's books and articles and for the reprinting of three essays: a lecture on "The Study of Literature" (1887), a review of Taine's *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* (1873), and an essay "Thoughts on Criticism, by a Critic" (1876) which is the fullest statement of his critical creed.

Inevitably, Mr. Ullmann's collection of gleanings raises the question of Stephen's stature as a literary critic. There can be no doubt of his general distinction in various fields: as a mountaineer, I presume, as the first editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography* who alone contributed 378 articles, as a biographer who wrote five volumes (Johnson, Pope, Swift, George Eliot, Hobbes) for the English Men of Letters series, as a moral philosopher who expounded agnosticism and an evolutionary *Science of Ethics* (1882), and finally and most eminently as an intellectual historian whose *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (1876) and the *English Utilitarians* (1900) put him possibly first among the neglected band of Victorian intellectual historians: Buckle, Lecky, John Morley, Flint, Mertz, Adamson, to name only a few.

But strictly from the point of view of literary criticism Stephen's position and importance are more debatable. Desmond MacCarthy in a lecture on Leslie Stephen (1937) called him "the least aesthetic of noteworthy critics" and complained that he is "deficient in the power of transmitting emotions he had derived himself from literature; he seldom, if ever, attempted to record a thrill." Q. D. Leavis, in an article in *Scrutiny* (Vol. 7, 1939), on the other hand, thought such deficiency an asset as criticism is "not a mystic rapture but a process of intelligence". Stephen for her is a great critic precisely because he is a sturdy moralist, the true "Cambridge critic", presumably a spiritual ancestor of her husband. Noel G. Annan, in his excellent general book on Stephen (1952), tried to strike a balance. He admits Stephen's limitations but still claims him as "Arnold's disciple" who "did for English fiction what Arnold has tried to do for poetry" (p. 256).

The comparison with Arnold will not, however, withstand inspection. Stephen does not share his faith in classical humanism, either ancient or Goethean. He does not advocate culture, criticism, or an opening of doors to Continental winds of doctrine and he does not believe in the future of poetry. As the review of Taine shows, he doubts the value of racial types, Celtic, Teutonic and Latin, so prominent in Arnold's criticism. He never uses touchstones. In a lecture on Arnold (1893) Stephen himself says that Arnold's intellectual type was different from his own. "Had Arnold been called upon to pronounce judgment upon me, he must, however reluctantly, have put me down as a Philistine" (*Studies of a Biographer*, 2, 79). Philistinism surely means here Stephen's own basic Utilitarianism which he tried elaborately to reconcile with Darwinian evolutionism. It means, in literary criticism, a frank intellectualism and moralism.

The essay on "Wordsworth's Ethics" begins characteristically: "Under every poetry, it has been said, there lies a philosophy. Rather it may almost be said, every poetry is a philosophy" (HL 2, 250). Anticipating the very phrasing of A. O. Lovejoy's statement that "ideas in literature are philosophical ideas in dilution", Stephen studies literature because "it holds a number of intellectual dogmas in solution" (HL 2, 253). He tries to extract from Wordsworth's poetry an ethics which, he confidently believes, will "spontaneously fall into a scientific system of thought" (HL 2, 256).

Stephen, however, is well aware of the difference between a philosophical treatise and a piece of imaginative literature. The whole aesthetic doctrine seems to him "a misstatement of the very undeniable and very ancient truth, that it is the poet's business, to present types, for example, and not to give bare psychological theory" (SB 2, 90). The poet must incarnate his thought in concrete imagery. "The morality, for example, of Goethe and Shakespeare appears in the presentation of such characters as Iago and Mephistopheles" (HL 2, 187). The role of criticism, or, at least one of its roles, will be a translation into intellectual terms of what the poet has told us by characters and events. The title of one of Stephen's essays "Pope as a Moralist" could analogously be given to almost all of his other articles.

But of course Stephen is not content with this role of translator: he judges and ranks his authors according to their implied moral philosophies. The standard is that of a secular, social morality which teaches us to recognize the "surpassing value of manliness, honesty, and pure domestic affection" (HL 2, 159) but still has a sense of evil, and a feeling for man's impotence and of the mystery around him. Shakespeare, Wordsworth, George Eliot, Scott meet these specifications and of all writers Dr. Johnson appeals to Stephen most by his morality and his sense of personal doom. On a lower level are the good commonsense moralists such as Pope and Fielding who have their limitations. "We scarcely come into contact with man as he appears in the presence of the infinite" (HL 2, 173). And then there are the writers whom Stephen usually calls "morbid", great and bitter men such as Swift, warped, protesting women such as Charlotte

Brontë, extravagant cynics such as Balzac, cloudy idealists such as Shelley and insincere buffoons such as Sterne.

This is, no doubt, moralistic criticism but it is literary criticism because it is concerned with the "world" of the poet, with his characters and events as they affect the characters, and with the literary value of the books, for Stephen is convinced of the basic identity of moral and aesthetic value. "The highest poetry must be that which expresses not only the richest but the healthiest nature," and "vicious feeling indicates some morbid tendency, and is so far destructive of the poetical faculty." "The vigour", he asserts, "with which a man grasps and assimilates a deep moral doctrine is a test of the degree in which he possesses one essential condition of the higher poetical excellence" (HL 2, 254-5). Within the limits of this conception Stephen analyzes the psychology of characters and the implicit morality of the chief English novelists from Defoe to Stevenson and applies the same procedure to dramatists such as Shakespeare or Massinger, to poets such as Pope, Gray or Shelley and to essayists such as De Quincy or Hazlitt. The criticism of books quite naturally passes into biography, into a judgment of the man rather than the work, for Stephen does not believe in the distinction. He can say that "the whole art of criticism consists in learning to know the human being who is partially revealed to us in his spoken or his written words" (HL 2, 3). He can identify the study of the life of Charlotte Brontë with the study of her novels (HL 3, 6) and he can become involved in the most awkward conundrums about Pope's "sincerity", since he admires him as a moralist and still has to accept the evidence, accumulated by Elwin, of his "lying on the most stupendous scale" (HL 1, 98).

Though Stephen has a professional grasp of British empirical philosophy he shies away from an analysis of the metaphysics, ontology or even theory of knowledge of the writers he discusses. He brushes off Wordsworth's "mysticism", sneers at Coleridge's philosophy and treats Shelley's Godwinian sensationalism and Platonic idealism as mere romantic moonshine. Nor do we get, of course, any analysis of technique, language or composition, whether in poetry or in fiction. He does on occasion recognize that "the technical merits of form can hardly be separated from the merits of substance" (HL 3, 110) but usually he "leaves such points to critics of finer perception and in a greater command of superlatives" (HL 3, 334 cf. HL 3, 61). The essay on Sterne has nothing whatever to say about *Tristram Shandy* as a novel: its parody of the novel-form, its handling of time, etc. The essays on Shelley and Coleridge shirk any discussion of the poetry. When Stephen recommends the address to Chaos from *The Dunciad* (Pope, 131-2) he quotes other people's opinions but carefully refrains from endorsing their praise. Occasional comments on Defoe's devices to enhance credibility (HL 1, 8ff.) or Richardson's difficulties with the epistolary form (HL 1, 64 f.) or Massinger's prosaic blank verse (HL 2, 144) are so rare that MacCarthy's conclusion about Stephen's criticism as the "least aesthetic" seems amply justified.

The moralistic point of view overrides also the historical and social point of view in Stephen. At first sight, he seems imbued with the historical method of his time. Certainly *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* contains passages which define the character of imaginative literature as a "function of many forces" (2, 330): the current philosophy, the inherited peculiarities of the race, its history, its climate, its social and political relations. The late lectures *English Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century* (1904) treat literature "as a particular function of the whole social organism" (p. 14), and Stephen's biographer, F. W. Maitland, reports that "I have heard him maintain that philosophical thought and imaginative literature...are but a sort of by-product of social evolution, or, as he once put it, 'the noise that the wheels make as they go round'" (p. 283). But however closely Stephen studies the relations between literature and history or of literature and the audience to which it was addressed, he is never willing to embrace the consequences of a sociological method: its complete determinism, its moral indifference, its relativistic suspension of judgment, its elimination of the individual. He complains that the "exaltation of the historical method threatens to become a part of our contemporary cant" (HL 2, 26), and ridicules the historical method if it means "accepting beliefs as fact without troubling about their reasons" (SB 2, 137). Even while he strongly recommends the study of English history and intellectual currents to the student of English literature, he recognizes that there is "a vast difference between what is called knowing a thing's history and really knowing the thing itself" (*Men, Books, and Mountains*, p. 220). He holds firmly to a fixed standard of morality which alone lifts him above the flux of history and allows him to judge literature, even though he himself, paradoxically enough, in his *Science of Ethics* tried to explain even ethics as a result of the process of evolution.

But apart from morality and truth Stephen has no standards or theory for literature. He expressly denies that there can be a science of aesthetics, or any general rules or principles

of criticism even though he recommends that the critic proceed in a scientific spirit, with due regard to facts, dispassionately, with "a certain modesty and diffidence in forming opinions" (MBM, p. 232). At most he grants "that there is surely no harm in a man's announcing his individual taste if he expressly admits that he is not prescribing to the taste of others" (Ib. 217). It seems significant that we hear nothing of ugliness or bad art. He can even say that "all criticism is a nuisance and a parasitic growth upon literature" (ELS, p. 6). "The one great service a critic can render is to keep vice, vulgarity, or stupidity at bay." (MBM, 231).

Ultimately Stephen simply distrusts art. Like his Utilitarian and Evangelical friends he concedes that "there is a good deal to be said for the thesis that all fiction is really a kind of lying, and art in general is a luxurious indulgence to which we have no right whilst crime and disease are rampant in the outer world" (HL 3, 143). He defends the author's comments in the novels of Fielding and Thackeray with an argument which makes him hardly a safe guide to fiction. "A child dislikes to have the illusion broken and is angry if you try to persuade him that Giant Despair was not a real person like his favourite Blunderbore. But the attempt to produce such illusions is really unworthy of a work intended for full-grown readers" (HL 3, 197).

This basic scepticism and even nihilism about the value of literature and the rights of criticism, rather than the modest self-disparagement which Mr. Ullmann considers so damaging, are the reasons for the present neglect of Stephen as a critic. His certainties are purely moral, not metaphysical or aesthetic, and even his acute moralistic criticism will be felt today narrowly circumscribed by his view of human nature and history. His moral vision, earnest, public-spirited, upright as it is, seems cramped by the complacencies and facile assumptions of his positivistic and utilitarian creed. We can fully recognize his great historical merits, especially in his defense of the kindred values of eighteenth-century literature. We can admire the sober analytical skill of many of his essays (especially in *Hours in a Library*, a collection greatly superior to the *Studies of a Biographer*). But we must admit the grave limitations of a sensibility which treats literature either as a moral statement in disguise or as a social and psychological document. It is hard to believe that Stephen's criticism can be made to speak to our time.

Yale University

René Wellek

NEWMAN AND THE PROBLEM OF CRITICAL PROSE

The Imperial Intellect (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955) is unquestionably the finest study of Cardinal Newman's educational ideas which has ever appeared. But despite the importance of A. Dwight Culler's achievement, his book suggests certain fundamental limitations of present scholarly and critical methods as applied to non-fiction prose, and of modern criticism and scholarship generally.

In tracing the genesis of Newman's *The Idea of a University* Professor Culler has divided his book into three parts: the first, an account of Newman's educational theories up to the time of the Dublin lectures; the second, an account of the circumstances surrounding the Dublin lectures themselves; and the last, an examination of the *Idea of a University*, which draws heavily upon Newman's past and the situation in Ireland as he saw it when he composed what many regard as his masterpiece. In his account of Newman's educational theory up to 1850 Culler has gone so far as to examine the textbooks with which Newman worked as an undergraduate and as a Fellow and tutor. Few Victorians can read this first portion of *The Imperial Intellect* without learning a great deal about education at Oxford in the early nineteenth century. It seems to me that Culler must have checked every book which Newman mentions in the *Apologia* and every teacher to whom he refers, so that the first hundred-odd pages of *The Imperial Intellect* are as much a background for the *Apologia* as for the work toward which it is specifically directed.

In the second part of his book he has relied heavily on Fergal McGrath's *Newman's University, Idea and Reality*. For the Dublin background of the lectures and for the actuality of Newman's Catholic University of Ireland as distinct from the theory, McGrath's book remains the standard authority, as Culler would be the first to concede. What McGrath did and what Culler emphasizes is to show the difference between Newman as a theorist of education and Newman as the Rector of a University. People used to talk of Newman as an impractical idealist who conceived of a University as a priest-ridden seminary dominated by theology. According to such talk, insofar as he allowed any concern with the world in his university, he allowed only the introduction of the liberal arts, provided they were sufficiently impractical. The truth is exactly the opposite. Newman as a Rector established a medical school which has had a distinguished record, concentrated on an engineering curriculum, and emphasized research. The remainder of his meager resources he devoted to the liberal arts.

In the last portion of his book Culler examines the educational ideal of Newman carefully, pointing out that it is an expression of the light that never was on land or sea, that Newman knew it was an impossibility, but that he also knew it was the kind of impossibility

which man must try to realize. What he was aiming at was the definition of the quality which distinguishes a university education from the education given by special schools, special interests, and special curricula. And in this aim Newman succeeded so well that he is a great deal clearer than Professor Culler, who obscures the aerial clarity of Newman's work by raising objections and suggesting alternatives which Newman sometimes mentioned, sometimes ignored, and sometimes knew nothing about. Culler's erudition is apparent, and he rehearses most effectively the Victorian arguments for and against certain educational theories, as in Chapter 11, "The Uses of Knowledge," where he concisely summarizes the great debate of 1808-1811 between Richard Payne Knight and Sydney Smith on the one side, and Edward Copleston and John Davison on the other. Nevertheless the third part of *The Imperial Intellect* is occasionally irritating.

The trouble is, Culler wrestles with many inconsistencies which are not inconsistencies at all. For example, he is dismayed because Newman, having successfully defended Knowledge as its own end, and Philosophy as the good which a liberal education procures for its students, insists that such an education is useful. "Would that he had not gone on, in the seventh discourse, to reinforce a good argument with a bad by telling us that the knowledge which he had just recommended as 'not useful' was actually, if we considered the matter closely, more useful than 'useful knowledge' itself" (p. 219). And Culler continues, "In other words, he has done precisely what Bentham said that every opponent of the utilitarian philosophy must do, he has combated the principle of utility with reasons drawn 'from that very principle itself'" (p. 222).

There is no difficulty at all in Newman's position, nor need it dismay the defender of liberal education. Newman's words are perfectly clear and his argument as suave as usual.

Certainly it is specious to contend that nothing is worth pursuing but what is useful; and that life is not long enough to expend upon interesting, or curious, or brilliant trifles. Nay, in one sense, I will grant it is more than specious, it is true; but, if so, how do I propose directly to meet the objection? Why, Gentlemen, I have really met it already, viz., in laying down, that intellectual culture is its own end; for what has its *end* in itself, has its *use* in itself also. I say, if a Liberal Education consists in the culture of the intellect, and if that culture be in itself a good, here, without going further, is an answer to Locke's question; for if a healthy body is a good in itself, why is not a healthy intellect? and if a College of Physicians is a useful institution, because it contemplates bodily health, why is not an Academical Body, though it were simply and solely engaged in imparting vigour and beauty and grasp to the intellectual portion of our nature? (*The Idea of a University*, ed. C. F. Harrold, p. 143)

There is little to improve in the conduct of this passage, or of the whole argument of Discourses V-VIII. Culler's protracted wrestling has the effect of smearing Newman's page with sweat.

Culler is not at his best in his commentary on Newman's *Idea of a University*, because, as he himself has pointed out (*VNL*, April, 1956), a great expository work is its own best exposition. Any exposition of *Sartor Resartus* is less coherent than the work itself. A great essay defies exegesis, though it is certain to attract exegetes. But after any given century has put its gloss in the margin, the succeeding century finds that it can get illumination only by sweeping aside the gloss and going back to the text itself.

The grand Victorian essay is the attempt of a writer to fix, once and for all, his human attitude toward some problem of human existence, and when the attempt is successful, that attitude is fixed beyond change. True, in his own life the essayist may advance beyond this point, as Newman frequently advanced past the work which is taken by the dilettante as the final expression of his thought, but his great essays fix once and for all the attitude of a complex human being in all its complexity at the moment of expression.

Of course it will be observed that what I am saying about the essay is what modern criticism has said of the creative work, poetry, fiction, and drama. But as the New Criticism recedes into the past, I believe it is demonstrable that its canons, considered apart from its practice, are perhaps more applicable to the essay than to poetry, since the widespread application of its methods to poetry has yielded an enormous divergence of opinion on even small poems. On the other hand, the essay, so denigrated by modern critics, is the literary form which actually defies exposition because it does verily carry its own meaning, as a poem is said to do but does not. It is impossible to convey any other meaning into the essay or out of it, if it is read carefully.

But the diversity of response to poetry is easily explainable, if we study poetry in the light of the grand work of exposition. The essayist observes the mass of material which the

world outside presents to him and defines his attitude toward that material by means of carefully selected and brilliantly ordered references to it. He absorbs external reality and gives it a subjective form. Once formulated, this view—to employ one of Newman's favorite words—this view will color his opinions of life, it will to some extent govern his actions until the view itself changes, but even then the essay will remain as the record of the view as it once was, and the greater the complexity of the materials and the more perfect the synthesis in the mind of the essayist, the more lasting is the fascination of the essay.

If we now proceed to poetry, we have a fair means of seeing how we in fact distinguish between a major poet and a minor poet. A major poet is a poet who has completed the process of internal formulation with which the essayist stops, but who has now taken a further step. Having formulated his view he issues it forth embodied in an imitation of external reality, an imitation which is constructed by the light of the internal view. His reference is not to the real world, but to his created world. A minor poet is a poet whose technique is adequate, but who proceeds directly from external material to external form, omitting the internal formulation which is the business of the essayist.

Every great poem is a concealed essay which has been given external form, and the ultimate greatness of that external form must be sought not in the mechanical manipulations of rhetoric, but in the correspondence between that form and the unwritten essay. Consequently, the value of a poem depends, to a considerable extent, on the complexity, the consistency, and the maturity of the unwritten essay on which the poem rests.

Turning now to a critic who, as we have recently been assured, is really a good critic after all, namely Matthew Arnold, perhaps we can see a little more of what he meant when he said that the Romantic poets, for all their greatness, did not know enough. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" makes the point I have been laboring at. In back of every beautiful poetic object there lies a great critical effort, or a great internal synthesis. Sometimes the poet composes his own unwritten essay; in happier times the age does it for him, as the Renaissance did for Shakespeare. The Romantic poets were not the inheritors of an unwritten essay, neither did they compose it, except for Wordsworth, and it is precisely Wordsworth's superiority in this respect which makes him a better poet than Keats, who from the standpoint of mere form was a more accomplished poet than Wordsworth. What everyone knows on reading Wordsworth's poetry is that for all its defects it is informed by a profound and consistent view of the world, whether we agree with that view or not, and this is the "something integral" which Eliot finds in Wordsworth.

Because the poet expresses his view by creating a microcosm in imitation of nature, his work will be susceptible of multiple interpretations, one apparently as sound as the other. In the presence of external reality intelligent men arrive at different conclusions; therefore it is a mark of a great poem that it will so recreate external reality as to recreate the varied reactions of intelligent human beings to the world itself. Consequently the most careful study of the form of a poem apart from its biographical and social content will not lead us to an understanding of what the poem is really about. It will only lead us to an appreciation of a form, and this appreciation is at bottom what Pater said it was, the critic's examination of the state of his particular set of atoms in the face of a work of art. The business of the scholar in the face of a poem is to write the unwritten essay which lies behind it; by sifting the external materials which confronted the poet, he provides the internal formulation which the poet seldom makes explicit. The business of the critic is to examine the correspondence between the unwritten essay and the created form.

Modern criticism has developed remarkable techniques for analyzing the form of the creative work. Nevertheless, when we have analyzed the form of a Hemingway novel, when like Omar we have talked about it and about, we wonder if the form reflects an adequate view of life. When the cavalry has ridden by, Milton's form will still hold the field, yet a certain critic has wondered if Milton's theology was sound enough to support great poetry, and a certain other critic wondered about Chaucer's lack of high seriousness. It has been said that in a poem the form is the meaning, or the substance, or the subject, but that is verbal trickery. In the final judgment of a poem, if there is such judgment, much will depend on the same qualities which determine the greatness of an essay.

But the fascination of the microcosm and the exhilaration of tracing its reflection of the creative mind protect the poem from rash detraction. One man finds himself repelled by Eliot's Anglo-Catholicism, another by Faulkner's habitat, but both accept the poetry and the fiction by a suspension of belief. The essay has no such defense, because its reference is directly to reality. The veriest tyro can tell that Newman's work leads to Catholicism and anyone can pronounce on that; most undergraduates suspect that laissez-faire economics has its drawbacks, so they know what to do with Macaulay. The wild, living intellect of man does not attract them. What they want is a story.

In the face of the essay, the scholar can trace the development of the internal formulation; this is his proper work. By showing the roots of an essayist's thought in the events of his life and the circumstances of the society around him, by demonstrating the human drama of the essayist's struggle to comprehend the world about him, the scholar can win for his subject the tolerance of readers and perhaps, eventually, the respect and admiration that the Victorian sage deserves.

Florida State University

Francis G. Townsend

JOHN STUART MILL: THE SECOND GREATEST INFLUENCE

Hopefully, the recent publication of Iris Wessel Mueller's *John Stuart Mill and French Thought* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956) is a sign of the times. The publication of F. A. Hayek's *John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor* (1951), R. P. Anschutz' *The Philosophy of J. S. Mill* (1953), Karl Britton's *John Stuart Mill* (1953), Michael St. John Packe's *The Life of John Stuart Mill* (1954), and in 1956 of Mrs. Mueller's book all point to a renewed interest in the "saint of rationalism." Surely we need Mill's clarity of thought, his defense of liberty, his reasoned faith in the possibilities of democratic progress, and his appeal to the rational in man. We are reminded all too frequently by the events of our own savage and cruel century that man is irrational, capable of terrifying acts that harm both himself and others. But Mill appeals to the best in us; he assumes his readers capable of the kind of thought and discussion that civilizes the individual—that releases him to decide what is good for him and hence, Mill would say, good for mankind.

In his belief that man not only should but could develop to the utmost of his capacity—a belief that Mrs. Mueller traces with great care—Mill appears at times to be naive, especially when he so obviously relied on the simplicities of associational psychology for his concept of human nature. But if in some ways Mill was naive, in other ways he was exceedingly sophisticated and complex in his thought. Moreover, after his mental crisis he was ever willing to learn, to modify his ideas, and to develop them further.

In this development the most important influence, beyond that of the utilitarianism that was thrust upon him as he crawled out of the cradle, was unquestionably that of France and of French thought. And it is this influence that Mrs. Mueller traces in her book, which she divides into seven chapters, six of them concerned with Mill's reaction to a particular event in France or to a particular mode of French thought. Specifically Mrs. Mueller discusses in detail the following: Mill's sojourn in France in 1820, when he was a boy of fourteen; the impact of the French revolution of 1830 and its aftermath; the influence of the Saint-Simonians, of Auguste Comte, and of Alexis de Tocqueville; and the re-assessment in his ideas caused by the French revolution of 1848. In the final chapter, "The Later Years," Mrs. Mueller demonstrates how these influences worked out in Mill's most important writings. By presenting her material in great detail, Mrs. Mueller has indeed proved her main thesis: "the influence of the French school was second only to that Benthamite training from which he learned to desire the reformation of the world" (p. 259).

With this judgment there can be no quarrel, but in leading to this main thesis, Mrs. Mueller has made a point, repeated a number of times in different ways, that greatly oversimplifies and distorts Mill's final position on liberty. In one summation of her point, she states it in this way:

If there were any question that Mill's purpose when writing *On Liberty* was not to defend the individual in acts of an economic or political nature that could in any way affect the lives of others but to defend the individual only in his exceptionally important but greatly limited right of complete freedom of thought, it becomes inescapable that by the time he wrote *On Social Freedom* in 1873 he had reached this position. (p. 252)

In the first place, *On Liberty* is addressed to societies of people capable of self-development, menaced by the "tyranny of the majority," not ruled by despots, and not inhabited by barbarians. Surely the political organization of such a society is clear; it must be that of a representative government, and the right to hold opinions and to publish opinions is a political right. The very publishing of opinions is a political act. Second, by insisting that Mill restricted the right of the individual to thinking as he pleased and to publishing his opinions, Mrs. Mueller left unclear the problem that Mill was striving to solve: the point at which an act crosses the boundary between the "self-regarding" and the "social." In any tyrannical organization of society every act of man, except the most elementary, is a social one.

Perhaps Mrs. Mueller was led into making this overstatement by the ideas developed in *On Social Freedom*, an essay not published until 1907. Those puzzled by the concept that perhaps

free will is an illusion—the concept developed in the introductory section of *On Social Freedom*—and by other concepts contradictory to those in *On Liberty* may now at least give up the puzzles arising out of these particular contradictions. In 1956, too late for Mrs. Mueller's purpose, Professor J. C. Rees of the University College of Swansea published a pamphlet entitled *Mill and His Early Critics* (University College, Leicester). In the final section of that pamphlet, Professor Rees proves as conclusively as careful scholarship permits that Mill did not write *On Social Freedom*. He explains how he was first puzzled by the contradictions mentioned above, then led to an examination of the rest of Mill's writings in relation to *On Social Freedom*, and finally convinced by a careful analysis of the original manuscript that Mill could not have written the essay. Among his arguments Professor Rees makes two especially salient points: the handwriting of the original manuscript is neither Mill's nor Harriet Taylor's, and on its margin is a note indicating that the author was considering writing a volume that would cover the very same subjects that Mill had already discussed in *Political Economy*.

Even so, Mrs. Mueller's overstatement contains an element of truth. Under the influence of French thought Mill modified many of the ideas that he had once cherished, and he was certainly aware, as Mrs. Mueller indicates, that man sometimes must be interfered with so that he will act in the best interests of society. In reaching this conclusion, Mill had modified a number of his beliefs, and these modifications Mrs. Mueller has traced to their French sources. For one, Mill became convinced that history taught man a lesson in relativity: what was good for one society at one time was not necessarily good for another society at another time. This concept Mill became convinced of by the Saint-Simonians and by Comte, and Mrs. Mueller demonstrates how importantly it figured in the ideas set forth in his later writings, especially in *Considerations on Representative Government*. For another, Mrs. Mueller shows how Mill developed a plan for the organization of government that was a compromise of three elements: the expertness in government insisted upon by the Saint-Simonians and Comte, the wariness of democracy learned from de Tocqueville, and the need of self-development of the individual—a need terribly impressed upon Mill during his mental crisis. And so Mrs. Mueller takes up and discusses the effect of French thought on Mill's ideas on government, on capitalism and socialism, and on topics related to these: the secrecy of the ballot, the systems of proportional representation and of plural voting, the possibilities of workers' cooperatives, and the right to regulate the ownership of the land.

In the course of demonstrating how Frenchmen and events in France worked upon Mill, Mrs. Mueller keeps, and rightly so, her focus on Mill. For example, in Chapter II, "The French Revolution of 1830," Mrs. Mueller discusses in great detail Mill's series of articles, published in the *Examiner*, on French life and politics. We learn, virtually issue by issue, how distressed Mill became because of the reactionary policies of the post-revolutionary French Chamber of Deputies. There is no doubt justification for following Mill thus closely, for at that time he was just beginning to break away from utilitarianism and to begin his own considerations of the problems of society. And, generally speaking, Mrs. Mueller supplies enough material on the thinker or the event to which Mill is reacting to allow the reader to follow her argument.

More than once, however, Mrs. Mueller oversimplifies or distorts the ideas that Mill is considering. On page 121, she makes this statement:

As has been seen, the Saint-Simonians did not repudiate the principle of property as such but only the method by which it passed from one generation to the next in their particular age....

True, the Saint-Simonians considered property in its historical context, but they considered it to prove their point: that private property should eventually disappear through confiscation at the time of death. They looked forward to an era when property would be held by the state and distributed to individuals in accord with their contributions to the state. (See the "Septième Séance" of *Doctrine de Saint-Simon*, edited by C. Bouglé and Elie Halévy, Paris, 1924.) It is fair to say that Mrs. Mueller is more successful in explaining the developments in Mill's ideas than she is in describing the ideas that affected his.

Mrs. Mueller's book is a useful one for those interested in Mill and in the intellectual history of the nineteenth century. Hopefully, it will awaken even more interest in Mill than there is at present and gain for his ideas new receptiveness and consideration. In this bad time, when the best indeed lack all conviction, we cannot do much better than to reconsider Mill.

A final word: surely both Mrs. Mueller and Mill deserve better than the brilliant lilac of the cover, the black end papers, and the black borders with which the University of Illinois press saw fit to embellish *John Stuart Mill and French Thought*.

ENGLISH X NEWS
THE MADISON MEETING

I. THE PROGRAM

Chairman, JEROME H. BUCKLEY, Columbia University
Secretary, AUSTIN WRIGHT, Carnegie Institute of Technology

I. Papers and Discussion.

1. "Schopenhauer and Hardy's 'food for final Hope' in *The Dynasts*," Carl J. Weber, *Colby College*. (15 min.)
2. "Philomela: A Major Theme in Arnold's Poetry," Robert A. Donovan, *Cornell University*. (20 min.)
3. "The Theme of Marriage in Tennyson," W. Stacy Johnson, *Smith College*. (20 min.)

II. Business.

Advisory and Nominating Committee: Chairman, Francis E. Mineka, *Cornell University*. (1957-1958); *Jerome H. Buckley, *ex officio*; Carl Woodring, Lionel Stevenson (1956-1957); George Ford, Edgar P. Shannon (1957-1958); Bernard Schilling, Francis G. Townsend (1958-1959).

1957 Program Committee: Chairman, William E. Buckler, *New York University*, Ada Nisbet, A. Dwight Culler.

Bibliography Committee: Chairman, Francis G. Townsend, *Florida State University*; William D. Templeman; Robert Donovan; Robert C. Slack; Oscar E. Maurer; Charles T. Dougherty.

Editor, Victorian Newsletter: William E. Buckler, *New York University*.

1958 Officers: Chairman, Austin Wright, *Carnegie Institute of Technology*; Secretary, Edgar Johnson, *City College of New York*.

2. THE LUNCHEON

The Victorian Luncheon will be held in the Wisconsin Union at 12:45 on Monday, 9 September. The cost will be \$2.75. Reservations should be made in advance of the meeting with Professor Carl R. Woodring, Bascom Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS: A SELECTED LIST

(Compiled by Oscar Maurer, University of Texas)

GENERAL

- ANTHOLOGY. Kenneth and Miriam Allott, eds. *The Pelican Book of English Prose. Vol. V: Victorian Prose*. Penguin. Rev. *FLS* (Sept. 14), pp. 533-34.
- ART AND THEATRE. Bernard Denvir, "The Eastlakes." *Quarterly Rev.* (Jan.), pp. 85-97. On the first director of the National Gallery and his formidable wife.
Charles Merrill Mount, *John Singer Sargent*. Norton. Rev. *SR* (Nov. 26), p. 16.
Hesketh Pearson, *Beerbohm Tree: His Life and Laughter*. Methuen. Rev. *FLS* (Nov. 23), p. 692.
George Rowell, *The Victorian Theatre: A Survey*. Oxford. Includes a very useful bibliography.
- BIBLIOGRAPHY. Austin Wright, ed. *Bibliographies of Studies in Victorian Literature, 1945-1954*. Univ. of Illinois Press. Indispensable! The previous volume, edited by Templeman and covering the years 1932-1944, should now be reprinted: copies are difficult to find.
- CRITICISM AND LITERARY HISTORY. Howard G. Baetzold, "Mark Twain: England's Advocate." *American Literature* (Nov.), pp. 328-46. On Mark Twain's visits to England, 1872-74, and his reactions thereto.
Wayne Burns, "The Genuine and Counterfeit: A Study in Victorian and Modern Fiction." *CE* (Dec.), pp. 143-50. Will provoke discussion and disagreement. Trollope's *Warden*, for example, is "counterfeit" art because it provides "insulation rather than illumination."
Hoxie N. Fairchild, *Religious Trends in English Poetry. Vol. V; 1830-1880. Christianity and Romanticism in the Victorian Era*. Columbia.
Frederic E. Faverty, ed., *The Victorian Poets: A Guide to Research*. Harvard. Another indispensable book. Paul F. Baum on Tennyson; W. C. DeVane on Browning; Faverty on Arnold; C. K. Hyder on Swinburne; John Pick on Hopkins; A. M. Terhune on Mrs. Browning, Fitzgerald, and Clough; H. M. Jones on the Pre-Raphaelites; Lionel Stevenson on later poets. Introduction by J. H. Buckley.
Frank O'Connor, *The Mirror in the Roadway: A Study of the Modern Novel*. Knopf. Rev. by V. S. Pritchett in *NYTBR* (Sept. 23), p. 5. Lively chapters on Dickens, Thackeray, Trollope, and Hardy, and other English and European novelists.

- Kristian Smidt, "Points of View in Victorian Poetry." *English Studies*, Amsterdam (Feb.), pp. 1-12. On obliquity or ambiguity of point of view, personal or dramatic, in Tennyson and others.
- Patricia Thomson, *The Victorian Heroine: A Changing Ideal, 1837-1873*. Oxford, Rev. in *FLS* (Jan. 11), p. 21. An attempt to assess the effect of the feminist movement on the heroine of the novel.
- Geoffrey Tillotson, "Victorian Novelists and Near- Novelists." *Seaweed Rev.* (Autumn, 1956), pp. 663-75. A notable review article, dealing with recent work on Dickens, Thackeray, Eliot, Trollope, and the Brownings.
- Basil Willey, *More Nineteenth-Century Studies*. Chatto. Rev. *FLS* (Nov. 16), p. 680. Illuminating essays on such "honest doubters" as Tennyson, Jowett, Froude, Morley, Francis Newman, and Hale White.
- ECONOMICS AND POLITICS.** Allan Bullock and Maurice Shock, *The Liberal Tradition: Fox to Keynes*. Black. Rev. *FLS* (Nov. 23), p. 690.
- W. D. Jones, *Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism*. Blackwell.
- HISTORY.** Richard Barkeley, *The Empress Frederick, Daughter of Queen Victoria*. Macmillan. Rev. *FLS* (Aug. 17), pp. 481-82.
- G. P. Gooch, "Some Great English Historians." *Contemporary Rev.* (Dec.), pp. 344-49; (Jan.), pp. 19-24. On Hallam, Macaulay, Carlyle, Froude, Lecky, Seeley, Acton, and others.
- W. N. Medlicott, *Bismarck, Gladstone, and the Concert of Europe*. Athlone Press. Rev. *FLS* (Sept. 28), p. 563.
- A. J. P. Taylor, *Englishmen and Others*. Hamilton. Rev. *FLS* (Nov. 30), p. 706. Includes essays on Macaulay, Carlyle, Disraeli, and Bright.
- G. M. Young and W. D. Handcock, eds., *English Historical Documents, 1833-1874*. Eyre and Spottiswoode. Rev. *FLS* (Jan. 24), p. 44. A massive, invaluable collection; general introduction by Young.
- PERIODICALS AND JOURNALISM.** Robert A. Colby, "How It Strikes a Contemporary: The 'Spectator' as Critic." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Dec.), pp. 182-206. A highly useful account of R. H. Hutton and his work for the *Spectator*, 1861-97.
- PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.** Winthrop S. Hudson, "Survey of Recent Literature: British Church History." *Church History* (Sept.), pp. 258-61. "After long neglect," says Mr. Hudson, "the nineteenth century is beginning to receive serious attention from historical scholars."
- Thomas McPherson, "Henry Sidgwick and *The Methods of Ethics*." *Church Quarterly Rev.* (Oct.), pp. 453-62. On the principal work of "the greatest of the Utilitarians."
- PUBLISHING AND BOOKSELLING.** George Sims, "Leonard Smithers: A Publisher of the Nineties." *London Mag.* (Sept.), pp. 33-40. The friend and publisher of Beerbohm, Beardsley, Wilde, and others.
- Nancy Spain, *The Beeton Story*. Ward, Lock. Rev. *FLS* (Jan. 4), p. 14. A new edition of Mrs. Beeton and *Her Husband*, with new material on Samuel Beeton.
- RELATIONS WITH THE CONTINENT.** Gilbert Phelps, "The Russian Novel in English Fiction." *Hutchinson Rev. Listener* (Sept. 20), p. 433. On the reception in England and the U. S. of the Russian novel in translation, and the influence of Russian novelists (especially Turgenev) on English and American writers.
- Giuliana Artom Treves, *The Golden Ring: The Anglo-Florentines, 1847-1862*. Translated by Sylvia Sprigge. Longmans. Rev. *FLS* (Nov. 2), p. 652. On Landor, the Brownings, the Trollopes, and others.
- V. P. Underwood, *Verlaine et l'Angleterre*. Paris: Nizet.
- SCIENCE.** Erasmus Darwin Barlow, "The Dangers of Health." *Listener* (Aug. 23), pp. 265-67. On Charles Darwin, his illness, and his family relations.
- Milton Millhauser, "The Literary Impact of *Vestiges of Creation*." *NLQ* (Sept.), pp. 213-26. Chambers's book, a precursor of Huxley and Spencer, not of Darwin, had little influence on belles lettres, but considerable on the literature of intellectual controversy.
- SOCIAL.** Virginia Cowles, *Edward VII and His Circle*. Hamilton (published by Harper in New York as *Gay Monarch*). Rev. *FLS* (July 27), p. 444. Lively account of the un-Victorian Marlborough House set.
- Hugo M. Pollard, *Pioneers in Popular Education, 1780-1950*. Murray. Rev. *FLS* (Oct. 12), p. 604.
- A. P. Young and E. T. Ashton, *British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century*. Routledge. Rev. by Charles Wilson, *Spec.* (Oct. 26), p. 579.

AUTHORS

- ACTON.** *Essays on Freedom and Power*. Introduction by Gertrude Himmelfarb. Rev. by Brian Inglis in *Spec.* (Oct. 19), pp. 542-43.
- ARNOLD.** J. B. Broadbent, "Milton and Arnold." *Essays in Criticism* (Oct.), pp. 404-17. A good example of how the persistence of the pejorative meaning of "Victorian" can close a critic's eyes and ears. A study of the similes in *Paradise Lost* and *Sohrab and Rustum*. A quotation will illustrate Broadbent's position: "Shelley and Tennyson are constantly describing watered and forested ravines: for Tennyson they are just scenery; for Shelley they do have a personal symbolic value; but for Milton in, say, Book IV of *Paradise Lost*, that kind of description is dramatically symbolic."
- Robert A. Donovan, "The Method of Arnold's *Essays in Criticism*." *PMLA* (Dec.), pp. 922-31. In his most important book Arnold developed a critical dialectic which gives the essays their special value.
- Lawrence Perrine, "Arnold's *The Scholar-Gypsy* and *Thyrsis*." *Explicator* (Feb.), item 33. Effective defense of Arnold against the charge that the Gypsy Scholar symbolizes escape from responsibility.

- R. H. Super, "Arnold's 'Tyrian Trader' and Thucydides." *Notes and Queries* (Sept.), p. 397. A plausible source for the famous image in the last two stanzas of "The Scholar-Gypsy."
- BEERBOHM. H. Montgomery Hyde, "An Afternoon with Max." *Spectator* (Oct. 5), pp. 445-47. Beerbohm's reminiscences about Wilde and other men of the Nineties.
- BORROW. R. Fréchet, *George Borrow*. Paris: Didier. Rev. in *Mercure de France* (Oct.), p. 321. A doctoral thesis.
- BRONTË. Georges Bataille, "Emily Brontë et le Mal." *Critique* (Paris), Feb., pp. 99-112.
 Lew Girdler, "Wuthering Heights and Shakespeare." *Huntington Lib. Quarterly* (Aug.), pp. 385-92. Thematic and structural parallels.
 John K. Mathison, "Nelly Dean and the Power of *Wuthering Heights*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Sept.), pp. 106-29. An able study of the use by Emily Brontë of a narrator who does not understand the story she tells.
- BROWNING. Thomas P. Harrison, "Birds in the Poetry of Robert Browning." *RES* (Oct.), pp. 393-405. Browning used bird imagery not only as embellishment but also in developing human insights.
 Archibald A. Hill, "Pippa's Song: Two Attempts at Structural Criticism." University of Texas *Studies in English* (1956), pp. 51-56. An analysis of "The year's at the spring" which rests on the assumption, basic to linguistic theory, that "it is form which gives meaning and not meaning which gives form."
 Edward C. McAleer, "Pasquale Villari and the Brownings." *Boston Public Lib. Quarterly* (Jan.), pp. 40-47. Villari, one of the few Italians with whom the Brownings were friends in Italy, supplied a link between them and Italian intellectuals. New letters.
 Gardner B. Taplin, "Mrs. Browning's Poems of 1850." *Boston Public Library Quarterly* (Oct.), pp. 181-94. Composition, textual revisions, reception. "Sonnets from the Portuguese," which first appeared here, were not popular with the reviewers.
- CARLYLE. Carlisle Moore, "The Persistence of Carlyle's 'Everlasting Yea.'" *NP* (Feb.), pp. 187-96. Asks the important question whether Carlyle's positive convictions, as expressed in *Sartor*, survived through his later career; concludes that he did not retain the letter and spirit of the 'Everlasting Yea' as a social prophet, though he never lost faith in God.
- COLLINS. Nuel Pharr Davis, *The Life of Wilkie Collins*. Illinois. Introduction by Gordon N. Ray. Rev. *FLS* (Jan. 25), p. 48.
- DICKENS. Arthur A. Adrian, "Charles Dickens and Dean Stanley." *Dickensian* (Sept.), pp. 152-56. On the circumstances leading up to Dickens's funeral in Westminster Abbey. (Adapted from *The Active Spirit*, a forthcoming biography of Georgina Hogarth.)
 Monroe Engel, "The Politics of Dickens' Novels." *PMLA* (Dec.), pp. 945-74. New light on Dickens's views on representative government, the class structure of English society, the poor laws, finance and industry, etc., derived from his two weeklies, *Household Words* and *All the Year Round*.
 K. J. Fielding, "Mill and Gradgrind." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Sept.), pp. 148-51. The satire on utilitarian education in *Hard Times* was not aimed at James Mill.
 Michael H. Futrell, "Gogol and Dickens." *Slavonic Rev.* (June), pp. 443-59. Dickens's influence on Gogol and a comparison of some aspects of their work.
 Edgar Johnson, "Dickens and Shaw: Critics of Society." *Virginia Quarterly Rev.* (Jan.), pp. 66-79. Parallels between "the greatest British writer of the 19th century" and "the greatest British writer of our own time," as artists and social critics.
 David Shusterman, "Peter Cunningham, Friend of Dickens." *Dickensian* (Jan.), pp. 20-35. A valuable account of Cunningham; lists his contributions to *Household Words*.
- ELIOT. *Middlemarch*. Edited and with an Introduction by Gordon S. Haight. Houghton Mifflin. An illuminating introduction discusses background, interplay of characters, and imagery in the novel.
 Maurice Beebe, "Visions are Creators: The Unity of *Daniel Deronda*." *Boston University Studies in English* (Autumn, 1955), pp. 166-77. The main theme of the novel—the need to lose one's life in order to find it—is expressed in symbols that unite the two stories, Deronda's and Gwendolen's.
 George R. Creeger, "An Interpretation of *Adam Bede*." *ELH* (Sept.), pp. 218-38. Deals with Eliot's use of symbolism, especially that of wasteland vs. fertile country, in *Adam Bede*.
 William J. Hyde, "George Eliot and the Climate of Realism." *PMLA* (March), pp. 147-64. The "climate" referred to is that of the *Westminster Review* under Chapman, in which "reality" in fiction was consistently advocated.
- HARDY. *Jude the Obscure*. Introduction by Carl J. Weber. Harper.
 J. O. Bailey, *Thomas Hardy and the Cosmic Mind: A New Reading of "The Dynasts"*. North Carolina.
 Samuel I. Bellman, "How 'New' a Woman was Hardy's Sue Bridehead?" *Colby Lib. Quarterly* (August), pp. 137-39. Sue's lineage is ancient, deriving from Aristophanes and Jonson.
- HOPKINS. Claude Collier Abbott, ed. *Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins, including his Correspondence with Coventry Patmore*. Oxford. Rev. *FLS* (Dec. 21), p. 763. A new edition, including a large number of hitherto unpublished letters to his mother.
 Anne R. King, "Hopkins's 'Windhover' and Blake." *English Studies*, Amsterdam (Dec.), pp. 245-52. Parallels to Blake's watercolor "Night Startled by the Lark" in Hopkins's poem.
- HOUSMAN. *Collected Poems*. Penguin. Rev. *FLS* (Sept. 28), p. 570. Contains all Housman's verse except the parodies and comic verse.
 John W. Stevenson, "The Pastoral Setting in the Poetry of A. E. Housman." *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Oct.), pp. 487ff. How the Shropshire setting and country speaker permitted Housman a studied irony which would have seemed sentimental or exaggerated if expressed by a Cambridge don.

- HUXLEY.** Cyril Bibby, "T. H. Huxley's Idea of a University." *Universities Quarterly* (Aug.), pp. 377-89. Huxley's views in relation to those of Arnold and Newman. Based partly on unpublished material; a valuable study.
- Oma Stanley, "T. H. Huxley's Treatment of 'Nature.'" *JRI* (Jan.), pp. 120-27. The change in Huxley's concept of Nature, from a romantic personification to a scientific "sum of phenomena," may have been influenced by Mill's essay on "Nature" (published 1874).
- KIPLING.** Paul MacKendrick, "Kipling and the Nature of the Classical." *Classical Journal* (Nov.), pp. 67-76.
- MACAULAY.** J. H. Plumb, "Thomas Babington Macaulay." *Toronto Quarterly* (Oct.), pp. 17-31. An enthusiastic defense of Macaulay as "intellectual giant" and historian.
- MILL.** Maurice Cranston, "'Mill on Liberty': A Reevaluation." *Listener* (Jan. 10), pp. 58-59.
- Iris W. Mueller, *John Stuart Mill and French Thought*. Illinois.
- Bertrand Russell, *Portraits from Memory and Other Essays*. Allen and Unwin. Rev. *FLS* (Nov. 2), p. 643. Includes a notable essay on J. S. Mill.
- MOORE.** Nancy Cunard, *Memories of George Moore*. Hart-Davis. Rev. *FLS* (Oct. 5), p. 579.
- NEWMAN.** *Autobiographical Writings*. Sheed and Ward. Prepared for publication by Henry Tristram, with additional editorial work by Stephen Dessain. Includes Newman's journal, and the memoir which he drew up from it at the end of his life.
- Prose and Poetry*. Selected by Geoffrey Tillotson, Hart-Davis.
- J. M. Cameron, "Faith and the Mind. I. The Night Battle. II. The Logic of the Heart." *Listener* (Jan. 3, 10), pp. 15-16, 51-52. Two useful discussions of Newman's search for a logical basis of faith.
- J. M. Cameron, *John Henry Newman*. Longmans. A recent item (44 pp.) in the convenient "Writers and their Work" series.
- H. Francis Davis, "Newman on Educational Method: Educating for Real Life." *Dublin Review* (Winter, 1956-57), pp. 101-13.
- OLIPHANT.** Seton Dearden, "Laurence Oliphant." *Cornhill* (Summer, 1956), pp. 1-32.
- Philip Henderson, *The Life of Laurence Oliphant: Traveller, Diplomat, and Mystic*. Robert Hale. Rev. *FLS* (Nov. 16), p. 678.
- PATER.** Angelo P. Bertocci, "French Criticism and the Pater Problem." *Boston University Studies in English* (Autumn, 1955), pp. 178-94. Recent criticism no longer sees Pater as hedonist and "aesthete," but as a romantic struggling for religious and intellectual synthesis.
- PATHORE.** Ernest Beaumont, "Coventry Patmore's Philosophy of Womanhood." *Downside Review* (Oct.), pp. 362-82. How Patmore's mystical concept of woman transcends such categories as those of Simone de Beauvoir.
- ROSSETTI.** Charles Tomlinson, "The Poetry of Christina Rossetti." *Poetry* (March), pp. 385-90.
- RUSKIN.** Joan Evans and J. H. Whitehouse, eds. *Diaries of John Ruskin, 1835-1887*. Vol. I: 1835-1847. Oxford. See especially a review by Sir Kenneth Clark in *Listener* (Oct. 11), p. 565.
- Jean Autret, *L'influence de Ruskin sur la vie, les idées et l'oeuvre de Marcel Proust*. Geneva: Droz, 1955.
- Maurice Cranston, "Ruskin's Letters to English Working Men." *Listener* (Jan. 31), pp. 192-93. On *Pors Clavigera*.
- John Tye Fain, *Ruskin and the Economists*. Vanderbilt Univ. Press. A valuable supplement (and in some degree a corrective) to Hobson's book. Concludes that Ruskin's indictment of the orthodox political economy is unjustified when applied to the work of its best exponents (e.g. Mill) but sound when applied to the popularizations and abuses of that doctrine.
- French Fogle, "Unpublished Letters of Ruskin and Millais." *Huntington Lib. Quarterly* (Nov.), pp. 39-51. Letters to Furnival shed new light on the Ruskins' unhappy marriage.
- Michael Lloyd, "Hawthorne, Ruskin, and the Hostile Tradition." *English Miscellany*, Rome (1955), pp. 109-33. The "hostile tradition" refers to English condemnation of the Italians as ignorant, idle, frivolous, immoral.
- S. A. L'Hopital, "Joseph Milsand, commentateur de Ruskin." *Revue d'Esthétique* (Jan.-March, 1956), pp. 58-70. On Milsand's *L'Esthétique anglaise* (1864), which first introduced Ruskin's theories to France. Milsand also helped make Browning, Tennyson and Carlyle known in France.
- STEPHEN.** *Men, Books, and Mountains*. Edited and with an Introduction by S. O. A. Ullmann. Hogarth Press.
- TENNYSON.** John Olin Eidsen, "The Reception of Tennyson's Plays in America." *PQ* (Oct.), pp. 435-443.
- Robert H. Woodward, "The Journey Motif in Whitman and Tennyson." *MLN* (Jan.), pp. 26-27. Verbal echoes of "Ulysses" in "Pioneers! O Pioneers!"
- TROLLOPE.** Rafael Helling, *A Century of Trollope Criticism*. Helsingfors: Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Noticed in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Dec.), p. 238.
- WILDE.** Richard Poster, "Wilde as Parodist: A Second Look at *The Importance of Being Earnest*." *CE* (Oct.), pp. 18-23. Wilde's play is at least in part an elaborate literary lampoon.
- Morse Peckham, "What Did Lady Windermere Learn?" *CE* (Oct.), pp. 11-14. A well-reasoned analysis showing that Lady Windermere learns nothing but continues to live in a world of illusion.
- Otto Reinert, "Satiric Strategy in *The Importance of Being Earnest*." *CE* (Oct.), pp. 14-18. How Wilde exposes both hypocrisy and the conventions that necessitate it.
- WILSON.** David Daiches, "Christopher North," in *Literary Essays* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd), pp. 122-31.

PROJECTS — REQUESTS FOR AID

- MAX BEERBOHM.** Lord David Cecil has been commissioned by Lady Beerbohm, in accordance with Sir Max's wishes, to write a biography. *FLS* (Oct. 26), p. 665.
- THOMAS DAVIDSON.** Albert Lataner is writing a book on Davidson (1840-1900), Scottish-American philosopher and founder of the Fabian Society. *FLS* (Oct. 26), p. 633.
- ERNEST DOWSON.** Christopher Bean is collecting material for a biography. *FLS* (Aug. 31), p. 511.
- SIR JAMES FRAZER.** Shaila E. Rubin is preparing a biography. *FLS* (Aug. 3), p. 633.

- GEORGE GISSING. Anthony Curtis is working on a biographical study. *FLS* (Oct. 26), p. 633.
 KENNETH GRAHAME. Peter Green is preparing a new study of Grahame (1859-1932). *FLS* (Jan. 25), p. 49.
 JAMES HANNAY. George J. Worth is writing a biographical and critical study. *FLS* (Oct. 5), p. 585.
 CHARLES MILLS. H. V. Morton is writing a book on British residents in Rome during the 19th century and asks information about Mills, who lived in the "Villa Mills," Palatine Hill, and is buried in the Protestant Cemetery. *FLS* (Sept. 14), p. 553.
 CECIL RHODES. J. G. Lockhart, with the assistance of the Rhodes Trustees, is writing a biography of Rhodes. *FLS* (Jan. 25), p. 49.
 ROYAL ALBERT HALL. Ronald W. Clark is writing a full-length history of the Hall, to be published in 1958. *FLS* (Jan. 11), p. 23.
 MADEIRA SMITH. Nigel Morland is writing the life of the famous Victorian ("not proven") murderess. *WFSR* (Sept. 30), p. 38.
 TRAVELLERS. Fitzroy Maclean is writing a book about British and other travellers in Central Asia during the nineteenth century. *FLS* (Jan. 25), p. 49.
 RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH. J. Bromley is preparing a biography of Archbishop Trench. *FLS* (Nov. 30), p. 713.
 OSCAR WILDE. With the help of Vyvyan Holland, Rupert Hart-Davis has undertaken the editorship of the collected edition of Wilde's letters. *FLS* (Dec. 7), p. 731.

THE VICTORIAN NEWSLETTER is edited for the English X Group of the Modern Language Association by William E. Buckler, 737 East Building, New York University, New York 3, New York. Subscription rates in the United States and Canada are \$1.00 for one year and \$2.00 for three years. All checks should be made payable to William E. Buckler, personally, so that they may be easily negotiated. The subscription rates for the United Kingdom are 7/6 for one year and 15/ for three years. Checks should be made payable to K. J. Fielding, Malayan Teachers Training College, Kirkby, Liverpool. Mr. Fielding is the British representative of VNL.

Announcing--

VICTORIAN STUDIES

A NEW QUARTERLY JOURNAL of the Humanities, Arts, and Sciences

Editors: Philip Appleman, General Editor; William A. Madden; Michael Wolff

VICTORIAN STUDIES will be devoted to the examination of English culture during the period extending approximately from 1830 to 1914. Its editors and advisers agree that this period demands a deliberate coordination of the various academic disciplines and they will therefore publish relevant articles in any of the humanities, arts, and sciences. They recognize that the proposed chronological limits are only indications of a center, and that study of the years before and after may well illuminate the years between. Other features of *Victorian Studies*: book reviews, notes and queries, bibliographies, and checklists. It offers its pages, too, as a forum for the discussion of controversial questions.

ADVISORY BOARD

RICHARD D. ALTICK
The Ohio State University

NOEL ANNAN
King's College, Cambridge

WILLIAM O. AYDELOTTE
State University of Iowa

T. S. R. BOASE
Magdalen College, Oxford

CRANE BRINTON
Harvard University

JEROME H. BUCKLEY
Columbia University

JOHN W. DODDS
Stanford University

FREDERIC E. FAVERTY

Northwestern University

GORDON S. HAIGHT

Yale University

HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK

Smith College

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

Harvard University

G. KITSON CLARK

Trinity College, Cambridge

HARRY LEVIN

Harvard University

FRANCIS E. MINEKA

Cornell University

HENRI PEYRE

Yale University

GORDON N. RAY

University of Illinois

DONALD SMALLEY

Indiana University

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

Birkbeck College, London

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

Bedford College, London

JACOB VINER

Princeton University

CONWAY ZIRKLE

University of Pennsylvania

EDITORIAL CONSULTANT

WILLIAM RILEY PARKER

Indiana University

CONTRIBUTIONS: Contributions are welcome and should conform to the MLA style sheet. They should be accompanied by return postage and can be handled more promptly if submitted in duplicate.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Subscriptions are \$5.00 or 35s. a year.

COMMUNICATIONS: All communications should be addressed to

The Editors
VICTORIAN STUDIES
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Columbia Books on Victorian Literature

MORE NINETEENTH CENTURY STUDIES

A Group of Honest Doubters

By Basil Willey

The central theme of this new work by the author of classic studies in modern English moral and intellectual history is the reinterpretation of orthodoxy in the light of nineteenth-century canons of historical and scientific criticism. Professor Willey, skillfully blending biography and criticism, illustrates significant phases of Victorian liberal thought from a creative group of theologians, historians, and men of letters. In his portraits of such people as Francis Newman, J. A. Froude, Tennyson, Benjamin Jowett, Mark Pattison, Frederic Harrison, Mark Rutherford, and John Morley, he presents these writers not as set period pieces but as honest and gifted workers whose labors have given shape to the present. "If faith today has recovered tone and confidence," Professor Willey says, "it owes this largely to the work of these pioneers who compelled it to abandon many impossible positions." \$4.00.

Other books by Basil Willey are: *The Seventeenth Century Background*, *The Eighteenth Century Background*, and *Nineteenth Century Studies*. \$4.50 each.

LEIGH HUNT'S LITERARY CRITICISM

Edited by Lawrence H. Houtchens and Carolyn W. Houtchens

Leigh Hunt's literary career extended over a period of fifty years, for at least half of which he was widely accepted as "a discerning, influential critic, a leading journalist and anthologist, a poet and translator, something of a playwright, a friend to poets extraordinary." The fifty essays in this book reflect his activities in all these fields, making available for the first time a wide range of critical writing on Wordsworth, Byron, Coleridge, Boileau, Tennyson, and many other men of letters. They also confirm the tendency of modern scholars, as more material becomes available, to find Hunt's close and acutely discerning criticism both interesting in itself and harmonious with the modern approach. This volume, which includes an *Essay in Evaluation* by Clarence DeWitt Thorpe, will open up several virtually new areas of nineteenth-century literature to the scholar and the general reader. \$8.50.

A companion piece to this volume by the same editors is *Leigh Hunt's Dramatic Criticism*. \$4.50.

RELIGIOUS TRENDS IN ENGLISH POETRY: VOLUME IV: 1830-1880

Christianity and Romanticism in the Victorian Era

By Hoxie Neale Fairchild

Professor Fairchild, in this fourth volume of a major work of literary history and criticism, examines the response of Victorian poets to "the ferment of attraction and repulsion between Christianity and romanticism in an increasingly secularistic age." He devotes individual chapters to each major poet of the period, omnibus chapters to several groups of minor poets, and critical chapters to important trends and movements. Making a clear-cut distinction between Christian belief in man's insufficiency and romantic faith in man's innate goodness and strength, and using a wealth of objective information, the author gives a lucid account of religious thought and feeling in the Victorian age—an age when almost every poet was obsessed by the religious problem. \$7.50.

Other books in this series are: *Volume I: Protestantism and the Cult of Sentiment*, *Volume II: Religious Sentimentalism in the Age of Johnson*, and *Volume III: Romantic Faith*. \$7.50 each.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y.