UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_172824
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

# THE YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME XXVII

1946

Edited for

The English Association

BY

FREDERICK S. BOAS

GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON
1948

*Oxford University Press, Amen House, London, E.C.4*

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS CAPE TOWN

*Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University*

Printed in Great Britain by
Latimer, Trend & Co., Ltd., Plymouth.

# PREFACE

THERE has been no change in the list of contributors to this volume as compared with its predecessors.

In the majority of the sections there has been, in 1946, a marked increase in the number of books published and available for notice in this survey, which also includes some books of earlier date which have now come to hand. The flow of relevant articles in periodicals on both sides of the Atlantic also tends constantly to increase. Hence this volume approximates in length to some of the pre-war issues. In several of the sections attention is drawn to recent 'finds' and to new trends or points of emphasis in scholarship to-day.

It is satisfactory to record, with the growth of the demand, both within the English Association and outside, for *The Year's Work in English Studies*, that it has been found necessary to raise the number of copies printed to two thousand.

F.S.B.

XI. THE RESTORATION . . . . . 176
By V. DE SOLA PINTO, M.A., D. Phil., F.R.S.L., Professor of English Literature in University College, Nottingham

XII. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY . . . 191
By EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A., F.R.S.L., Emeritus Professor of English Language in the University of Reading

XIII. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER. I. 218
By DOROTHY MARGARET STUART, F.R.S.L.

XIV. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER. II 242
By H. V. ROUTH, D.Litt., F.R.S.L., formerly Byron Professor of English Literature and Institutions in the University of Athens; and FREDERICK S. BOAS

XV. BIBLIOGRAPHICA . . . . . 258
By STRICKLAND GIBSON, M.A., formerly Keeper of the University of Oxford Archives

INDEXES . . . . . 265

# I

# LITERARY HISTORY AND CRITICISM: GENERAL WORKS

By ETHEL SEATON

THERE has been a considerable increase in books of criticism, especially in collections of critical essays. A new note is discernible in many, a desire to correlate literature and life, together with a certain self-conscious uneasiness, natural perhaps in the first difficult year of peace.

Montgomery Belgion has collected as *Reading for Profit*[1] nine lectures on English literature given in a prisoner-of-war camp. He keeps well in view both the audience, and also the object, of enticing the ignorant, and the book is helpful, sensible, and suggestive. Some of his comments may surprise, as that 'the blinding of Gloucester is a mere incident in *Lear*, and of small importance'; and one may wonder why the only reference to Milton is a sentence on his blank verse. The lecture on 'The New Poetry' is interesting and debatable; this is probably what Belgion wanted. The eighth lecture on 'Poetry' will be of most interest to the informed reader, though that on 'Poetic Drama' runs it close.

*We Who Teach*[2] is a lively discussion of modern problems of education, especially in the United States. Jacques Barzun addresses it to parents, students, and intending teachers, and warns these last that 'educators' patois' is 'easily the worst English now spoken'. Barzun furnishes a list of English books desirable for the student to own, and now hard to purchase. He stresses the need for a common stock of tradition, and uses a good story of Hazlitt lecturing on Dr. Johnson to point the moral that, if a people loses a common body of belief, stories and expressions, it loses also, and that lamentably, 'immediacy of understanding, and a common sympathy with truth and fact'.

[1] *Reading for Profit*, by Montgomery Belgion. Pelican Books. pp. 287. 9*d*.
[2] *We Who Teach*, by Jacques Barzun. Gollancz. pp. 248. 10*s* 6*d*.

Peter Kavanagh's survey, *The Irish Theatre*,[3] is a systematic, thorough, close and full inquiry, inspired by the desire to get at the far-distant 'secret roots' of the Abbey Theatre School of Drama. The book is divided into five continuous periods of about fifty years each (the apparent gap of eight years in the mid-eighteenth century in the table of contents is a printer's error). In each period, sections on The Stage and Dramatic Trends take precedence. The net is cast wide; all Irishmen by birth, however anglicized, are included, and Congreve gets in, not by birth, but by education. The stress is on the historical rather than the literary significance, so that Lord Orrery gets more attention than Sheridan. The Latin plays of the Jesuits are included though they are not specifically Irish in tradition. Part I, on the earliest times, is pioneer work by Kavanagh; he finds no positive evidence for Mysteries and Moralities in Ireland before the sixteenth century, though their medieval occurrence may be presumed from documentary prohibition. It is ironic that the first religious plays which have come down to us are two anti-Catholic plays by Bishop Bale, acted at Kilkenny in1553.

The influence of the English players, brought over in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, led to the building of the first public theatre, the short-lived Werburgh Street Theatre (1637–41), due to the enterprise of a Scot, John Ogilby. It is perhaps a rather large claim that thereby Ireland was 'on a level with the neighbouring island, England'. Shirley's visit, 'by request', began the long series of Anglo-Irish plays. The Smock Alley Theatre of the Restoration (whose company visited Oxford in 1677) and the eighteenth century Aunger Street Theatre carried on the tradition, though in the latter the riotous behaviour of the mob kept good actors away. Even more interesting are the references to the small theatres in provincial towns, and the touring of the Irish company. Greater attention to these, and to the plays by minor Irish writers, or on the Irish scene (e.g. Henry Burkhead's *Tragedy of Cola's Furie, or Lirenda's Miserie*, on the 1641 insurrection), would have been more novel and more welcome to the reader than full consideration of plays well known to students and mainly English in scene, as those of Farquhar, Steele, Goldsmith, and Wilde. The downward limit of date is 1904, and Shaw and the Abbey Theatre

[3] *The Irish Theatre, being a History of the Drama in Ireland from the Earliest Period up to the Present Day*, by Peter Kavanagh. Tralee: The Kerryman, Ltd. pp. x+ 489. 21*s*.

are summarily dealt with by short bibliographies and lists of dates; the Gate Theatre gets a three-page account. The book is carefully documented, and easy of reference, with a bibliography and indexes.

Other theatrical matter and criticism may also be noticed here. *Theatre Notebook*,[4] the new quarterly of theatrical research, completed its first volume in 1946. It represents and serves in a modest but already mature form the desire for practical aids to the knowledge of playhouse matters. The wide range of its interests is illustrated by the variety of subjects already opened up: juvenile drama, harlequinades, scene-painting, pictures of theatres down to the present day, lists of plays of different periods, all these show its usefulness for reference. More difficult questions of acting and production are attacked in such articles as A. C. Sprague's 'Did Betterton Chant?' and B. L. Joseph's 'Acting and Rhetoric'. Answers to queries are also furnished. One of *Theatre Notebook's* most cherished and important projects, to set up a Society for Theatrical Research, has now been realised.

Ronald Peacock deplores that poetic drama is under a cloud, and in *The Poet in the Theatre*,[5] he shows how 'a few authors tried to maintain the poetic integrity of drama' against competition from within (realistic drama in prose, and commercialism) and from without (the novel and the lyric). As he is not aiming at an historical survey, he considers first T. S. Eliot and, more unexpectedly, Henry James: Eliot, as challenging his whole period by both criticism and practice, and as restoring to the drama poetic, religious, and formal conventions heightened and intensified; James, because, though outwardly a dramatic failure, his themes, 'the gradual illumination of psychological strains in the relations between a small group of people', served to reveal to him his true medium, the dramatic novel. After considering the effect of Continental dramatists, Grillparzer, Hebbel, Ibsen (who 'cut drama off from its poetic roots'), Chehov, and von Hofmannsthal, Peacock returns to writers in English with Shaw, with the lyrical and sub-

[4] *Theatre Notebook. A Quarterly of Notes and Research*, ed. by Sybil Rosenfeld and Richard Southern. 103, Ralph Court, Queensway, London, W.2. Vol I. pp. 68. Annual subs., 12*s.* 6*d.*

[5] *The Poet in the Theatre*, by Ronald Peacock. Routledge. pp. viii+139. 10*s.* 6*d.*

jective dramatist, Synge, and with Yeats, whose 'sensuous world of drama shapes itself upon an ideal world of spirit', and uses a 'complex imagery of emotion'. In a summary conclusion, 'Tragedy, Comedy, and Civilization', Peacock reaffirms moral values; they alone enable us to know tragedy when we see it. The tragic poet's work, by its emotional corrective, brings society, suffering from moral chaos, into agreement on the essentials of good and evil. The whole subject will also be viewed below from a different angle by Ivor Brown.

Two more surveys remain to be described. Dorothy M. Stuart's lively consideration of *The English Abigail*[6] ranges at will, in time from Bartholomaeus Anglicus down to *Cranford*, in personalities from the real Margaret Giggs to the imaginary Pamela, and in the social strata from Blanch Parry, Elizabeth's Gentlewoman of the Bedchamber, through Abigails of ambiguous status, like Pall Pepys, to the 'Marchioness' and Peg Sliderskew, or from 'greasy Joan' to Churchyard's deft and well-trained maid who had a short way with spiders. Miss Stuart brings out sympathetically the toïl and hardship of the maid's lot in centuries ignorant of labour-saving devices; but she also lightens the picture with the resilience of youth, as of Rebecca in *Mansfield Park*, sallying out on a Sunday 'with a flower in her hat'. The gold thread running through the varied narrative is the genuine and strong affection mutually felt by many mistresses and maids, as by Lady Verney and her Luce, Mrs. Carlyle and Helen Mitchell, or Mrs. Browning and her devoted Wilson.

Erich Auerbach in *Mimesis*[7] attempts 'a history of West European realism, as the expression of the changes in man's view of himself'. It is a volume which in size shows an enviable freedom from paper shortage, and where nevertheless stringency might have been an advantage in preventing repetition and discursiveness. Auerbach's method is to select as text a scene from history or literature naturalistically recounted, to analyse exhaustively its methods of expression and description, its tempo and its psycho-

[6] *The English Abigail*, by Dorothy Margaret Stuart. Macmillan. pp. viii+221. 15*s*.

[7] *Mimesis; Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der Abendländischen Literatur*. Bern: A. Francke Ag., Verlag. pp. 503. 23 Swiss fr.

logical presuppositions, and to set it up as a signpost for its epoch and for man's changing view of his universe.

Only two chapters deal with English literature: 'The Weary Prince' (xiii), and 'The Brown Stocking' (xix and last). The former is not on Hamlet, as one would expect, but on Prince Hal, in his scene of self-disgust with Poins (*2 Henry IV*, II, ii); Auerbach makes this the text for a discussion of Shakespeare's mingling of comic and tragic, of exalted and trivial, of classical and popular, antique and modern, with comparison also of Shylock, Hamlet and Macbeth. This mixed style is the inevitable expression of a world which had lost its medieval unity and security, and had a new consciousness of fluctuating human personality set against a shifting background. Shakespeare's view of tragedy is aristocratic, and *bourgeois* tragedy is far from his conception; figures like Klärchen and Gretchen are unthinkable in his world. Auerbach concludes, perhaps debatably, that Shakespeare's view of the world has no dealings with the soul of the common folk, as had later romantic dramatists.

Half a page is later given to the gradual development of satirico-comic realism reflecting contemporary manners and problems in Fielding, Dickens and Thackeray. The last chapter is based on a long excerpt from Virginia Woolf's novel, *The Lighthouse* (1927), with the 'stream of consciousness' eddying in and around Mrs. Ramsay and her circle as she knits and measures a heather-mixture stocking. Auerbach compares with Proust and Flaubert. By these and later writers, notably James Joyce, the mirror held up to nature and consciousness is broken into a myriad fragments; and the inquiring gazer who would see life steadily and whole is rewarded by kaleidoscopic shifting and distortion, in which every moment has (or lacks) equal significance with every other. The tendency is a symptom of uncertainty and confusion; melancholy and irony inspire its style, and the whole is often subtly expressive of lack of confidence in culture, even of enmity to culture, worst of all of an impulse to destroy.

Several writers have a concern for the relation of literature to the state of the world or the nation. Such is G. Wilson Knight, who in his *Hiroshima*[8] completes a trilogy on literature and the

[8] *Hiroshima: on Prophecy and the Sun-Bomb*, by G. Wilson Knight. Andrew Dakers. pp. 131. 6*s*.

nation. The first part describes his immediate reaction to the news of the atomic bomb; the second part conjoins and unites separate essays on national subjects, such as 'The British Genius', and on literary subjects such as 'Shakespeare's World', or 'A New Whitehall'. The 'prophecy' of the title is found in the great poets, but 'no rigid lesson is to be drawn' from his examples. The effect is indeed blurred by the facility of the quotations, which do not always seem to be of the highest relevance and cogency. The statement is at times oracularly vague; for example, many readers of his appreciation of Francis Berry's *The Iron Christ* might fail to realize that the 'Christ of the Andes' is a fact, and not a figment of the poet's imagination.

Rex Warner in *The Cult of Power*[9] also combines his political philosophy and his literary criticism. He sees the destructive cult fascinating Marlowe, betraying Macbeth, and culminating in the 'dark gods' of D. H. Lawrence. In 'On Reading Dickens' he finds on the other hand a creator of extraordinary fecundity, whose faith in human nature stood fast, though his faith in contemporary society decreased; his continual development is away from optimism and towards satire, yet he remains 'more like Prospero than Jaques'. His characters are 'nature written large rather than meticulously', written indeed allegorically at times. In 'The Allegorical Method', Warner again comments on Dickens's 'allegorical conceptions', and sees also Bunyan and Swift as having the power to make by allegory the extraordinary credible, almost commonplace (but to call the Yahoos apes, as Warner inadvertently does, is to lessen the virulence of the satire). 'Notes on the Language of Aeschylus' involve constant cross-reference to Milton's aims, achievement, and style; Warner pleads for the study of the classical languages, desiring them, as did Milton, to be the keys to the literatures and not merely ends in themselves.

Henry S. Canby was asked by the University of Melbourne to give in 1945 a series of lectures on American literary history. In *A New Land Speaking*,[10] he has re-stated in a single long essay the

[9] *The Cult of Power*, by Rex Warner. The Bodley Head. pp. 155. 7*s.* 6*d.*

[10] *A New Land Speaking*: *An Essay on the Importance of a National Literature*, by Henry Seidel Canby. Melbourne Univ. Press. pp. 30. 2*s.* 6*d.*

ideas underlying the whole course, and his estimate of what happens in the past, present and future to the Anglo-Saxon tradition in literature when transplanted to other continents by emigrant societies. It passes through an early imitative and utilitarian stage, and tends to lag behind the development of the new nation, until that nation becomes conscious of its new way of life, observes its different conditions, and describes and narrates them first to itself and then to the outer world. Regional literature aids the emergence of a national literature; thus a Concord group yields to a Walt Whitman. Words and, more important, native speech-rhythms grow away from the parent stock into a new and flexible language. A young nation needs to cultivate its own reading public, nourish them on the best world literature, and then interpret itself to itself by an independent literature of its own.

The late John Laird before his death collected a miscellany of literary papers, *Philosophical Incursions into English Literature*;[11] the title suggests that these are the raids of a professorial philosopher into a neighbour province. His first foray takes him into the Shakespeare country, 'Shakespeare on the Wars of England'; later he considers poetic philosophies, such as Pope's *Essay on Man* (where he stresses the differences from Bolingbroke), Shelley's 'self-conscious' metaphysics. Wordsworth's natural piety, Hardy's *Dynasts*, which 'heaves uneasily in the wash of determinist conceptions', and Bridges' *Testament of Beauty*, in which Laird finds grandeur as a 'philosophy of being and becoming'.

More novel and perhaps more engaging are the studies of 'irregular and unacademic philosophers': Sterne; Dickens, whose characters use and even obtrude the logic implicit in their type and in their trades, and enjoy letting off 'moral crackers'; Robinson Crusoe's philosophy, 'not profound, but careful and serious, and characteristic of the liberal thought of its age'; and finally Dr. Watts, also not great but especially interesting, both in his period and in his deliberate and logical rejection of romantic and lyrical impulses in the cause of rational piety (see also below pp, 214–15).

The revised and augmented version of Jacques Maritain's *Art et Scolastique* has been translated afresh with the more precise title,

[11] *Philosophical Incursions into English Literature*, by John Laird. C.U.P. pp. vii+205. 12*s*. 6*d*.

*Art and Scholasticism.*[12] The latest edition is thus made available for English readers, and in this sense may be mentioned in this survey, since Maritain has of course no concern with English literature. The new material consists of three essays. 'The Frontiers of Poetry', 'An Essay on Art', 'Some Reflections on Religious Art', and additional commentary notes. The first new essay embarks on explanations of tendencies in contemporary art and literature. The transcendental nature of Maritain's conclusions is shown by his definition of poetry as that 'divination of the spiritual in the things of sense which also will express itself in the things of sense'.

Maritain's essay 'The Frontiers of Poetry' is challenged by Milton C. Nahm in his volume, *Aesthetic Experience and its Presuppositions*,[13] for its transcendental ateleology, of which the logical conclusion is that God alone can produce beauty; man, doomed to work merely in *sensibilia*, is reduced to the level of a craftsman. Nahm himself is aiming at 'an essay of the aesthetic of empirical idealism'. He begins by examining the antinomy between the two opposing ideas about art, that it degrades by indulging emotions, and that it ennobles by exalting emotions. Nahm's optimistic, though not facile, conclusion, that exaltation prevails, may be too dogmatic for philosopher-critics, but the literary reader will find much to interest and stimulate him. Three-fifths of the book is taken up with an elaborate discussion of historical theories of aesthetic experience; in the remainder Nahm discusses art as a symbol of the life of feeling. The chapters on *katharsis* and on symbols, especially generic symbols such as unite *Hamlet* and the *Oresteia*, are particularly interesting. Symbols and myths, which are often the detritus of outworn science, are illustrated from Greek and English poetry. A knot of examples from English poetry and prose clusters in Chapter VIII, 'The theory of Aesthetic Surface'. In the conclusion, 'The Tragic and the Comic', Nahm finds that both kinds can reach the sublime, and have the power to release energy and restore equilibrium at a high level.

Adam Fox's *Plato for Pleasure*,[14] intended for beginners in

[12] *Art and Scholasticism, with Other Essays*, by Jacques Maritain. Trans. by J. F. Scanlan. Sheed and Ward. pp. x+177. 8*s*. 6*d*.

[13] *Aesthetic Experience and Its Presuppositions*, by Milton C. Nahm. New York: Harper. pp. xiv+554. $4.50.

[14] *Plato for Pleasure*, by Adam Fox. Westhouse. pp. 170. 8*s*. 6*d*.

Plato, or rather for the people, devotes some three pages to English Platonists, 'traditional', like Spenser, Coleridge and Shelley, and 'personal', like Wordsworth. In addition, Fox ranges freely through English literature for parallels, from *Ministering Children* to Hooker, whose matter may be scholastic and Aristotelian, but whose temperament is like that of Plato. For the modern Elizabethan student, Appendix II is particularly useful, with its details of Stephanius's edition of the *Dialogues* (1556).

In *The Idiom of Poetry*,[15] Frederick A. Pottle prints a revised edition of his Messenger Lectures of 1941, together with three new and corrective studies. In 'An Alternative Beginning and a Summary', he disavows his former approach to poetry through the physical sciences; now he prefers the channel of linguistic study, especially that of the historical critic rather than the purist. In literature too the most helpful expositor is he who says, not 'It is blest', but only 'It is here'. In 'Dogma, Science, and Poetry', he traces the substitution of poetry or of art for dogma, through Arnold and Tolstoi to I. A. Richards, who 'identifies dogma (so far as it has value) with poetry', and so to Croce who makes art the base, not the apex, of man's powers, and to Max Eastman, who sees poetry, divorced from conduct, as an 'extension of experience', and therefore inherently valuable. Finally, in 'The Moral Evaluation of Literature', Pottle, while accepting the orthodox Christian dogma, yet acquiesces also in the present secularization of literature, since moral 'roughage', such as the work of Somerset Maugham, D. H. Lawrence, and Hemingway, is necessary to a robust and mature literary digestion.

W. A. Osborne's *Essays and Studies*,[16] a few of them reprints, appear like the *obiter dicta* of a scientist taking his recreation in literary pastures. The first and fullest paper is on 'Scientific Errors in Literature and Art', and exposes the many writers who 'came to grief over the moon', and not the moon only but the sun, the stars, rainbows, the murmuring shell, horsemanship, and in medicine the distinction between sign and symptom. In 'Forerunners'

[15] *The Idiom of Poetry; Revised Edition, with Other Essays*, by Frederick A. Pottle. Cornell U.P. and O.U.P. pp. xx+234. 14*s*.

[16] *Essays and Studies*, by W. A. Osborne. Melbourne: Lothian. pp. 188. 10*s*. 6*d*.

(i.e. anticipations of great poets in lesser ones), some attractive but perhaps not surprising examples are given. Short notes record his observations on 'Vowel Assonance' and its effectiveness in prose and verse, on 'Sigmatism' or 'the reproach of sibilants' in English (he notes how successfully Tennyson avoided it in *The Brook*, and in *Crossing the Bar*), and on 'The Magic of Monosyllables'. Like Rex Warner, Osborne pleads for the retention of Latin and Greek in schools; sensitive as he is to the magic of poetic sound and expression, he feels the impossibility of adequate transmission by translation.

Science itself is invoked in Frederika Blankner's contribution to *Twentieth Century English*[17] (pp. 315–21) entitled *Literary Pattern as a Graph of Social Evolution*; here she claims to make 'an inquiry into a new field' by correlating pattern-making in nature with patterns in art. The cause of pattern in the physical world is vibration (e.g. 'Chladni figures', sand patterns); similarly vibration in the mind of the artist (not his brain merely) may be the cause of art patterns. Physical vibration and pattern are mutually indicative; so by analogy may vibration, stimulated by emotion, mood, or idea, be indicative of the cause of the inspiration of an art pattern. So far the non-scientist may follow Miss Blankner in her hypothesis; but he may feel disinclined to accompany her in her further suggestion that the complete graph of 'the social moment or the course of social historical evolution' will then be accurately read, Genius has a knack of breaking out of magic circles, still more out of prescriptive graphs.

Josephine Miles in *Major Adjectives in English Poetry*[18] has undertaken an interesting study, based on statistical tabulation of the quantity of adjectives in English poets—the word is not used as a metrical term, but in the sense of frequency of recurrence. The Introduction provides tables based on concordances of major poets and a few minors such as Herrick. These calculations attest Miss Miles's laudable industry; they also betray some of the dis-

[17] *Literary Pattern as a Graph of Social Evolution*, by Frederika Blankner. In *Twentieth Century English*, ed. by William S. Knickerbocker. New York: The Philosophical Library.

[18] 'Major Adjectives in English Poetry', pp. 305-426 of *The Vocabulary of Poetry*, by Josephine Miles. California U.P., and C.U.P. 22*s*.

quieting features of such study. For example, 'figures are approximate', but within what limits? Again, no indication is given of the canon of earlier poets; thus the figures for Marlowe are presumably based on Crawford's exhaustive *Marlowe Concordance*, which, however, includes the three parts of *Henry VI*, now removed from the Marlowe canon, and several plays which are still only conjecturally his; thus the value of the table of Marlovian usage is impaired. Or the adjective 'proud' may not often occur in Chaucer (there are nevertheless three instances within the first two hundred lines of *Anelida and Arcite*), but its idea is there in other forms, e.g. 'Chauntecleer in al his pryde'.

One feels inclined to wish that Miss Miles had knocked away the scaffolding of her critical structure, all the more so as her critical chapters are full of interesting observations, and often confirm the general impression of critical readers, such as the affinity between Wyatt and Donne confirmed by the paucity of epithets in both. Her chapters on 'Four Poets of Discourse: Wyatt, Donne, Pope, Wordsworth', and 'Four Poets of Description: Spenser, Milton, Collins, Keats', make suggestive reading. The chapter on 'Modern Quality' starts with Hopkins and Whitman as the model on one hand, Housman on the other; T. S. Eliot occupies a middle position, since his 'epitheting' 'turns the sensory to the purposes of judgment with emphasis upon the less pleasant sensory'. The 'Conclusion' takes as typical the incidence and the shades of meaning of 'good' and 'bright' as opposed to 'bad' and 'dark'; Miss Miles then sums up her findings on the changes from Elizabethans to moderns in the use of some half a hundred major epithets.

Donald Stauffer's *Nature of Poetry*[19] has a clarity of structure and an ease of style which make it pleasant reading. In seven chapters, or rather interlocking essays, he maintains the thesis that poetry is exact, intense, significant, concrete, and complex; these are its qualities; it is also rhythmical and formal, clarifying its substance by verbal patterns in sound. It is exact, in that a poem is particular, 'Individual, unmistakable, unduplicable', like a person; it is intense in passion and emotion; it is so significant that it is the most effective of moral agents; it is concrete in its pictures

[19] *The Nature of Poetry*, by Donald A. Stauffer. New York: Norton; London: Bell. pp. 291. 15*s*.

and instances; it is complex, again like a person, in its unity achieved through variety and its harmonious interplay. Stauffer's exemplary poem is Housman's 'Into my heart an air that kills'.

On rhythm, a personal experiment leads him to conclude that 'the rhythm of poetic feet is usually slightly faster than the rhythm of the pulses'; he suggests also that Shakespeare probably gained from hearing the actors speak his verse. Stauffer has very attractive illustrations for his points, from Dante to Archibald MacLeish. His exposition of passages from *Othello*, *Measure for Measure*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Paradise Lost* repays reading; and he can justify an apparently unconvincing example, as that of intensity in Spenser's marriage of the Thames and the Medway. On complexity, he revives Dante's four senses as still the valid basis for poetic meaning, and would combine with them I. A. Richards's four types. Both poet and reader need to cultivate Keats's 'negative capability', and to acknowledge the 'relativity of truth', of which Stauffer takes *The Ring and the Book* to be the epic.

The late Forrest Reid's title, *The Milk of Paradise*,[20] prepares us for the honey-dew of poetry and criticism, and indeed he confines himself to that transparent poetry whose high and sole function it is to clear the eyes of our imagination. Beginning with 'How many miles to Babylon?' and 'Tom o' Bedlam's Song', he considers the lyrics of John Clare (himself his own 'happy, dirty, driving boy'), of Chatterton and Blake, and of Coleridge, with his 'peculiar, crystalline quality'. Dream-poems, visionary poetry, poems of childhood, poems to animals and insects, are the butterflies that his net catches. He rewards the reader with some rare specimens, such as poems left unprinted by William Morris, or the strange *Orphan's Song* of Sydney Dobell, a song indeed of 'the bird in my bosom'. Reid's aim is to cite poems of inexplicable magical power; and he quotes a casual comment made to him by A.E.; 'in all true poetry, there is a mingling of heaven and earth'. He concludes, whimsically anticipating and enjoying the reader's surprise, with a supporting quotation from John Stuart Mill, beginning, 'The poetry of a poet is Feeling itself'.

Several volumes of collections of essays on varied subjects have

[20] *The Milk of Paradise: Some Thoughts on Poetry*, by Forrest Reid. Faber. pp. 80. 6*s*.

appeared; the two annuals may take precedence. Volume XXXI of *Essays and Studies*[21] contains chiefly specialized considerations of Shakespeare, Milton, Mary Coleridge, and James Joyce. The only essay of a more general application is H. S. Bennett's *Medieval Literature and the Modern Reader*, which lays bare the temptation to facile half-understanding of earlier literature. In fact, a considerable equipment, a detailed knowledge of medieval life and thought, ecclesiastical and civil, and especially of the conventions, are needed if one is to get the full flavour from even the most readable medieval writer. By skilful choice of passages from Chaucer, Bennett makes plain by his explanations how often the subtle, ironic undercurrent escapes the modern reader.

In editing Volume XXIII of *Essays by Divers Hands*,[22] Harold Nicolson describes the continuous purpose of the Royal Society of Literature as to protect, preserve, retrace, and finally enjoy 'the long and lovely river of English letters'. Papers which enjoyably remind us of certain authors here are Willard Connely's on *Emily Dickinson*, and N. Hardy Wallis's on *Thomas Hood*. In *Sir Thomas Bodley and his Library*, F. S. Boas displays the man and his visible foundation, to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary (1945) of Bodley's birth. The magnitude of the accomplishment has triumphed over the limitations which he would have set, as the exclusion of 'idle' and 'baggage' books, especially contemporary plays, of which 'hardly one in fortie' was perhaps 'worth the keeping'. Fortunately the steady influx of MSS. of older English literature, and the collections of Douce and Malone, have made the Bodleian the magnet that draws students of English from all over the world.

A very different estimate from Bodley's of poetic drama is that of Ivor Brown, who asks (like Ronald Peacock) *Can there be a revival of poetic drama in the modern theatre?* and gets the dusty answer, 'somewhat unlikely or at any rate very difficult'. The audiences' desire for visual beauty and imaginative escape is now satisfied by ballet and good films, the satisfaction of the ear is found in orchestral music, and, worst of all, the poets do not furnish lucidity and melody. A less depressed view of the moderns is

[21] *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association.* Vol XXXI, collected by V. de Sola Pinto. O.U.P. pp. 106. 7*s* 6*d*.

[22] *Essays by Divers Hands; Transactions of the R.S.L.* Vol. XXIII, ed. by the Hon. Harold Nicolson. O.U.P. pp. ix+ 115. 10*s*. 6*d*.

taken by Joseph Bard, in his *Only a Poet's Word*; to him 'poets and poetry have righted themselves' since the unstable nineteen-twenties. The poet can still be 'Integer vitae', with power over words, feeling, and poetic vision; he should still be 'scelerisque purus', uncontaminated by materialism and political propaganda.

Prose Fiction is the subject of two papers: G. P. Gooch surveys the rise and practice of *Historical Novels*, and claims that Scott did equal service to history and to literature; L. A. G. Strong, on *The Art of the Short Story*, deplores the cleavage between the serious and the popular or commercial short story. At the turn of the century, the short story of action, well shaped and rounded off was in the hands of such masters as Kipling, Wells, Jacobs, and Conan Doyle. The rise of the episodic, psychological, short story is due to the influence of Tchekov; when badly done it is invertebrate. Each kind could learn from the other. Finally, M. H. Spielmann, in a paper on *Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Spelling* challenges the accepted explanations of its variability (carelessness, ignorance, lack of standardization), and propounds instead a purposeful enrichment, 'deliberate ingenuity of diversification and love of innovation both in author and printer'. His examples are impressive, but one may doubt whether the philologists would support this novel and debonair explanation.

Charles Morgan has reprinted a further selection of *Reflections in a Mirror*;[23] some half-dozen are on literary themes. A memorial essay on Robert Nichols (who died on 17 Dec. 1944) finds the essence of his genius in the 'strange mingling of seer with gentleman of fashion', and praises his poetry for its 'music, comprehensibility, variety, and energy of expression'. 'The Independence of Landor' depicts Carlyle's 'unsubduable old Roman', confident and independent, with a mind and a poetic power jewel-like hard and richly coloured. 'Soldiers' Writing' records Morgan's observations after a stay in the front line in 1944; the men's mood, unlike that of the volunteer army of 1914–18, was one of stoicism, of recognition of a destiny. From this, tragic writing may result or at least writing disciplined, selective, and austere.

Of 'Creative Imagination' (a lecture at the Sorbonne in 1936) Morgan argues that it is a mutual act, requiring a 'communicating

[23] *Reflections in a Mirror, Second Series*, by Charles Morgan. Macmillan. pp. xii+229. 8*s*. 6*d*.

tension between giver and receiver'. There are lines of poetry, as in Shakespeare and Racine, which 'stab the hearer into new, independent life'.

Morgan elaborates this idea further in a lecture of 1945, *The Artist in the Community*;[24] the artistic impulse is 'neither self-regarding nor world-regarding'. The artist's function is 'to enable men to imagine for themselves'; to fulfil it, he must himself be a free man in a free community.

About half of Arthur M. Clark's *Studies in Literary Modes*[25] is a revival of metrical controversy, the rest is on varied modes. He begins with a plain, straightforward consideration of the historical novel, and another of the art of satire. 'A Defence of Rhetoric' reflects the increasing interest in this art, rightly called here 'the architecture of communication', since it gives the strength of organic design, 'strength with grace, power with beauty'. He sees its primary function as to select and arrange; to persuade by 'flowers of rhetoric' is a secondary purpose. In 'Poetry and Verse', he argues for metre as an essential, not an accidental of poetry; the onus of proof of the superiority of free verse lies on the poet who prefers this medium.

Clark then settles down to four studies on rhyme. He begins with two well-informed and detailed surveys, first of the European debates on rhyme or no-rhyme, and then of the occurrence of rhyme (or sound-correspondence) in Greek and Latin, popular in origin, tolerated by the Golden Age, encouraged by the Silver Age, and culminating in church hymns. Two critical studies follow; Clark claims that rhyme 'steadies' the average hearer, and states (unfortunately only too truly) that 'metrical sensibility is a rare gift among listeners'. What de Banville called 'l'imagination de la rime' is dying out with the substitution of reading for listening. Clark would recover rhyme, difficult though it be, as a cornerstone of the structure of poetry.

Under the title, *Scholarship, Its Meaning and Value*,[26] H. W.

[24] *The Artist in the Community*. The sixth W. P. Ker Memorial Lecture delivered in the University of Glasgow, by Charles Morgan. Glasgow: Jackson. pp. 34. 2*s*. 6*d*.

[25] *Studies in Literary Modes*, by Arthur Melville Clark. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. pp. v+218. 15*s*.

[26] *Scholarship, Its Meaning and Value*, by H. W. Garrod. C.U.P. pp. 79. 4*s*. 6*d*.

Garrod prints the J. H. Gray Lectures delivered by him in Cambridge (1946). While admitting a wide meaning for the term ('In a sense, wherever we have letters, there we have scholarship'), he restricts himself, after a brief introduction on Alexandria and Rome, to that kind of learning which England calls scholarship, and Europe philology, and which, dating from the fifteenth century, may fairly be termed Renaissance. Poggio Bracciolini founds this line of scholars, which continues with Laurentius Valla, Politian, and Erasmus to its zenith in Scaliger, then, in England, with differences, with Bentley and Housman; one hopes that, in spite of the present 'second death of the world' the line may stretch out to the crack of doom. Garrod lingers lovingly over these pioneers, their gusto, their joy in disinterested learning, and their immense services to European thought. Nevertheless he is bold and progressive enough to suggest that the time has come to revise our view of the ends and means of this scholarship, to stand still no longer where the first scholars stood, but to go forward, to do as they did rather than continue (sometimes needlessly) to do what they did. A token of this new spirit is Garrod's suggestion, of special appeal in this chapter, that English is fit to take the place of Latin in elegiac inscriptions: 'I do not believe that English can never do this last piety.'

Mrs. Gordon has followed up her biography of her husband (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 12) with the promised volume of his lectures and essays, *The Discipline of Letters*,[27] mostly reprints, and nearly all fortunately revised by him. Not before printed are his lecture (1938) on Hopkins and Bridges, and a memorial lecture (1937) on John Swinnerton Phillimore. In the former he defends Bridges for delaying the publication of Hopkins's poems till in his judgment the time was ripe for the public to appreciate them. In the latter he praises this descendant of the line of Scholars as one for whom 'the unnatural modern division between learning and literature did not exist'. Tributes of friendship and admiration are also paid in the studies of Andrew Lang and Professor Sir Walter Raleigh. Two papers reflect Gordon's piety for his native land; 'Scottish Literature' is revised from 'A Scotsman's Heritage', and in 'Redgauntlet', he deserts poetry for fiction. There are two Virgilian sub-

[27] *The Discipline of Letters*, by George Gordon. O.U.P. pp. iv + 207. 12s. 6d.

jects, a regular survey, 'Virgil in English Poetry', and a less regular but perhaps more attractive mythical study, 'The Trojans in Britain'. The most controversial theme might well be 'Shelley and the Oppressors of Mankind', but the moderation of tone precludes contentiousness; indeed, over the whole volume there plays, like summer lightning, the writer's (or speaker's) fastidiousness of taste and felicity of phrase. The title of the book comes from Gordon's inaugural lecture (1923) as Merton Professor of English Literature, and is a clue to the prevailing mood. In 'Poetry and the Moderns', his inaugural lecture as Professor of Poetry (1934), the discipline of poetic tradition and poetic experiment is still the theme.

Twelve years later than Gordon, C. M. Bowra, in his inaugural lecture as Professor of Poetry (1946), *The Background of Modern Poetry*,[28] approaches the same theme, and pronounces *ex cathedra* his sympathetic approval of the newness of modern English poets. He fits them into the long sequence of tradition, revolt, and experiment which makes the continuity of our literature, and traces the influence of Arnold, Poe, Hopkins, also of Eliot, the master of the art of anti-climax, 'in which no discord is resolved, and no consolation offered'. Illustrating from Eliot, Day-Lewis, Dylan Thomas, and Sidney Keyes, he finds a 'positive dynamic poetry', valuable to the society of their time.

George Orwell's *Critical Essays*[29] are all unrevised reprints, and some, such as 'In Defence of P. G. Wodehouse', seem already somewhat out of date. His criticism is a sword which smites and blesses. Thus Kipling was a brutal jingoist who 'disgustingly allied himself with the ruling power', yet he did believe that the gods punish *hubris*, and he did have a grip on reality. Dickens is praised for his vitality and descriptive power, but unfortunately 'he sees everything from the consumer angle'; Orwell is rather naïvely surprised that he is both read by the working-classes, and also buried in Westminster Abbey. The essay on W. B. Yeats is a review of Menon's book on the poet, and suggests a 'connexion between his tortured . . . style of writing and his rather sinister vision of life'. Orwell judges literature from the social angle; he has a reformer's desire for mental and moral hygiene (cf. the paper

[28] *The Background of Modern Poetry*, by C. M. Bowra. O.U.P. pp. 20. 2*s*.
[29] *Critical Essays*, by George Orwell. Secker and Warburg. pp. 169. 8*s*. 6*d*.

on 'Boys' Weeklies'), and he holds his current even 'through muddy passages'.

A small group of books has to do with the art of fiction. V. S. Pritchett, as a novelist himself, undertakes in *The Living Novel*,[30] not a history of the novel, but 'short journeys of re-discovery' of the great novelists, the European masters who are for all time by virtue of having 'a direct apprehension of life', of being 'sensitive to an intrinsic situation'. The first and largest section of the book considers the chief British novelists, from 'The Ancestor', Fielding, down to Arnold Bennett, J. Meade Falkner and Arthur Morrison. The article on *Edwin Drood* is the most original and interesting of the many studies of Dickens in this year's collections, perhaps because Pritchett, unlike most modern critics, is robust enough to 'swallow Dickens whole and put up with the indigestion'. It is pleasant too to find real appreciation of George Eliot, and that not only for the humane breadth of *Middlemarch*. Pritchett's critical formula often has a way of getting two birds with one stone; thus 'D. H. Lawrence is a religious journalist where Wells is political'; or 'Bennett's collector's passion for ordinariness is a kind of poor relation of Meredith's passion for the fantastic'; or, most surprising, 'Kipling and Wells are obviously divergent branches of the same tree'.

Phyllis Bentley, also writing 'as a practitioner rather than a critic', offers her *Observations on the Art of Narrative*[31] in brief, almost schematic form. Feeling that this field of criticism suffers from inexact terminology, she concentrates on three aspects of the novelist's art, description, scene, and summary, and exemplifies their distinct uses, and the methods of their alternation and blending. Like Auerbach above, Miss Bentley sees a dividing date in the history of the novel with the advent of Virginia Woolf, and the establishment of the 'stream of consciousness'. She claims nevertheless that the 'summary' still has its uses.

The first part ('Books') of Eric Partridge's *Journey to the Edge of*

[30] *The Living Novel*, by V. S. Pritchett. Chatto and Windus. pp. xi+260. 8*s*. 6*d*.

[31] *Some Observations on the Art of Narrative*, by Phyllis Bentley. Home and Van Thal. pp. 41. 5*s*.

*Morning*[32] consists of an informal and unacademic series of judgments on novelists of our time of all ranks, in the form of brief and sympathetic characterizations of the man or woman and the works. Partridge does justice to the sound craftsman and the good teller of tales, but he gives the palm to the 'intellectualist' novel-writer, to Charles Morgan and Tennyson Jesse.

Two biographical tributes to academic figures have to be noticed here. L. C. Martin brings out the loss to English, and not only English, letters in the death of Oliver Elton in 1945.[33] His monumental *Surveys* of later English literature are works such as perhaps only he could have accomplished during a full teaching and professorial career, and *The English Muse* is the fine flower from these roots. His translations from the Russian continued to appear after his retirement, bearing further testimony to the breadth of his culture.

Helena Deneke has written a detailed and intimate biography of Grace Hadow (1875–1940),[34] Principal of St. Anne's Society, Oxford, and the distinguished sister of a distinguished brother. As a member successively of three of the Women's Societies of Oxford, and as secretary to Barnett House, she touched and adorned university life at many points, and her many-sided personality, her wit and wisdom are remembered by numbers with affection. She is known to English letters as the writer of *Chaucer and his Times* (Home Univ. Lib., 1914), as the editor of *Selections from Sir Walter Raleigh*, and as co-editor of various anthologies, of which the *Oxford Treasury of English Literature* is chief.

H. A. Vachell has an unexpectedly peaceful title, *Now Came Still Evening On*,[35] for a book of six months of memories in mid-1945; he depicts Bath during the war, and his own restricted pursuits and kindly octogenarian memories. The reader has the sense of well-stocked shelves behind his chair, but literary criticism is compara-

[32] *Journey to the Edge of Morning*. Thoughts upon Books, Love, Life, by Eric Partridge. Muller. pp. ix+85. 6*s*.

[33] *Oliver Elton, 1861-1945*, by L. C. Martin in *Proc. of the Brit. Acad.*, Vol. 31. O.U.P. pp. 20. 3*s*. 6*d*.

[34] *Grace Hadow, 1875-1940*, by Helena Deneke. O.U.P. pp. 225. 10*s*. 6*d*.

[35] *Now Came Still Evening On*, by Horace Annesley Vachell. Cassell. pp. 223. 10*s*. 6*d*.

tively rare. He notes the aptness to wartime politics of Coleridge's *Table-Talk*, and as an early champion of Henry James (especially of *What Maisie Knew*) he defends as 'almost invariably arresting and convincing' his often impugned adjectives and adverbs. Recalling Hardy, he has personal memories of his charm and happiness in old age, in contrast to the tragic melancholy of his powerful lyrics. Most interesting and intimate are his pages on his attempt in the way of friendship to restore Ernest Dowson to mental and physical health.

Another book of memories, P. V. Bradshaw's *Seen in Perspective*,[36] a panorama of fifty years, includes a chapter on Victorian and Edwardian art and literature which has some material for the literary and social historian.

Eric Bligh in *Tooting Corner*[37] calls up vividly, though unsystematically and even incoherently, a picture of an almost vanished way of living, the mid-Victorian dissenting connexion, and the southern suburbs of London while they were still villages with independent life. He paints attractive portraits of his doctor-father, a fine example of the 'old Dissenters', and especially of his mother, 'ever in touch with beauty and literature', with Herbert and Crashaw and George Macdonald. Soon the son discovered for himself Herrick and Carew, and later Swinburne; at sixteen he saw his first play, *The Shrew*, and, hearing *L'Allegro* repeated, realized Milton. The beauty of the Anglican liturgy and of Pater's prose enthralled him, and added the 'philosophy of sensation' to his religious and literary foundations; but he still prefers the Milton even of the pamphlets to the persuasions of Pusey. The wandering chronicle ends with him at seventeen, absorbed in Pater's *Gaston de Latour*.

Some unusual anthologies have appeared. In *The Mint*[38] Geoffrey Grigson offers what he hopes may become the first of a series, a miscellany of work by modern writers, creative as well as critical. The chief critical papers are on Yeats, Clare and William Barnes. H. W. Hausermann, in *W. B. Yeats's Idea of Shelley*,

[36] *Seen in Perspective, 1895 to 1945*, by P. V. Bradshaw. Chapman and Hall. pp. 219. 15*s*.

[37] *Tooting Corner*, by Eric Bligh. Secker and Warburg. pp. 336. 15*s*.

[38] *The Mint; a Miscellany of Literature, Art and Criticism*, ed. by Geoffrey Grigson. Routledge. pp. xii+220. 8*s*. 6*d*.

claims that Yeats held two opposite conceptions of Shelley, which he probably never realized to be mutually exclusive, since they reflected his own alternations of emotional calm or tension. John Clare is presented as 'the absolute poet, little tainted by literature', and some dozen of his unpublished poems and prose-fragments are printed, illustrating his amatory verse, his nature-poetry, and his critical views. Grigson himself contributes a brief biography and estimate of William Barnes, stressing his amazing range in foreign languages, and his influence on Hopkins. Grigson believes that Barnes 'could become one of the healthy, if lesser, antidotes to the Romantic disease', and desires to 'exhibit his mind's cool-aired quality'.

*The Quiet Spirit*[39] is designed by Frank Eyre to be read consecutively since, though purposely 'simple and unpretentious', there is a 'continuous thread of poetic thought' running through the five sections. It would therefore be contrary to the compiler's intention to signalize poems of special interest, but one may name a few of the living poets most often drawn upon for this 'unusual aspect of modern poetry': Edmund Blunden, A. Y. Campbell, John Freeman, Stella Gibbons, St. John Gogarty, and Ruth Pitter.

Agnes M. Mackenzie, in *Scottish Pageant*,[40] has collected a specialized and highly selective anthology to the greater glory of medieval Scotland. Her object is to teach and delight patriotically; unfortunately she gives only general and not precise references for the interesting and often unusual extracts, which are drawn from a wide field of the verse, prose, and documents of the time. The book is most attractively printed.

Hugh Macdonald has collected a volume of interest to all students of human personality in its infinite variety. His *Portraits in Prose*,[41] a hundred and thirty-eight in number, range in chronological order from William Rufus (by an Elizabethan) to A. E.

[39] *The Quiet Spirit. An Anthology of Poems Old and New*, compiled by Frank Eyre. O.U.P. pp. ix+146. 8*s.* 6*d.*

[40] *Scottish Pageant*, ed. by Agnes Mure Mackenzie. Oliver and Boyd for the Saltire Soc. pp. xiii+261. 8*s.* 6*d.*

[41] *Portraits in Prose*. A Collection of Characters chosen by Hugh Macdonald. Routledge. pp. xxiii+350. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Housman (by A. S. F. Gow), and in subject from familiar pictures of kings and queens (or rather a queen; what would Queen Victoria have said to her omission?), politicians and ecclesiastics, to poets, men of letters and *le beau monde*. All styles are exemplified, the subtle malice of Sir Tobie Matthew on Lucy, Countess of Carlisle, or of Butler on 'A Duke of Bucks', the hero-worship of Boswell, the heartfelt response of De Quincey to Mrs. Wordsworth and Dorothy, and the amused and tolerant affection of junior for senior academic figures. The book is well equipped with notes and references.

Sir Stanley Unwin has issued a completely revised and re-set edition (fourth) of his now world-famous book, *The Truth about Publishing*.[42] In the 'Introductory', dated January 1946, he claims that he has deliberately ignored the 'topsy-turvy conditions of wartime publishing'; he has, however, inserted some modifying footnotes. Perhaps the only out-of-date statements are those on Russia and Czechoslovakia as markets for British books. In its new form, the book fulfils better than ever its purpose of setting forth the whole process of publishing, for the instruction and benefit of the literary, and especially of the inexperienced author. The information is so clear, and the advice so helpful and benevolent, that an author neglects it at his own peril.

[42] *The Truth About Publishing*, by Sir Stanley Unwin (fourth ed.). Allen and Unwin. pp. 352. 8*s*. 6*d*.

# II

# ENGLISH LANGUAGE: GENERAL WORKS

By R. M. WILSON

AN appreciable amount of important work was produced in 1946, and once again the greater part of it came from American and Continental scholars. It was especially gratifying that the year should have seen the completion of the late Professor Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar* with the publication of *Part V: Syntax* and *Part VI: Morphology*, but unfortunately it has not been possible to obtain these for notice.

A fair amount of work on general linguistics has appeared, and since much of it is incidentally concerned with English it appears advisable to list here the more important books and articles. An excellent and convenient manual of linguistics is that by B. Migliorini,[1] much of interest is to be found in O. Jespersen's *Mankind, Nation and the Individual*,[2] and note should also be made of H. M. Hoenigswald, *Sound Change and Linguistic Structure* (*Language*, April–June). An excellent and comprehensive survey of the techniques employed in the descriptive analysis of words is E. A. Nida's *Morphology*,[3] and other articles on the same subject are by Z. S. Harris, *From Morpheme to Utterance* (*Language*, July–Sept.), and by D. L. Bolinger, *Visual Morphemes* (*Language*, Oct.–Dec.). F. P. Chisholm's book[4] constitutes an excellent introduction to the methodology and problems of general semantics. S. De Ullmann, *Language and Meaning* (*Word*, Aug.), is concerned with the place to be assigned to semasiology in linguistics, whilst C. Morris, *Signs, Language and Behaviour*,[5] deals with subjects on the

[1] *Linguistica*, by B. Migliorini. Florence: Le Monnier.

[2] *Mankind, Nation and the Individual*, by O. Jespersen. Allen and Unwin. pp. 221. 8*s*. 6*d*.

[3] *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*, by E. A. Nida. Linguistics, Vol. II. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press. pp. xii+221.

[4] *Introductory Lectures on General Semantics*, by F. P. Chisholm. Institute of General Semantics. Lakeville: Conn. pp. v+126. $2.50.

[5] *Signs, Language and Behaviour*, by C. Morris. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. pp. xii+365. $5.

borderline of semantics and philosophy. Most of the essays in *Twentieth Century English*[6] are concerned with the psychological and educational aspects of the subject, but some of them, e.g. I. A. Richards, *Idle Fears about Basic English*, and H. L. Mencken, *Designations for Coloured Folk*, are more immediately concerned with the subject of this chapter. The only work on the primitive period of the language is W. H. Bennett, *The Cause of the West Germanic Consonant Lengthening* (*Language*, Jan.–March), which attempts to suggest a reason for the phonetic process underlying the change.

In passing to publications specially bearing on English language from the O.E. period to the present day note has first to be taken of a stimulating paper on *Old English Verse and English Speech Rhythm* (*Trans. of the Phil. Soc.*). In this M. Daunt suggests a new approach to the vexed question of Old English versification, namely, that Old English verse is really conditioned prose, i.e. the spoken language specially arranged with alliteration, but arranged in a way that does no violence to the spoken words. For the purpose of the paper the basis of Siever's groupings is accepted, but it is pointed out that his five types are 'language patterns', not 'metrical patterns'. They are 'pieces of language', and within the piece the word order is usually normal, while the poetical effect is achieved by repetition and alternation of pieces. An analysis of *Beowulf* 1255–1354 suggests that the groups of patterns to be found in the half-lines are the shape they are because the language itself is that shape, and not because the poet arranged them. Consequently it would seem that poetry, at that time, was made with 'pieces of language', groups of spoken language arranged to run easily and not monotonously on the breath. But if it is true that the A-E types represent shapes of spoken language then it ought to be possible to find them in any existing Old English which can be considered colloquial, though it must be remembered that even in poetry the unit is not necessarily the line or the half-line, but the sense is often run on. Unfortunately we know very little of spoken Old English; practically all that is available is the conversation between Cædmon and the angel, Alfred's conversation with Ohthere and Wulfstan, and occasional forms in the glosses. An examination of the first shows that, given the sentence stress which seems appropriate to the

[6] *Twentieth Century English*, ed. by W. S. Knickerbocker. The Philosophical Library. New York. pp. 460. $5.

situation, the phrases fall naturally into the various types of half-line. Against this it might be argued that colloquial Old English is practically unknown; the only colloquial English about which we can know anything is our own. Accepting this Miss Daunt takes examples from newspapers, advertisements, etc., to show that modern English has preserved much of the pre-Conquest speech rhythm. The verse of Shakespeare and Chaucer also falls naturally into the old types of half-line, and it is suggested that it is the presence of these particular rhythm shapes that makes their verse so timeless in its appeal and so easy to listen to.

J. W. Watson Jr., *Northumbrian Old English ēo and ēa* (*Language*, Jan.–March), argues that the usual view which regards the confusion of these two diphthongs as being merely graphic is incorrect. Certainly in the earliest monuments the probability is that the confusion consists largely in the writing, and such graphic confusion would arise easily enough. But even here there are occasional textual forms which, though too isolated to be conclusive, point to actual phonemic coalescence of the two diphthongs. But the strongest evidence for such phonemic coalescence is the history of the developments of the diphthongs in modern dialects derived from Northumbrian. If the diphthongs fell together in Northumbrian they should be represented by the same sound in the modern northern dialects, though it is obviously not enough merely to show that the modern developments are the same. If *ēo* and *ēa* fell together in Northumbrian as a diphthong with an open vowel (*æ*) as the first element then the later development must have coincided with open *e*; if they fell together as (*e:a*/*e:o*) the later development should be identical with close *e*. Consequently it is necessary to consider the development of ME. close and open *e*, and since these coalesced in many of the local dialects in early ME. it is necessary to seek those which preserved the distinction between them. Such a dialect is to be found in Lorton (West Cu.) where Anglian *ē* and *ǣ*[2] are distinguished as *ī* and *ei* respectively, and where OE. *ēa* and *ēo* have shared the development to *ei*. This indicates that the phonemic coalescence must have taken place in OE. Similar conditions appear also in the dialects of Warkworth and Howgill. The data given in J. Wright's *Dialect Grammar*, although not entirely satisfactory, suggest that over the major portion of Northumbrian territory there was an actual phonemic coalescence

of *ēo* and *ēa* rather than the mere graphic confusion of Luick's theory.

R. L. M. Derolez, '*—and that difficult word* garsecg' (*Gummere*) (*M.L.Q.*, Dec.), surveys the data and views connected with the etymology of the word in the hope that it may lead to a better understanding and to a definite solution of the problem. The word is well-attested in OE. literature; in poetry it denotes the ocean, but often that which figures the limit between the world of the living and the realm of the dead, whilst in glossaries and prose works it translates L. *oceanus*. The various suggestions that have been put forward at various times are carefully considered and impartially examined, but the author is content with this and puts forward no theory of his own.

An inquiry into the meaning of the noun *tutel* and the related verb *tutelin*, found in early ME. only in the *Ancrene Wisse*, is the subject of S. T. R. O. d'Ardenne, *The Devil's Spout* (*Trans. of the Phil. Soc.*). Such a form could represent OE. **tȳ̆tel/*tŭtel*, of which the former is the more probable. Neither form is recorded in OE. though the former is probably at the root of the personal name *Tytel*. To explain all the forms found later it is necessary to suppose (i) **tūt-*, with by-form **tut-*, to which early ME. *tutel* is closely related. (ii) **tōt-*, OE. *tōtian* 'protrude, stick out'. The large number of forms in modern English dialects and place-names shows that these two stems, whether originally related or not, have become virtually interchangeable. The root meaning was probably 'to protrude, stick out', but the semantic development has been complicated by onomatopoeic suggestion, and what we have to deal with is a group **tūt-/*tōt-* covering a mixed semantic area 'protrude/hoot', in which the two leading senses are blended. An examination of the cognate forms in related languages, especially the Germanic dialects of the Low Countries, corroborates the evidence found inside English, and it is quite clear that *tutel* in the *Ancrene Wisse* means 'spout'. Such a sense for the word is confirmed also by the fact that in medieval descriptions or paintings of devils they are not infrequently represented as having a long nose in the form of a spout, and this is evidently the idea that the author of the *Ancrene Wisse* wished to drive home. An appendix deals with the large number of personal and nick-names found in early

records which are to be associated with these stems, the most famous being that of the Gothic king *Totila.*

Probably the most suggestive article on a general Middle English subject is J. R. Hulbert's *A Thirteenth-Century English Literary Standard* (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct.), which is a discussion of the conclusions reached by J. R. R. Tolkien in his essay '*Ancrene Wisse*' *and* '*Hali Meiðhad*' (see *Y.W.*, x, 140). In this Tolkien decided that the consistency and similarity of dialect between the Corpus MS. of the *Ancrene Wisse* (A) and the Bodley MS. of the *Katherine Group* (B) indicated that these versions must be 'substantially in the very language of the original works, and belong to the same place and at least approximately the same time as those works and their authors (or author)'. But there are indications which suggest a considerable time-interval between the original and A, and if that be the case some other explanation must be sought for the lack of any trace in AB of a mixture of forms of periods sufficiently separate in time to differ in orthographic or linguistic usage. Hulbert suggests that a more likely reason for the similarity and consistency of dialect is that both A and B were written in a standard literary language. This is also indicated by the use in both of special spelling conventions not explainable on a simple phonetic basis, and there are other indications of a special control of the spellings. The linguistic history of the texts is not clear, and the simplest assumption would be that the extant copies derive from originals composed in a dialect not greatly different from that found in AB. Hulbert sees no reason to suppose that this was not the case, but nevertheless feels that Tolkien has over-emphasized the difficulties of translation from one ME. dialect into another. Scribes commonly replace alien forms of words with those of their own speech, and if this usually produces a mixed dialect, so too is that found in holographs and legal documents. Another difficulty in accepting Tolkien's view is the fact that a brief examination of the Nero MS. (N) as compared with A makes it clear that the inflexions are generally much better preserved in the former. It seems improbable that N has imposed these more archaic and dialectal features on the language of his source. It is much more probable that in these respects A has modernized his original.

The best explanation of the language of A and B is that it is a standard form, accurately followed by A and B, approximately by

a number of other scribes. The original language of the *Rule* was probably that of an author working in almost the same locality as that in which the reviser who later made the exemplar followed by A worked. N retains some of the more archaic and dialectal elements of the original, and the consistency of A is due to the fact that its scribe used a standard which was in vogue in his scriptorium, his motive for spelling as he did being the desire, or requirement, to conform to a certain standard. The same is true of B, though it may be that B's original does not date so far back as the composition of the *Rule*.

During the Middle English period official records in Latin or French frequently contain English words, and this is more especially true of those from 1300 onwards. Some use has been made of this material, but the sources have never been systematically explored. This is to be regretted since they often provide earlier examples of words or meanings than those given by *O.E.D.*, supplement the material in the case of some rare words, or even record words hitherto unknown. In addition the context may give valuable hints as to the etymology of some of the words. An especially useful source of this type is the series of Close Rolls, and the bulk of the material in M. T. Löfvenberg's work[7] has been drawn from the years 1272–1435 of the series. The value of the material is shown by the fact that more than 450 words have been noted, about a third of which are either not in *O.E.D.* at all or only there in a different sense, whilst the remainder provide earlier examples—sometimes several hundred years earlier—of words already recorded. Amongst words not to be found in *O.E.D.* are *ivory comb* (1394), *wire hat* (1426), *couple* (1366) 'measure of fruit', *broad-bow* (1394), *potsugar* (1385), *oint* (1402), 'lard', *gunder* (1407) 'ship's boat', *manfare* (1326) 'ship navigated by a single man', etc. Many words are recorded much earlier than the examples given in *O.E.D.*, e.g. *footcloth* (1401–1639), *flask* (1417–1549), *mug* (1400–1570), *cotman land* (1315–1882), *millpond* (1371–1697), *shire-hall* (1390–1796), *tier* (1346–1569), etc. Even more interesting are some of the common words which can be dated earlier—even if by only a few years—e.g. *hake* (1317–1430), *breast-plate* (1358–*c.* 1386), *boar-spear* (1395–1465), *cannon* (1400–1525), *noble* (1344–1362),

[7] *Contributions to Middle English Lexicography and Etymology*, by M. T. Löfvenberg. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup. pp. xxiii+110.

*bullion* (1379–1451), *bay* (1354–1385), *sewer* (1338–1402–3), *crimson* (1416–*c.* 1440), etc. As an example of a word whose history is appreciably filled in may be cited *fenland* (1338) for which *O.E.D.* has no quotation between 1070 and 1855. In addition to its own intrinsic value the work emphasizes the fact that *O.E.D.*, despite its undoubted excellencies, cannot yet be regarded as giving a comprehensive picture of the vocabulary at any one period.

The last point recurs again in F. M. Salter, *John Skelton's Contribution to the English Language* (*Trans. of the Royal Soc. of Canada*), an article of much wider interest than the title might suggest. A considerable work by Skelton, which had not yet been published, is preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. This is a translation (from the Latin of Poggio) of the *History of the World* by Diodorus Siculus, probably completed by Skelton in 1485. An edition is being prepared by F. M. Salter and H. L. Edwards, and it occurred to the former to make use of this hitherto unknown text as a test of 'Skelton's quality as an innovator in linguistic matters if he really was a humanist'. The result, a list of more than 800 words which Skelton used before any other recorded author, is sufficient proof of his innovations. But the very magnitude of the number is suspicious, and led to a consideration of the conditions under which *O.E.D.* was produced. These, when reviewed, make the gaps in the work less surprising. In any case Salter's point is not that *O.E.D.* misses the existence of words for long periods, but that scholars have often treated the dates in it as if they were decisive and used them for dating other works, a method which the inaccuracy of our knowledge of the history of the English vocabulary renders quite invalid. For example when *O.E.D.* gives the first quotation for *poem* under 1548 scholars are apt to take it that the word did not exist in English before that year, whereas all that the dictionary makers imply is that they have not found the word before 1548. The first part of the article ends with a list of the 816 words from Skelton's translation which were either completely new or were used in special senses before the earliest use of the words and senses recorded in *O.E.D.*

After discussing various other inaccuracies Salter, though acknowledging that in some respects *O.E.D.* is 'truly great', is driven to the conclusion that it 'by no means represents the whole of the English vocabulary in Skelton's time', and that anyone using it

must bear in mind its omissions and confused datings. The article ends with a list of the 640 words already credited by *O.E.D.* to Skelton as the first user, and this list shows that he drew in 'and preserved for honourable careers many a folk word of apt value, and his penchant for Anglicizing Latin terms must have given us many workaday words that still carry on the business of the world'.

In *Baret's 'Alvearie', an Elizabethan Reference Book* (*S. in Ph.*, April) J. Sledd discusses the composition, sources and historical importance of this English-Latin dictionary first published in 1573. The book contains little original work, and appears to have been mainly intended as a reference book for schoolboys and undergraduates, and as such won a favourable reception and long continued in use. To-day it is of importance from various points of view, but in the main Sledd limits himself to a single aspect, Baret's proposals for a reform of English spelling. These owe much to the earlier works of Smith and Hart, and like them Baret's dependence on classical models tends to obscure the contemporary pronunciation of English, and to ignore the differences of structure between English and the classical languages. He recognizes well enough that the symbols with which men choose to represent sounds are not necessary, permanent and universal, but nevertheless cannot rid himself of the contemporary feeling that each letter had the natural power of representing a certain sound, an idea which long persisted. On the other hand when dealing with the semi-vowels he is much less derivative, and perhaps even a little ahead of his age. Historically the importance of the work lies mainly in the fact that Baret adequately represents the common knowledge and opinion of his time. He is content to take most of his ideas from his predecessors, and it is this modesty which gives value to his proposals since he affords an insight into the contemporary state of linguistic thought among educated men.

Next come two tracts written by Sir William Craigie for the S.P.E. In the later of these[8] he collects a number of passages illustrating what was formerly thought and published upon the standard of English. A short introduction gives the opinions of some medieval writers on the Middle English dialects, beginning with

[8] *The Critique of Pure English from Caxton to Smollett*, by Sir W. A. Craigie. Society for Pure English, Tract No. 65. O.U.P. pp. 55. 3*s.* 6*d.*

William of Malmesbury—substantially the same in Higden and Trevisa—and continuing through various anonymous writers. Before the fifteenth century the idea that there might be a standard above the dialects had apparently presented itself to none, but gradually the London dialect began to supplant the others in literary use. After that it was not long before the question of the best standard presented itself to Caxton with whom the critique of Pure English definitely begins. As an appendix there is reprinted in full a treatise entitled *Vindex Anglicus* written by an unnamed patriot and first printed in 1644.

In the earlier of the tracts Sir William is concerned with agricultural writings,[9] the result of his investigations being to convince him that 'the best writers on agriculture have also shown themselves masters of the language in that sphere which brings it into closest contact with the soil of England'. He begins with a brief survey of agricultural writers, from Fitzherbert, through Tusser and Mortimer, to the eight volume collection of the works of William Ellis of Little Gaddesden, Herts., issued in 1745 as *The Modern Husbandman, or the Practice of Farming*, and it is with this that the pamphlet is mainly concerned. Craigie shows that Ellis employs, and is often the first to put into print, many technical terms, the names of agricultural implements, varieties of grain and field plants. In addition a careful study of the ordinary and less technical words contributes greatly towards completing the record of language in general use in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. A selection is given of the 600 words to be found in this collection which either fill a gap in the history of the word, carry it on to a later date, or show it to be of earlier origin than has hitherto been noted. Even greater in number, and equal in interest, are the words used by Ellis, or the senses in which he employs them, which are unrecorded in *O.E.D.*, and he is particularly rich in new collocations and compounds. A final note deals with William Marshall, a writer of a different type from Ellis but no less interesting, who published his *Minutes of Agriculture* in 1778.

The note on *Inflected English* is concerned with the treatment of English words when borrowed into a language with a rich inflexional system. Examples are to be found in Lithuanian newspapers

[9] *Pure English of the Soil. Inflected English*, by Sir W. A. Craigie: Society for Pure English, Tract No. 64. O.U.P. pp. 32. 3*s*. 6*d*.

published in the U.S.A. in which words are freely taken over from American English, provided with appropriate endings, and then inflected according to the rules of Lithuanian grammar. The variety of the forms which results from this contrasts strongly with the simplicity of the corresponding words in English, and show how great an advantage English has gained by discarding most of its original inflexions.

In an introductory chapter De Witt T. Starnes and G. E. Noyes, *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson*,[10] describe the medieval and Renaissance ancestors of the dictionary, and show that by the sixteenth century various influences had prepared the way for the emergence and development of the English dictionary. One of the most important of these was that which came from the pedagogical works and school books, such as those of Bullokar, Mulcaster, and more particularly Coote whose *English Schoolemaster* is the immediate predecessor of the first English dictionary —Robert Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabetical* (1604). Following chapters deal in detail with the twenty-one dictionaries—excluding Johnson's—which appeared between 1604 and 1755, discussing the qualifications of the dictionary makers, their expressed aims, sources, methods of compilation, the inter-relationship of the various works, the relationship of English dictionaries to contemporary bilingual dictionaries, the readers for whom each work is intended, their vogue, usefulness, etc. From this detailed survey various interesting points emerge. The early dictionaries are merely lists of hard words; Cole (1676) first notes dialect and canting words, but ordinary everyday words are not included before the *New English Dictionary* of J.K. (1702). The term *dictionary* is first used by Cockeram (1623), who also introduces the biographical sketch and the entry giving miscellaneous information. Etymology is first attempted in Blount's *Glossographia* (1655) and established as a requisite of any reputable dictionary by Bailey (1721), whose later dictionaries show signal advances in scope and technique. The Kersey-Phillips dictionary (1706) takes the first steps towards the evolution of a modern technique of definition, advances being made on this by Martin (1749) who is also the first to make a clear

[10] *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755*, by De Witt T. Starnes and G. E. Noyes. Univ. of North Carolina Press. pp. x+299. $3.50.

distinction between the various senses of the word. The indication of accent and the introduction of grammar are first popularized by the *New General English Dictionary* (1735). But despite innovations the relations between the various dictionaries lead to the conclusion that in this early period lexicography progressed by plagiarism, and that the best lexicographer was often little more than the most discriminating plagiarist. Appendices deal with medieval and Renaissance vocabularies, the development of cant lexicography, and a bibliography and census of dictionaries in American libraries, whilst sixteen plates at the beginning give facsimiles of title pages or of typical pages from some of the dictionaries dealt with.

•

A single aspect of this subject is dealt with in E. K. Sheldon, *Pronouncing Systems in Eighteenth-Century Dictionaries* (*Language*, Jan.–March). The devices first used to record the pronunciation were inexact, incomplete, and often confusing, and in attempting to work out an adequate pronouncing system the dictionary makers passed through three stages:

1. The placing of an accent mark over the stressed part of the word. A primitive system with no means of indicating the quality of the vowel or the pronunciation of the consonant, but one which remained until well into the second half of the century.

2. Continuing to use accents, but in addition indicating long or short vowels by the position of the accent. Syllabification is not shown, nor is the sound of the vowels indicated in any but the stressed syllables; no clue is given to the pronunciation of the consonants, silent letters are not indicated, nor is the accent used on monosyllabic words.

3. The result of the inadequacy of the second stage was that in the second half of the century the final stage was reached—the diacritical system as we now know it. In general this system took two forms differing in the typographical devices used. The use of the macron and breve, of grave, acute and circumflex accents, of italicized letters, etc., appears first, but several used instead small numbers over the vowels. As this stage develops the second type becomes more popular, perhaps partly because the first to use the former bungled the job by over-elaboration, whilst the first to use numbers produced a fairly simple, clear and workable system. An examination of the various dictionaries ends with Sheridan

and Walker who represent the final resolution of the various gropings.

The object of A. Ahlgren[11] is to present the main facts connected with the use and history of the definite article 'before certain nouns denoting parts of the body, mental faculties, articles of clothing and other personal belongings, where otherwise, in the majority of instances, a possessive adjective is found in English'. The exhaustiveness with which the subject is treated may be gathered from the fact that the work is based upon some 9,000 examples taken from English literature from the earliest times up to the present, and from the description which the author gives of the sources and range of his collected material. He decides that the use of the definite article before nouns of possession is partly due to 'historical and traditional causes and partly dependent on the meaning conveyed by the article as opposed to that of the poss. adj.', and consequently classifies his material into three divisions, each of which includes a 'general account, in which the main features are dealt with, and a detailed account, pointing out actual usages and illustrated by groups of examples, modern and of earlier date'. This is followed by an historical survey of references to the subject from Palsgrave (1530) onwards; the usage is compared with that in other Germanic languages, and is then discussed under the following heads:

1. The traditional article. Three definite types of construction are exemplified by the sentences *She hit him in the face, He was red in the face, He foamed at the mouth.* These types date from the oldest period of the language.

2. The generalizing article. It is used with a generalizing effect when (*a*) the noun of possession forms part of a sense unit so that it is not felt to have direct reference to any one owner, and (*b*) it forms part of a statement as to something characteristic of or common to different individuals.

3. The demonstrative/determinative article—instances of the ordinary function of the definite article when it points out something already defined or to be defined.

G. Langenfelt, *The Roots of the Propword 'one'* (*Studier i Modern*

[11] *On the Use of the Definite Article with 'Nouns of Possession' in English*, by A. Ahlgren. Appelbergs Boktryckeriaktiebolag: Uppsala. pp. xv+221.

*Språkvetenskap i Stockholm*), provides material from the middle and modern periods for the study of this problem, and distinguishes between the various earlier uses of *one*. The theories on the subject of Luick, Einenkel, and Jespersen are found to be unsatisfactory, and are followed by a consideration of the similar phenomenon in the Scandinavian languages. Langenfelt believes that the stages by which *one* became a propword was a popular development of the spoken as opposed to the written language. The Middle English speaker, uninfluenced by similar phrases in the poetry, would know and use expressions like *each one*, *every one*, *such* (*a*) *one*, *many* (*a*) *one*, where the numeral character was discernible to him, and others such as *some one*, *any one*, where *one* =individual had become incorporated. Once the individualizing *one* had been added to a construction, such as *a good*, it spread gradually to all adjectives, even when the same danger of confusion was not likely. This usage was under way in the fifteenth century and spread rapidly during the sixteenth.

E. Calver, *The Uses of the Present Tense Forms in English* (*Language*, Oct.–Dec.), comments on the misunderstanding of the matter of time in attempts to isolate the meanings of English verb forms. Jespersen is taken as representative of the grammarians who have explicitly taken time into account and his statements on the subject are examined phrase by phrase and found illogical and inaccurate. The usual procedure has been to consider all the so-called simple tenses together and all the progressive tenses together, but since it can be shown that the uses of the present tense forms do not correspond exactly with the uses of the past tense forms they ought to be examined separately if the description is to be accurate. Accepting the theory that statements are made about experience, and that experienced present time is of whatever duration the speaker considers to be present, the problem is to distinguish between the uses of the simple present tense and the present progressive tense. In order to arrive at a basic meaning for the former a number of more specialized uses are illustrated, the meanings of which shade into one another, the differences being determined by the vocabulary, by the assumed context, or by aspect. The following uses, with examples, are then noted: logical, universal (*Two plus two equals four*), habitual customary action (*he smokes*), order of nature (*roses smell*), ability (*he sings double*

*bass*), directions (*enter King and Queen*), use in sentences denoting future time (*he plays Schubert's serenade*), and the historical present. Omitting the last, which belongs to another pattern, a basic meaning can be arrived at. This common meaning is not repetition, succession or continuity of occurrence, nor duration or the lack of it, but the constitution of things. The simple present is the tense of character, of insight, and by contrast the present progressive is the tense of mere occurrence.

S. S. Newman, *On the Stress System of English* (*Word* Dec.), finds it necessary to distinguish between expressive accents and normal stress phonemes, and this is followed by a classification of stress accents. In English three phonemic classes, with six varieties of stress, are to be distinguished—Heavy Stress (nuclear heavy, subordinate heavy), Middle Stress (full middle, light middle), and Weak Stress (sonorous weak, pepet weak). Numerous examples are given to illustrate the various types, and their occurrence is explained.

A. Gabrielson, *Några Terminologiska Frågor i Engelsk Fonetik* (*Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap i Stockholm*), deals with various questions of terminology in modern English phonetics, including the terms *breath* and *breathed*, the division of speech sounds into vowel and consonant, the definition of diphthong and triphthong, the distinction between *assimilation* and *similitude*, etc. Here too mention may be made of the fact that Vols. XIII (1937), XIV (1940) and XV (1943) of the above periodical have only just been received, and it may be useful to include here the titles of articles in these volumes which would be of interest to students of English. In Vol. XIII appear C. H. Fernquist, *A Study on the O.E. Version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in Cott. Domitian A.VIII*, and H. Gerring, *The Pronunciation of Adjectives and Attributive Past Participles in -ed.* Vol. XIV includes G. Langenfelt, *Family Names as English Font-Names and other Name Problems*, and Vol. XV, E. Slettengren, *On the Development of OE. Initial sc*, and G. Langenfelt, *y in Billy, etc.*

R. A. Hall, Jr., *A Note on Bound Forms* (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct.) harks back to a discussion by Penzel (*J.E.G.P.*, xlii, 418) of the term *complex word* used to describe a phrase such as *King of England*

because the bound forms *-'s* can be added to it: *the King of England's daughter*. He suggested that confusion has arisen because most discussion of bound forms has occurred in connexion with analysis of the inflexion of individual words, and all bound forms occurring with individual words have been considered on the same level. The best solution appears to be to recognize that forms may be bound on more than one level in the structure of a language, e.g. in West European languages with four levels of morphology and syntax we should recognize four levels of bound forms. These would be indicated by the use of different symbols to precede or follow the various types of bound forms, rather than continuing the current practice of using a hyphen indiscriminately with some forms and no indication at all with others.

An article on word-formation in modern English comes from A. G. Hatcher, *Twilight Splendour, Shoe Colors, Bolero Brilliance* (*M.L.N.*, Nov.). One of the most characteristic innovations in technical and official language is that represented by noun combinations in which the second noun names some aspect of the first. This general pattern falls into several classes, reflecting the commercial, scientific, sociological, economic aspects of the world today. The condition or aspect which is classified may belong to some general sphere and may represent a factor with which society must cope (*transportation difficulties*), it may be the condition of modern man himself that is involved, his morale, general welfare, and efficiency, considered as a factor (*employee morale, family welfare, pilot efficiency*), or the classification may be applied to commodities (*food quality*). It is particularly the calculating quality which is apparent (*running time, water power, man power*), and in general the keynote of this type of expression is a concern with efficiency and success. This pattern of word formation is still greatly limited. Only when the phenomenon is viewed as a social or technical problem with which one must cope, and only when the aspect of that phenomenon is one that can be recognized and isolated is this procedure resorted to (e.g. *skin condition* but not **room condition, will power* but not **imagination power, family welfare* but not **family serenity*).

Most of the examples of this utilitarian type are a product of the last decade, but the logical relationship which they illustrate is to be found in noun combinations from the time of OE. *gumcyst*.

Shakespeare has *vulture folly*, *idiot laughter*, etc., and compare also the Victorian poets *twilight splendour*, *maiden grâce*, *forest gloom*, etc. Originally the type was an artistic device by which the poet could suggest crystallization of an ideal quality, but it is obvious that the poetic *twilight splendour* and the commercial *shoe colors* represent two distinct inspirations. The technical and official types do not trace their origin to a poetic device but have come about simply as a result of an increasing desire to classify various aspects of modern civilization. But there is also a third type which is due to the deliberate imitation of the poetic type by commercial writers. *Sandal simplicity*, *bolero brilliance*, *leg loveliness*, are variations on the theme of *twilight splendour*, for here we have to do not with a condition that is accidental or temporary, or with one that may fluctuate and needs gauging, but with an inherent and constant aspect. This self-conscious adaptation of a poetic device indicates that the particular pattern has ceased to inspire poets, since only then will advertisement writers find inspiration in it. But advertisement has only given the *coup de grâce* to what was already expiring.

Various studies by Leo Spitzer on the etymology of individual words have appeared of which the most important is probably an article on *Patterns of Thought and Etymology: ii Curse* (*Word*, Aug.). In this Spitzer is concerned to show from a discussion of the etymology of *curse* how a close inspection of the particular medieval pattern of thought leads to a solution of an etymological crux. The semantic development and etymologies so far suggested are unsatisfactory, and whilst the form suggests L. *cursus* 'turn' there are obvious semantic difficulties. Evidently we have to start from a certain use of the verb *incurrere* which, in classical Latin, was used of 'running into' ills of any kind, and in late Latin came to be said more and more of crimes, i.e. moral ills, from which comes the sense 'to sin'. But there is still a semantic gap between *incursus penae* 'the fact of having incurred a penalty', or even *incursus* (*-io*) 'error, sin' on the one hand and the oldest English phrase 'to have God's curs', where we should translate *curs* by 'wrath'. No medieval Latin or Romance text seems to bear witness to a meaning which could lead to 'moral condemnation, curse', and in all probability the bridge is to be found in the various formulae of anathema and excommunication. Since in the concretized thinking

of the Middle Ages the wrath of God, or of his lieutenants on earth, had pragmatical, material, objective consequences, so wrath must become exteriorized in a penalty imposed by the authorities. It is as if *incurrere iram* and *incurrere poenam* had coalesced into one conception of 'incurring the wrath of the authorities and being punished by them'. Thus *incursus* was able to become exactly synonymous with English *curse*, with moral condemnation, censure, blame. It is this assumed moral vengeance of the deity, as interpreted by the censorial authorities, worldly or ecclesiastical, of this earth, which has led to the semantic development of English *curse*.

In similarly detailed fashion Spitzer deals with the etymology of *Burglar* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.), and in *Three Etymologies* (*P.Q.*, July) with *interlope, interloper*; *jam, jamble, jumble*; and *rubbish*.

Spitzer, on *The Gentiles* (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct.), finds it surprising that dictionaries should be nearly unanimous in failing to recognize the strange but common use of *Gentiles* for 'Christians' as opposed to 'Jews'. Presumably the reason why Christians should identify themselves with the heathen instead of considering themselves the successors of God's elect people, is due to the peculiar nature of the Calvinism imported from England by the earlier settlers in America. This consisted in an extraordinary reverence for Old Testament patterns of thought and conduct. In seventeenth-century England those sects which recruited themselves from the lower classes could understand the Old Testament better than the abstract dogmatic books of the New Testament, and in their fight against the High Church were led to adopt more easily the ideas of the Jewish Bible. Thus Calvinist religious leaders, seeking to found a New Canaan, were able to identify themselves so closely with ancient Jews as to borrow their terminology—even when the term had to stamp them as excluded from Judaism. In considering themselves as successors of the Jews they adopted a designation which denied the succession in question and perpetuated discrimination.

Kemp Malone, *Two Good Anglo-Saxon Words* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.), gives a quotation in which *Anglo-Saxon* simply means 'plain English', and is applied to words of foreign origin introduced into the language hundreds of years after the Conquest. This

meaning of the word, though neglected by the dictionaries, is well established by current usage.

C. B. Brown, in *The Contribution of Latin to English*,[12] is concerned only with the contribution to the vocabulary. He lists in alphabetical order 'every Latin term that has produced a word in English of any consequence, and under each Latin term groups all important English words that derive from it'. Special attention is paid to medical and scientific terms, and practical exercises have been inserted at the end of the various sections. On the whole the work appears to have been carried out carefully and conscientiously, though the etymology of some of the words is not always as certain as might be inferred from a reference to this work. In addition its usefulness as a reference book is lessened by the fact that no indication is given as to whether the English word in question is directly from the Latin, or whether it has been borrowed only indirectly through some other language or languages.

The *Dictionary of Unusual Words*[13] is intended 'not merely to introduce unknown words but to draw attention to the possibilities of words which are superficially known', though whether this is really the best way of fulfilling such intentions may be doubted. The inclusion of some of the words is due to the difficulty of pronunciation, but since this is indicated only by the use of the ordinary alphabet, without 'strange signs or hieroglyphics' the indications help little. The use of other words is usually, though not invariably, illustrated by quotations, not always particularly apposite, nor is it possible to say why quotations should be given for some words but not for others. Certainly the book is an interesting one to dip into, but equally certainly the inclusion of such words as *adipocere*, *gregueria*, *meniscus*, *mundungus*, *vielleuse*, etc., hardly supports the claim of the compiler to have 'made a selection of words which, although diverse in character may properly and aptly be used in conversation between individuals of a norma standard of education and intelligence'. This is the first of a series of four books to be published, the plan being to introduce words

[12] *The Contribution of Latin to English*, by C. B. Brown. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt Univ. Press. pp. x+246.

[13] *Dictionary of Unusual Words—Part A*. Leigh-on-Sea: Thames Bank Publishing Co. pp. 271. 8*s*. 6*d*.

of increasing difficulty and obscurity as the work progresses. That being so it is difficult to imagine what words can appear in the fourth book of the series.

The purpose of J. B. Firth, *The English School of Phonetics* (*Trans. of the Phil. Soc.*), is 'by giving a brief account of the origin and reaches of our notable work in this branch of linguistics . . . to show how very English it is, and to emphasize above all things, continuity in that quality over a long period'. He begins by summarizing the miscellaneous aims of English phoneticians, and goes on to deal in detail with some of these aims, showing how large an importance English workers have had in the development of the various subjects. The development of an international phonetic alphabet owes much to the work of English phoneticians from Hume onwards, whilst the study of the language and of standards of pronunciation has its beginnings with Ælfric, through Hart—who looks back to the Conquest—Bullokar, Wallis, Coles, down to Sir William Jones and thence to the beginning of the Philological Society. Firth then turns to the invention of systems of shorthand, beginning with Dr. Timothy Bright of York who was the forerunner of an incredibly large number of systems leading eventually to Pitman. From shorthand we turn naturally to the invention of new letters to serve the needs of new spelling or transcription. Apart from the runes of Old English and the inventions of Orrm such devices have been common from Elizabethan times onward, beginning with Smith's *Alphabeticum Anglicum*, Bullokar—whose spelling was tried by Queen Elizabeth—Butler, Holder, and as before through Sir William Jones to the scholars of last century, there is a continuity in this as in other aspects of phonetics. But the most epoch-making work before Sweet's real foundation of the English school was the immense stimulus given to phonetics and general linguistics by Sir William Jones. He introduced the Indian grammarians and phoneticians, without whom it is difficult to imagine the nineteenth-century school of phonetics, whilst his contributions to the study of spelling, transcription and transliteration, together with his wise observations on phonetics, were the inspiration for a great deal of work in England, Germany and America. From the latter country comes the work of Franklin, Webster, Whitney, and, most interesting of all, Samuel Haldeman—the real founder of modern Amerindian

linguistics. Having carried the influence of the English school through Jones to the Continent and America, Firth ends with a brief summary of the continuity of the work of the English school from Jones, through Ellis, the Bells, Murray, Pitman, to Joseph Wright and Sweet.

It is well that modern linguists should be reminded of their debt to a scholar who never received his due academic recognition. In a pleasant and interesting paper on *Henry Sweet* (*Trans. of the Phil. Soc.*) C. L. Wrenn makes clear the enormous debt which is owed to the pioneer work of this scholar. The method used, a brief commentary on the chief facts of his biography, shows clearly the early development of Sweet's scholarship, and the numerous divisions of the subject in which he did valuable pioneer work. He laid the foundations of Old English dialectology, taught phonetics to Europe, and made England the birthplace of the modern science. His studies in the pronunciation of living languages marked a new departure, whilst in his *History of English Sounds* the historical facts of English phonology were set forth by a scientific student in the light of the facts of the living language. His series of primers show that he was a born teacher of the highest quality, and the literary judgment and imagination displayed in his *Anglo-Saxon Reader* make it one of the best of such introductions to Old English and have kept it in constant use. After 1885 Sweet turned away from his Anglo-Saxon studies to produce the works in grammar, comparative philology and the theory of language which mark his later years. This shift of interests had disadvantages as well as advantages. On the one hand a series of academic disappointments and rebuffs caused him to become dissatisfied with one piece of work after another, with the result that much of his published work lacks an important expository part. On the other hand the continued freedom from any sort of academic ties enabled him to spend far more time on pioneering scholarship than would have been possible for a University teacher.

English place-names have again received little attention. Apart from W. G. Arnott, *Place-Names of the Deben Valley Parishes*, which it has not been possible to see, the only work to appear is an article by K. Jackson, *On the Name 'Leeds'* (*Antiquity*, Dec.). Jackson finds serious objections to Max Förster's explanation of

the name. He agrees that the best way of accounting for Będe's *oi* is to take it as the mutation of an earlier *ō*, and the only late British sound which could have been heard as *ō* by the Anglo-Saxons is the earlier *ā* which became *ō* in late British. As for the suffix, since *Loidis* is a *regio* in Bede it is more probably a tribal name than a river one, presumably in *-enses* rather than *-issa*. This means a British *Lātenses/Lādenses* becoming late British *L ōdēses/ Lōðēses*, either of which would be borrowed into PrOE. as *Lōdīs*. No obvious etymology suggests itself for Celtic *lād-*, but Celtic *lāt-* gives Welsh *llawd*, Irish *lāth* 'heat in animals', and more generally 'heat, ardour, passion'. Hence *Lātenses* may well contain a river name *Lāta* 'the boiling or violent one', and the etymology of *Leeds* would then be 'the folk living round the Lāta'.

Rather more work has appeared on American place-names, and more especially an excellent popular work on the subject by G. R. Stewart.[14] Using the framework of a general historical account of the discovery and development of the U.S.A. the author has given an admirable account of the origin and evolution of the place-names. After a brief chapter on the early Indian names he goes on to discuss those given by the early settlers and explorers, and here it seems possible to distinguish different tendencies according to the nationality of the people involved. The Spaniards, in general, seem to have taken the business of naming seriously, and their characteristic names echo the festivals of the church calendar; the French, intermingling more closely with the Indians, usually retained the Indian names, either in translation or in a French form, whilst the English, keeping up their old habits, simply transplanted the familiar English names, however unsuitable the new setting might be. However in the case of the last this tendency had died out by the end of the seventeenth century and native resources begin to be utilized, more especially in the way in which the founder or an important inhabitant now gives his name to a town.

Perhaps naturally the old traditions of naming are completely broken down by the Revolution, and it is after this that the old classical names, Troy, Syracuse, Athens, etc., become popular, reminders of the classical interests of the late eighteenth century. From such names arises the habit of using any notable or fine-

[14] *Names on the Land*, by G. R. Stewart. Random House, New York. pp. 418. $3.

sounding foreign name, whether of city, province, or country, but as far as native names are concerned *-burgh* and *-ville* become the almost invariable suffixes, though in addition the old names are carried westward from the east coast by the pioneers.

During the nineteenth century the romantics came into their own; poetic words such as *glen*, *vale*, *hurst*, *mere*, etc., became popular, foreign words were borrowed and Indian names used, the latter often being given highly poetic meanings which the author regards with a good deal of wholesome scepticism. The Civil War, on the whole, had comparatively little effect on the names, and the last considerable outbreak of naming comes during the second half of the century and mainly affects the West. After 1890 naming becomes more official. The Board of Geographic Names decides on disputed cases, and after 1906 is entrusted with approving new names. The chief name-givers are no longer the wandering frontiersmen but the members of the Geological Survey, Forest Service, or National Park Service.

Such an outline necessarily omits many of the interesting topics dealt with by the author, and all interested in place-names will find this a fascinating book, especially valuable as giving a general indication of how place-names arise.

An excellent example of the careful and detailed work on which Stewart's more general book is based is provided by a book on West Virginia place-names.[15] A general introduction shows that many of the early place-names refer to tragedies or events in the lives of early pioneers, whilst others provide evidence of their nationality. There are a good many Indian names, though since most of them are modern they provide no evidence for the earlier inhabitants of the district. Names taken from the flora and fauna of the region are of interest since the changing geographical conditions have left many of them as misnomers in modern times. As was to be expected industries have left their mark on the nomenclature, and these not only the modern industries dependent on coal, iron, or oil, but also the earlier ones of the pioneers. On occasion the names reveal the religion of the early settlers, and their general illiteracy, whilst in contrast are a few names taken from literature and the classics. Historical events are of course commemorated,

[15] *West Virginia Place Names*, by H. Kenny. Piedmont, West Virginia: The Place Name Press. 1945. pp. xii+768. $6.

the Revolution and the various wars, Civil, Mexican, Spanish, First World War, down to MacArthur, a post-office established in 1942. A survey of the original sources on which the work is based shows how much these vary in quality and quantity, and it is obvious that nothing can take the place of that personal investigation on the spot which has been the source of much of Kenny's information.

A brief section on the phonology of the dialect as exemplified in the place-names, where the phonetics is sometimes doubtful, and remarks on the changes of place-names and synthetic place-names, is followed by the main body of the book, consisting of the names in alphabetical order. Probably the point which most immediately attracts notice is the modernity of many of them, so much so that not infrequently it has been possible to obtain an explanation of the name from one who was present at the actual christening. A surprisingly large number of places have changed their name, sometimes as many as three or four times. In general the work appears to have been carried out carefully and conscientiously with few possible sources left unexplored.

On personal names the most important work to appear for some considerable time is G. F. Black's comprehensive and scholarly work dealing with the origin, meaning, and history of several thousand Scottish surnames,[16] and including also a number of early personal names which did not become surnames but nevertheless have a special interest of their own. The introduction describes the gradual rise of surnames in Scotland, emphasizing the fact that from early records it is not always possible to say whether the surname has developed or not, whether for example *filius Davidi* means 'son of a man called David', or whether the family in question had been 'Davidson' for several generations. The various types of surname are dealt with, patronymics, local and territorial names, official and trade surnames, nicknames, and the interesting use of 'to-names'; and the author agrees with Ewen in concluding that comparatively few are to be derived from nicknames. The development of Christian names into surnames leads to remarks on the history of the former, and on the general principles of naming in the Indo-European languages with particular

[16] *The Surnames of Scotland. Their Origin, Meaning and History*, by G. F. Black. New York: The New York Public Library. pp. lxxii+838.

reference to Gaelic names and the influence on them of the clan system. Especially interesting is a discussion of the methods employed in changing or concealing Gaelic names, numerous examples of which are to be found in the book. The introduction of Norman and Irish names leads to a consideration of population movements during the historic period, and, although it is emphasized in the preface that the folklore and fairy-tales of clan origin are no concern of the author, yet he does give us a section which shows the length to which some amateur etymologists are prepared to go. Equally entertaining is a short list of curious descriptions and names, e.g. Adam Aydrunken, Ricardus Hangpudyng, etc., which can be added to the list given by Ewen. More useful, if less amusing, sections are those dealing with the alternative forms and the corruptions in spelling to be met with in the records. In the main body of the work the names are dealt with in alphabetical order, each entry giving the origin of the name—where known—its earliest occurrence in the records, and a list of forms with notes on variants, as well as on some famous or notorious users of the name. A useful glossary of uncommon or obsolete Scots words concludes the book.

It is a safe prophecy that this book, scientific and scholarly without ever becoming dull, will deservedly remain the standard work on the subject.

Useful work on a limited part of the subject is to be found in E. Ekwall, *Variation in Surnames in Medieval London*,[17] which opens with a brief survey of the more important reasons for the medieval variation of surname. A local or other surname may interchange or be combined with an occupational designation; a by-name or nickname could be used side by side with or instead of a real surname; an inherited surname of non-local origin may interchange with a local designation; two local surnames may interchange or be used side by side; sometimes an interchange of a purely formal nature may occur; and finally surnames must often have been transferred from one person to another, not by inheritance but by actual transfer, e.g. an apprentice may acquire the name of his master. It is this last type of transfer that forms the main subject of the present study which is strictly limited to

[17] *Variation in Surnames in Medieval London*, by E. Ekwall. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerups Förlag. 1945. pp. 56.

medieval London, the material being mostly derived from the London records of the period before *c.* 1350. Various examples of the transfer of a master's surname to an apprentice are given divided into various categories, according as to whether the father's name is or is not known, whether the person whose surname has displaced an earlier one is known or not, and transfers which are indicated only by agreement between the name of a master and his apprentice. A few instances also occur of the transfer of the surname of a near relative. In most cases it is the mother's maiden name which has been transmitted, and it seems to have been not unusual for a married woman to continue to use or be called by her maiden name. In general the results of the inquiry suggest that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries it must have been quite usual for the surname of the apprentice to be replaced either temporarily or definitely by that of his master, and usually the new surname displaced the old one altogether. Evidently in the fourteenth century the Christian name was still the important one, and the usage as regards surnames had not yet acquired the fixed character it had later. But it must be emphasized that the variations here noted are exceptional, and in the vast majority of cases London citizens had hereditary surnames.

W. Wood, *An Investigation of the Hambleton Dialect* (*Trans. of the Yorks. Dialect Society*), begins with a description of the methods used in the collection and arrangement of material for a thesis on this subject. A descriptive account of the sounds of the modern dialect is given, the development of the Middle English sound system into it is briefly noted, together with an outline of its grammar and a series of specimen texts. The article ends with various conclusions and opinions, both general and particular, on dialect.

D. S. Bland, *Basic English* (*Journal of the South-West Essex Technical College*), after a brief glance at the history of artificial languages goes on to describe some of the differences between these and Basic English. Some frequent criticisms of the latter are mentioned, but Bland decides that, despite these, Basic English 'is the most logical attempt yet formulated to build a world language, and the one most likely to succeed'. Its great advantages are that it is based on and leads to a natural language, it is succinct, it is sup-

ported by a literature, it lends itself to satisfactory teaching methods, and it is based on a language already spoken by two of the leading nations of the world and one which is flexible enough to bear deviations from the normal without undue strain. Perhaps the answers to some of the criticisms are not as final as the author hopes, but the disadvantages of Basic English are so often stressed that it is well for the other side to be presented.

After rather a long interval—the last part appeared in 1940—it is good to see the resumption of the publication of *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*.[18] In this part there are few long articles, *dwell* v., *e* 'eye', *eke*, *end*, and *enter* being perhaps the longest and rarely taking more than a couple of columns. Perhaps the most striking feature of this instalment is the number of words in the short part of D to be included which have had to be left as 'origin obscure', e.g. *dullie*, *dunche*, *duntibour*, *dirk*, *dusch*, *dyall*, *dyvour*, etc., a fact which helps to emphasize the difficulty of medieval Scots. The general plan of the dictionary has been discussed earlier, and all that needs to be said here is to express the immense debt owed to the editor by all students of Middle Scots.

On American English E. Ekwall, *American and British Pronunciation* (*Stud. Neoph.*), is the first serious attempt to deal with the historical relation between educated American and educated British pronunciation. A brief survey of remarks on the subject by earlier writers is followed by a statement of the author's own objects, 'to try to formulate the problem more definitely than has been done hitherto', and 'to find out as nearly as possible at what point of time or period the differentiation between British and American took place or began'. After a few preliminary remarks on American pronunciation Ekwall goes on to review critically, in the light of the general development of English pronunciation, a number of outstanding features of American pronunciation, involving a discussion in detail of stressed vowels in *glass*, *calf*, *grant*, etc.; *name*, *no*, *more*, etc.; *sun*, *squirrel*, *stirrup*, *syrup*, *dog*, *hot*, *get*; the unstressed vowels in *-ary*, *ery*, *-ory*, *-ile*, and the consonants *r* and intervocalic *t*. The conclusion is that American pronunciation shows a striking agreement with British standard

[18] *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, by Sir William A. Craigie. Part X (Dullit—Execratioun). O.U.P. pp. 120. 21*s*.

pronunciation such as it was in the latter half of the eighteenth century. After that period the latter has undergone important changes which are not shared by the former, and political separation has gone hand in hand with linguistic differentiation. Ekwall argues that this agreement cannot be due to chance, and educated American pronunciation must be essentially founded on the standard British pronunciation or have been strongly influenced by it. Either the educated among the early colonists must already have had a pronunciation which on the whole agreed with southern standard English and this was adopted by the people generally and has lived on down to our time, or, more probably, educated American speech was under the influence of standard English all through the Colonial period, and shared its development. When the colonies became independent the direct and close communication ceased, and the new country even placed itself consciously in opposition to England and everything British. From that time American pronunciation has on the whole been independent of British, and so has not shared in its later developments, but remains at about the stage it had reached by the time of the Revolution. This does not, of course, mean that American pronunciation has stood still, nor is the possibility excluded that influence from Standard British has made itself felt to some extent even in the last century and a half.

K. L. Pike's investigation into the intonation of American English[19] was begun in order to discover the best methods of teaching English intonation to foreigners. In general intonation is constituted by a series of pitches, and in each language the use of pitch fluctuation tends to become semi-standardized, so that all speakers of the language use basic pitch sequences in similar ways under similar circumstances. These abstracted characteristic sentence melodies may be called Intonation Contours. Intonation changes or adds something to the meaning of the phrase; it is not limited to specific syllables or words but may be spread over many syllables, and can be divided into parts. In English there are four significant levels, extra-high, high, mid and low, but these are only relative, and the distance between the four levels varies. By themselves the levels are meaningless; it is the intonation contour which carries the

[19] *The Intonation of American English*, by K. L. Pike. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Publications. Linguistics. Vol. I. pp. xi+200.

meaning whilst the pitch levels contribute end-points, beginning-points, or direction-change-points to the contours. Pike goes on to demonstrate that intonation contours are intimately related to pauses and rhythm, and a survey of contrasts between pause, rhythm and intonation is made, followed by a description of the various methods used for the transcription of intonation. The specific contours of American English are next listed, with a tentative statement of their meanings, and the modification of contours is considered. The next points to be dealt with are the difficulties and problems of intonation met with by the English Language Institute, the ways in which these were overcome, the symbolism used, and the value of intonation in teaching a method for analysing Tone languages. This is followed by the analysis of seven selections taken from a conversational text, which shows the difference of occurrence of the various intonation contours, and it is discovered that those which have been chosen on other grounds for teaching to Latin American students of English were also the most frequent ones. A brief final chapter considers the relation of intonation to speech as a whole.

A scholarly book on Australian English is S. J. Baker's *The Australian Language*.[20] It opens with a discussion of Australian English and continues with a survey of previous work on the subject. The second part deals with the subject historically from convict times to the present, different chapters noting the different additions to the vocabulary from practically every source, the land, the bush, the city, the flora and fauna, sport and war, etc. An interesting chapter deals with the contribution of the aborigines, with the various types of pidgin English the use of which is considered a degrading influence on its users who could just as easily learn standard English, and the spread of Australian English into some of the neighbouring islands. Other chapters deal with alphabeticisms, craft slang, vulgarisms, and the influence of English dialects and of American English. It is worthy of note that the author considers the last to have been greatly exaggerated and that there has been quite as much influence the other way. Part III deals with the language in literature, stresses the influence of the newspapers, and more especially of the *Bulletin*, on the develop-

[20] *The Australian Language*, by S. J. Baker. London and Sydney: Angus and Robertson. 1945. pp. xii+425.

ment of the language, and deals briefly with the use of the idiom by Australian writers. The fourth section deals scientifically with the vexed question of the Australian accent. It seems certain that a large-scale reshuffling of English vowels has occurred in Australian. Tongue movements are much more restricted than those of standard English. Vowels are brought more closely together, and are more liable to influence one another. The final conclusion on the subject is that the 'Australian way of speaking represents something new in world-speech; but a good deal of it is inherited. Some of the elements approximate those of Cockney, others are reflected in the English provinces, especially in the north'.

Despite the excellence of the work some reservations are necessary. Perhaps its very comprehensiveness prevents the emergence of a picture of standard Australian. It is not at all clear how many of the Australian terms noted are used all over the country, and so may be said to belong to the standard language, and how many are merely local. The author himself appears to have felt this difficulty when he declares that it is not possible to make 'a cut-and-dried differentiation between standard words and those that fall into the more popular section of our language', and again, 'Australia is too young in the development of her language for this question of the standard and the non-standard to be carried beyond a certain stage'. No doubt this is true, but equally certainly it should have been possible to give some indication of which words were merely dialectal and which were more widely known. Such minor points, however, detract little from the real value of the work, and it is to be hoped that Baker will give us that companion volume on New Zealand English on which he has already apparently done much work.

# III

# OLD ENGLISH

By MARJORIE DAUNT

THIS year there is a noticeable increase in books, a welcome sign of a little improvement in the paper supply and of confidence among publishers. There are two important works on the period of Bede and a revision of Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader* which may well count as a new book, so scarce have the older editions been of late. A new *Old English Reader* from Paris is also a pleasant indication of the interest taken there in our early language and literature. Mossé's Reader was published in 1945 but was not available for notice in the volume for that year. Among articles, the most noticeable trend is that away from what might be called 'text-tinkering' which has provided us with a large proportion of the corpus of criticism attached to our texts. The present writers are much more concerned with contextual probability, the probability provided by archaeological knowledge, or by discovery of authorities or contemporary philosophical ideas. These are valuable and productive lines of research, needing more and more workers.

The first book to be mentioned deserves its priority. *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*,[1] by William Levison, is a valuable volume for students of Anglo-Saxon and fills an existing gap. The chapter headings show the varied angles from which the period is approached. An Introduction on 'Channels of Intercourse and Trade' is followed by 'England and the Church of Rome' (specially important section on pilgrimages); the Frisian Mission; Boniface; German Mission and the Reform of the Frankish Church; from Pippin to Charles the Great; Learning and Scholarship. In addition there are eleven important appendices. The chapter on Learning and Scholarship, with its special section on Anglo-Saxon script on the Continent, should be read with attention by those who hold that similar scribal writings in Old English

[1] *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, by William Levison. O.U.P. pp. 360. 21*s*.

and Old Frisian documents are proof of 'sound changes' common to both languages.

The Introduction mentioned above suggests that intercourse was never wholly interrupted, and thus it is not necessary to assume a period during the early Saxon settlement so dark that no communication from the mainland could reach these islands. The text of this book is most readable and clear of references, which are properly kept in footnotes.

A new edition of Henry Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*[2] is an event. It is re-edited with some alterations by C. T. Onions. There are some changes in the texts, all for the better. Extracts from Alfred's translation of Boethius replace the dull piece from the *Cura Pastoralis*; Bede's account of the coming of the Angles, Saxons and Jutes is the other important prose addition. The Epilogue to Cynewulf's *Elene* fills a gap in the original scheme, and the dialect section has been improved by having fewer Mercian hymns and more Latin. The little introductory paragraphs to the extracts have been revised and brought up to date, and some additions have been made to the notes.

It is in respect of the notes that the reviser may meet the criticism which he forestalls in the preface. He declares his loyalty to Sweet's aim of keeping the book above the elementary level. Is it less elementary to give full additional notes on some texts and leave others scanty? The *Wanderer* comes off badly and has nothing valuable been written about *Judith* since 1892? What about all the work on Charters done by Florence Harmer?

A notable contribution to Old English Studies is the *Manuel de l'Anglais du Moyen Âge*[3] of Fernand Mossé. This book came out in 1945 but was not then available for notice and is too good not to be welcomed as a sign of real interest in our early history. The only features of the volume that cannot be praised are the paper and printing. Script, pronunciation ('devant *l* et *r* + consonne et devant *h*, *ea* note également le son [œ]'), phonology, stress, grammar and syntax all are adequately treated from the most modern

[2] *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, revised by C. T. Onions. O.U.P. pp. 320. 10*s*. 6*d*.

[3] *Manuel de l'Anglais du Moyen Âge. I. Viel-Anglais. Grammaire et Textes*, par Fernand Mossé. Paris: Aubier.

angle. The conciseness is admirable. 'La Phrase' covers the essentials of Old English Syntax in about seventy small pages. It is clearly paragraphed and grouped. History is not forgotten and the notes are full of material.

In *The Religious Principle in 'Beowulf'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June) Marie Hamilton suggests that 'the orthodox view of Providence known to the English converts also included the dogma of election and grace, which analysts of *Beowulf* have neglected'. She admits the difficulties of her problem since actual proof is 'out of the question' and 'the only tests at hand are harmony with the prevailing tenor of the poem and congeniality to the intellectual climate in which it flowered'. There is much interesting material in the article, but it does not seem to prove anything, since the mixture of heathen and Christian has always been so involved in all countries as to be hard to disentangle.

When Grendel could not approach the throne of Hroðgar, is it a symbol of spiritual favour or is it a traditional reference to the non-Christian sanctity of the Scandinavian throne?

A large part of the argument deals with the relationship, if any, of Grendel and Cain and finds rather complicated expression. The line of thought is at once perhaps over-subtle and over-simple, since it accepts elaborate Christian theological thought and sweeps away folklore and its anthropological foundation. At the same time there are many interesting points raised, though the interest is often one not necessarily created by the writer.

In *'Beowulf' and the Classical Epic* (*Mod. Phil.*, Nov.) James R. Hulbert offers a spirited defence of *Beowulf* against the many critics who have disparaged it in comparison with Homer or Virgil. He points out that Ker and Haber have done *Beowulf* more justice than other writers, realising that digressions and apparently irrelevant references are to be found in the classical models. Hulbert suggests a very apt comparison of the 'associative' style of writing in *Beowulf* and in many modern writers, notably Browning and Conrad. Admiration for this method of writing, as opposed to direct narrative is a matter of personal taste and not of 'right or wrong'. The supposed absence of suspense, due to the foreknowledge of the outcome of the action is countered by reference to many acknowledged works of art, and even thrillers, in which suspense is based on wonder *how* the known end will be reached.

There is a slight wavering of the defence against Ker's criticism of the principal actions of *Beowulf* as curiously trivial. Hulbert rightly feels that they may be trivial to *us*, but were grim and real to their hearers. He does not refer to Bertha Phillpott's stimulating suggestion of deliberate avoidance of a greater dramatic situation, which would make the author of *Beowulf* a conscious artist —not merely a tale teller.

Carrying the attack into the enemy's camp, Hulbert winds up with a claim of the superiority in some respects of *Beowulf* over the *Iliad*. The chief of these respects is the psychological truth with which the main characters are revealed in their many speeches and in references to, and hints about, them. Little is said about outward appearance, but a great deal is known about *Beowulf's* thoughts—or even probable thoughts. This article shows how old material can be reconsidered and profitably and refreshingly restated. Yes, the critics of *Beowulf* have often been 'naïve'.

A long and interesting article on *The Knight Yder and the Beowulf Legend*, by Elaine C. Southward (*Med. Aev.*), is only incidentally relevant to this survey. The author traces in detail the many references in Arthurian literature to Yder, son of Nut, who first makes his appearance in the eleventh century. His adventures with a bear, a giant, a special sword and a rescued maiden, are ultimately, and highly probably, traced back to the same 'bear's son' folk-tale that is responsible for the adventures of *Beowulf*. Similar adventures are to be found attributed to Hereward the Wake in the *Gesta Herwardi* which places them in the period of the hero's youthful wanderings.

The main features of the story are set out in numbered sequence and each point is referred to its source: 'In some country connected with the Scandinavians, a young hero deserted by his companions kills a bear with his hands in the ladies' bower. He then kills a giant in his retreat, cutting off a limb with a wonderful sword belonging to the giant, given to the hero by a maiden, to whom the giant had confided it. She was in his power but is delivered by the hero, whom she married.'

It is impossible here to trace the growth of this story round Yder, son of Nut, but the parallelism between the Arthurian 'Matière de Bretagne' and *Beowulf*, and again with *Gesta Herwardi* suggests a possible new field for *Beowulf* exploration.

*Notes on Old English Poetry*, by K. Sisam (*R.E.S.*, Oct.), deal with two passages in *Genesis B*, ll. 313–17 and ll. 327–9, followed by an essay, 'On the Authority of Old English Poetical Manuscripts', to which special attention should be given. The aim of the essay is to establish what degree of general accuracy in the poetical MSS. can be established to justify those so-called 'conservative' editors (R. P. Wülcker, R. W. Chambers, etc.) who try to interpret a MS. reading until finally driven to a small emendation.

A number of cases are considered where there is a small overlap between the contents of one O.E. poetical book and another, thus making the balancing of readings possible.

These cases are (*a*) *The Soul and the Body* in the *Exeter Book* and *the Vercelli Book*, (*b*) *Daniel-Azarias* verses in the *Exeter Book* (Azarias) and *MS Junius II* (Daniel), (*c*) *Solomon v. Saturn* (ll. 30–95) in MS. CCCC 422 (late tenth century) and a fragment in the margin of CCCC 41 (possibly late eleventh century).

In these small samples the number of differences in readings is remarkably large. They cannot be accounted for as slips or mistakes, but seem more consistent with oral transmission of verse. This cuts at the root of the conservative respect for MS. readings. A similar examination of *The Dream of the Rood* and the Ruthwell Runes, and of the existing versions of *Caedmon's Hymn* and the *Leiden Riddle* shows that tenth-century texts do not reproduce the archaic or dialectal forms and spellings of earlier copies. The important point is emphasized that copyists of Old English texts were not expected to reproduce the originals letter for letter, as if they were Latin or Biblical matter.

Further instances from *Beowulf* support Sisam's contention that the accuracy of the texts cannot be taken for granted and that there is no sign of correction of glaring mistakes by any early reader. This does not imply the same degree of inaccuracy in all existing MSS., nor is it suggested that MSS. should not be carefully consulted. This illuminating article carries with it in footnotes many comments and suggestions of the greatest value.

Erika von Erhardt-Siebold works patiently away at the *Riddles*, trying to explain them from an archaeological point of view, obviously the most hopeful line of approach. In *Old English Riddle No. 4* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept) she offers possible evidence for the old solution 'hand-mill' which has never been quite accepted. Her

interpretation rests on the 'rings' of the riddle being the sockets on which various parts of the mill pivot. A neat drawing illustrates the possible mill. Would it be allowable to take *þrag-bysig* not in the usual sense of 'busy at times', but as originally *þrap-bysig* "busy at torturing or burning?" *þrawan* which appears in Aelfric's vocabulary (*O.E.D.*, throw, 'vb') means 'twist', 'turn', and also 'torture on the rack'.

The same writer (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) turns to *Old English Riddle No. 39* and opens up a fascinating field of early scholarship by suggesting that the interpretation is *Hypostasis Death*; not only on account of the thought contained in the poem, which is fully analysed, but also because death hypostatized, that is 'an ideal reality in Plato's sense, . . . a suprasensible reality', was a subject of discussion, since some held that it was not admissible to hypostatize deprivative notions. So the author of the Riddle might have composed it when such a subject was topical. Miss von Erhardt-Siebold finally pleads for the co-operation of Celtic scholars in the attempt to reconstruct 'a *Thesaurus* of knowledge, which had been accumulated from material originating in the Italy of the post-Plotinian, Neoplatonic-Christian era', which she believes to have existed among the Celts of the British Isles at an early period. This quest should receive the widest possible support. Anglo-Saxon studies are suffering from the absence of a knowledge of Irish in Anglo-Saxon scholars.

Miss Erika von Erhardt-Siebold tackles another problem, *The Anglo-Saxon Riddle 74 and Empedokles' Fragment 117* (*Med. Aev*). The curious sequence of images, young woman, grey-haired woman, strong youth, bird, fish, and the return to land, in the Riddle finds an almost exact parallel in Empedokles' *Expiations* 'a religious poem of an orphico-pythagorian character composed in the fifth century B.C. She translates Empedokles' lines: 'Once I was young man, maiden, plant, bird, and mute fish cast ashore.'

Empedokles is expounding 'a cyclic metempsychosis which is coupled in a definite way to the elements earth, water and air'. This fascinating suggestion is followed up in some detail and the difficulty of tracing the source from which the Anglo-Saxon writer drew his Empedoklean idea is frankly admitted. Once again the absence of any exact information as to the learning of the early

Celts blocks the way, and will, until a corpus of such knowledge is built up. Possible suggestions are put forward.

*Riddle 9 (12) and 8 (10, 11)* are treated by A. E. H. Swaen (*Neophilologus*, July). The first is translated and explained as 'Night' with comments on earlier views; the second note deals ornithologically with the barnacle-goose.

*Variation in 'Widsith'*, by Kemp Malone (*J.E.G.P.*, April) starts with an analysis of 'variation' (i.e. Ealhhild, dryhtcwen dugupe, dohtor Eadwines) from the syntactical point of view, but much of the argument centres in the interpretation of *wrap waerloga* as applied to Eormenric, which he refuses to accept in its original sense, since neither history, nor tradition present Eormenric as a truce-breaker. Being convinced that the poet of *Widsip* would not disparage Eormenric, Kemp Malone translates *waerlogan* as dative plural and the variation as 'foe to treaty-breakers'. The historical discussion is interesting but the examination of the variations is rather subordinated to it.

A note on *Crist 558–585* by K. Jost (*Eng. Stud.*, Dec.) is best summarized in the writer's own words, since to condense the evidence would be unfair. '*Crist 558–585* is neither a speech of the angels on the Mount of Olives, addressed to the disciples, nor a hymn of praise sung by a host of angels in heaven after the Ascension. It is a fragment of a dialogue between a herald-angel outside the gates of heaven and a spokesman of the angels inside, of which the first part, owing to a leaf missing from the manuscript has unfortunately been lost.' This interesting suggestion makes a framework into which the apparent contradictions of the passage can logically be fitted.

Some points may be added to the notice in Chapter II, p. 31, of J. W. Watson, Jr.'s article, *Northumbrian Old English ēo and ēa* (*Language*, Jan.–March). Special weight is there given to the use of one Runic symbol on the Ruthwell Cross for ēo in *behēaldun* and *ea* in *heafdum*. This Watson holds has been generally overlooked and can only imply that the Runic sign represented one phoneme. Other textual evidence is also presented.

Turning to modern dialects the writer is on dangerous ground.

It is generally accepted that Ellis and even Wright are not safe authorities on which to build maps of dialect areas, but such evidence as can be gleaned appears to support the one-phoneme theory, thus proving Bülbring to have come nearer to the truth than Luick.

The danger with all these dialectal studies lies in the fact that hitherto almost all examinations of dialect have been made on an historical basis, thus the evidence which would tell for or against any given theory *may* have been missed. In the present state of our knowledge, and till the English Dialect Survey now being undertaken by the Philological Society produces new material this article on *ēo* and *ēa* presents as good a case as any.

A note of comment on *Old English Whale-hunting* is contributed by L. Whitbread (*M.L.R.*, April). The point at issue is the possibility of killing sixty whales in two days with only five companions, as Ohthere claims, especially if the complicated methods recorded by the Arab Al Udhri were used (cf. B. White, *Y.W.*, xxvi, 46). Either whales were smaller, perhaps walruses, or Ohthere was telling a fisherman's tale. The present writer has sometimes wondered if the usual reading is a confusion of *syx tu on twam dagum*, e.g. six (in a kill) twice in two days' hunting.

*Old English Verse and English Speech Rhythm* by the present writer (*Trans. of Phil. Soc.*) has been noticed above, Chapter II. p. 30

# IV

# MIDDLE ENGLISH

## I. CHAUCER

By DOROTHY EVERETT

THE 1946 work on Chaucer is more varied in kind than of late. There are rather fewer explanatory and textual comments, and rather more signs of 'literary' interest—interest, that is, in the processes of the poet's mind and art.

This survey will begin with some publications which can be called 'general' in the sense that they are concerned with more than one of Chaucer's works. An article by Norman Callan, *Thyn Owne Book: A Note on Chaucer, Gower and Ovid* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.), shows a sensitive appreciation of some of the details of Chaucer's art. Callan examines Chaucer's and Gower's handling of passages which both alike derived from Ovid, in particular the story of Pyramus and Thisbe and the description of the House of Sleep (*Metamorphoses*, XI). He finds that, in general, Gower keeps close to Ovid, 'but he is never the slave of [his original], and in this respect he is superior to Chaucer, who sometimes is', notably in the *Legend of Lucretia*. Callan draws attention to details in Ovid which caught Chaucer's imagination (and have sometimes been ignored by Gower)—the 'harde tyles' (*coctilibus*) which made the walls of Babylon (*L.G.W.*, 709), and the 'fistula simile' (*Met.*, IV, 119 ff., *L.G.W.*, 851–2), for instance. Comparing the two poets' renderings of the passage describing the House of Sleep, he pays tribute to the 'astonishing' metrical skill of Gower, but evidently prefers the 'strength' of Chaucer's versions (in the *Book of the Duchesse* and in the *Hous of Fame*).

Callan thinks that the passages taken directly from Ovid, and the various incidental allusions to him, are hardly, by themselves, sufficient to account for the phrase 'thyn owne book', used of the *Metamorphoses* by the eagle in speaking to Chaucer (*H.F.*, 712), and he considers what effect Ovid's work may have had upon Chaucer's poetry in general. Ovid's poem 'is an anthropological work of more serious scope than is usually granted, dealing largely

with myths of transformations in Nature wrought by the agency of sexual passion', and it is as such that it appealed to Chaucer. Callan thinks its influence can be seen in such passages as *Troilus*, II, 64 ff., 50 ff., and particularly III, 1 ff., but he stresses that it is 'implicit rather than overt', 'a "covered qualitee", showing its finest effects when expressed obliquely'.

In *A Note on Chaucer's Use of Aristotelian Psychology* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.), Marshall W. Stearns shows that Aristotle's theory of cognition is the ultimate source of several passages in which Chaucer describes the effect of a lady's appearance on the heart of a lover. Aristotle's theory—that knowing involved three processes: sensation (stimulation of the sense organs by some external object), imagination (part of which is the storing of copies of these sense-impressions in the mind), rational thought (discrimination between true and false, a process which can be so disturbed by strong feeling that illusions may result)—was taught, with modifications, in the universities of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and is later found in medieval literature, for example, in the *Roman de la Rose* and the *Vita Nuova*.

In *Troilus* I, 295 ff., Criseyde's 'look' quickens such desire in Troilus 'That in his herts botme gan to stiken Of hir his fixe and depe impressioun'; in terms of the Aristotelian theory, the first process being over, the second (imagination) takes place, and the image of Criseyde is stored in Troilus's heart (the heart being, in Aristotle's view, the organ of memory). This second process is referred to several times in *Troilus* (cf. I, 365–6; III, 1541–4), and elsewhere, for example, in the *Merchant's Tale*, E 1977–81, and, more obscurely, in the *Hous of Fame*, 36–40; generally the word 'impress' (or 'impressioun') is used in connexion with it. In the description in the *Merchant's Tale* of January's growing determination to marry May there is a strong suggestion of the following (third) process, and a jesting side-glance at it is to be found in the description of the carpenter's state of mind in the *Miller's Tale*, A 3611–17.

Stearns does not attempt to trace the course by which this Aristotelian conception reached Chaucer, but it is clear that he could have learnt it from a number of sources.

This is perhaps the best place to mention Robert A. Pratt's

chapter, entitled 'Karl Young's Work on the Learning of Chaucer', in *A Memoir of Karl Young*[1]—a sketch which has considerable interest for students of Chaucer. Young had undertaken to revise T. R. Lounsbury's chapter on 'The Learning of Chaucer' (in *Studies in Chaucer*, 1892, Vol. II), and, in the course of ten years' study he had produced a 'large collection of well-organized notes and writings of various kinds', from which it is possible to gather something of the scope and nature of the book he would have written. (Since Pratt's chapter will not be easily accessible, Young's own words, as reported by Pratt, may be freely quoted here). Young's revision of Lounsbury's work would evidently have been thorough-going. Besides taking account of all the information that has accumulated in the last half-century, the reviser, he thought, should try to put himself as completely as possible in Chaucer's place, he 'must try to escape, momentarily, from his inheritance of Puritanism,, and from his modern experience in romantic freedom'. He must also attempt to realize 'Chaucer's bibliographical surroundings'; that is, he must ask, not merely how did Chaucer use his books, but such other questions as, how he got them, how they differed from the printed poems we use, whether any of the books he knew 'still lurk in the original manuscripts, generally unknown to us'. Some notes for the Preface and some chapter headings show that Young's book would have dealt, among other topics, with medieval education and medieval libraries as known to Chaucer.

Pratt remarks that the articles which Young actually published represent a very small proportion of the work on which he was engaged. Much more was indicated at a meeting of the English Graduate Union, Columbia University, when Young told of two volumes (each represented in a number of MSS.) which Chaucer must have known—one, a 'standard medieval school reader' containing pieces by many authors to whom Chaucer alludes or from whom he borrows (authors such as Cato, Maximianus, Statius and Claudian); the other, a collection of 'antimatrimonial pamphlets, including Valerius, Theophrastus and Jerome', a book similar, in fact, to that which Jankin the clerk possessed. Among his concluding remarks on this occasion, Young noted his impression that 'Chaucer seems to have handled a smaller number of weighty

[1] *A Memoir of Karl Young*, by several hands. New Haven, privately printed. pp. 64.

volumes than we have sometimes supposed. Like all sensible men, he resorted to literary conveniences, and culled not a little of his information quite casually, or at second hand'. As a result 'His poems become, if that is possible, slightly more delightful. Their sententiousness assumes more of the pleasant naturalness of boyhood memory. The names of the great ones from antiquity nestle more modestly into the verses, and what learning there is rides the rhythms with an easier grace. More than ever Chaucer seems friendly, natural, and lovable'.

Pratt's second publication, *Chaucer Borrowing from Himself* (*M.L.Q.*, Sept.), first draws attention to the similarity between the fourth stanza in the *Invocacio ad Mariam* in the Second Nun's Prologue (G 50–56) and the fourth stanza of the Prioress's Prologue (B 1664–70). The first of these passages is based on part of St. Bernard's prayer to the Virgin in Dante's *Paradiso*, and it has generally been assumed that the second was also suggested by it, but Pratt notes that it is closer to Chaucer's own rendering than to Dante. Since the *Invocacio* was almost certainly written before the Prioress's *Tale*, Pratt thinks it likely that for her Prologue Chaucer turned, not directly to Dante's lines, but to his own rendering of them.

The second passage in which Pratt sees Chaucer borrowing from himself is the invocation to Cytherea in the *Parlement of Foules* (113 ff.). This, he thinks, is related in some way to the invocation to the second book of the *Hous of Fame*, which is itself compounded of ideas and phrases from passages in Dante and in the *Teseida*. Pratt suggests that the passage in the *Hous of Fame*, being closer to the sources, is the earlier, and was used for that in the *Parlement*. This instance seems less certain than the first, for the resemblances between these two Chaucerian passages are less fundamental.

In his book *Geoffrey Chaucer*[2] Alberto Castelli examines Chaucer's art as manifested in his poetry as a whole.

The first of his three chapters gives the facts about Chaucer's life, and, after describing his more important works, stresses the part which his connexion with the court, and his learning, played in his poetry. Commenting on Chaucer's attitude towards religion

[2] *Geoffrey Chaucer*, by Alberto Castelli. Brescia. pp. 175.

and politics, Castelli notes that he is not greatly interested in the theory of either. Religious problems interest him only when they are of concern to a suffering human being (as when Troilus is brought up against the problem of free will), or when a man's relation to religious life has a special bearing on his character (as with the Parson or the Prioress).

In his second chapter, entitled 'Il libro e la natura', Castelli begins by discussing Chaucer's use of books in some detail. Chaucer constantly directs his readers to his sources, sometimes so that he can cut short his narrative, sometimes for other reasons, and his references to and quotations from other writers, which differ from the usual appeal to authority, are an important and characteristic part of his poetic technique. Chaucer's allusions and comparisons are drawn principally from three sources, the Bible, classical myths and legends, and the chivalric romances; sometimes, as in the first stanza of the Balade in the *Legend of Good Women*, the three kinds appear intermixed. His Biblical allusions are not peculiar to him; the names he introduces are those familiar in all medieval literature, and they are employed in the usual connexions. In his allusions to the figures of chivalric romance, Castelli finds, almost always, an element of mockery; the remark made of Lancelot in the *Squire's Tale*, 'and he is deed', seems to him typical of Chaucer's attitude ('Morte erano, per Chaucer, tuttè le figure dei cicli cavallereschi'). Towards the heroes and heroines of classical story his attitude is different again. Very often he alludes to them in order to illustrate such states of mind as sadness or fear, though there are exceptions to this in, for example, the *Manciple's Tale* and the *Nun's Priest's Tale*. Chaucer's comparisons drawn from nature are mostly very brief and of a familiar kind, though he sometimes raises them above the commonplace by some slight addition as in 'whit as *morne* milk', or by making an unusual application of them.

At the close of this chapter Castelli quotes the description of Alison in the *Miller's Tale*, remarkable, among other things, for the many comparisons it includes, and he notes its great particularity as compared with one of Boccaccio's descriptions of women. The discussion of Chaucer's portraits is continued in the last chapter, where the descriptions of Blanche the Duchess and of the Prioress are analysed as examples of Chaucer's earlier and later methods, and Castelli shows how a portrait presented in the

General Prologue is amplified in the links and tales. He draws attention to the effects which Chaucer gains in the *Canterbury Tales* by his grouping of the pilgrims, one of his examples being the contrast achieved by the placing of the portrait of the Parson immediately after that of the Wife of Bath. As a result, Chaucer's framework has breadth and at the same time informality, and thus offers a strong contrast to the limited, symmetrical structure of the *Decameron.*

Though there are some misunderstandings of Middle English in this book, as a whole it is based on a careful study of Chaucer's poetry, and, with its lively translations of many passages, it should arouse interest in Chaucer in Italy. In spite of the rather florid style of parts of it, its author has a fresh approach and a power of observation which enable him to make a number of points well worth noting by students of Chaucer in any country.

E. E. Slaughter's *Love and the Virtues and Vices in Chaucer*[3] and Marchette Chute's *Geoffrey Chaucer of England*,[4] apparently a popular account of the poet, have not yet come to hand.

Among the publications specially concerned with the *Canterbury Tales* mention may first be made of Joseph Delcourt's edition of some selections, *Chaucer. Contes de Cantorbéry*,[5] which is presumably intended for French students reading English. His texts of the *General Prologue*, and of the *Tales* of the Clerk and the Franklin are from the Ellesmere MS. (as presented in the Six-Text edition), slightly emended from other MSS. printed in the Six-Text edition. There are explanatory notes on the *General Prologue* and the *Franklin's Tale*, and, to help with the understanding of the *Clerk's Tale*, the texts of Petrarch's Latin version and the anonymous French version (from MS. Bibl. nat. fr. 12459) are printed at the foot of the page. Discussions of origins and sources, and of other relevant matters are prefixed to each extract.

The introduction consists of two parts, first, a fairly brief account of Chaucer's life and work, second an 'Introduction Grammaticale' which describes, in considerable detail, the pronuncia-

[3] *Love and the Virtues and Vices in Chaucer*, by E. E. Slaughter. Nashville.
[3] *Geoffrey Chaucer of England*, by Marchette Chute. N.Y.
[5] *Chaucer. Contes de Cantorbéry*, ed. by Joseph Delcourt (Bibliothèque de Philologie Germanique, X). Paris. pp. 329.

tion, grammar, syntax and versification of Chaucer, with examples drawn from the three extracts. This part of the book would be useful to any student; it is fuller than the grammatical sections in most English and American editions of a similar kind, and the facts are more clearly set out.

Cognisance has, in general, been taken of recent work on Chaucer (for example, Severs's work on the sources of the *Clerk's Tale* has been utilized), and the book as a whole witnesses to the editor's careful scholarship.

The popularization of Chaucer, which almost inevitably means the modernization of his language, is the aim of H. L. Hitchins's book.[6] This is emphatically not intended for students or scholars; indeed the author goes out of his way to warn off those who already read Chaucer, or who understand Middle English. His 'modernization' consists in substituting a modern word where the Middle English is obsolete, but, since he aims at preserving Chaucer's metre and rhythm, he has to keep many Middle English endings. He knows that he has thus produced 'a conglomerate of Middle and Modern English which must be horrid to the learned etymologist', but his justification—that he hopes to whet the appetite for the task of reading the real Chaucer—is perhaps sufficient. It may, however, be remarked that Nevill Coghill's rather bolder modernizations (for the B.B.C. Third Programme) made a pleasanter impression.

Anyone who has studied, or proposes to study, Manly's and Rickert's great book *The Text of the 'Canterbury Tales'* will be grateful for the masterly summary and discussion of Manly's ideas presented by Germaine Dempster in *Manly's Conception of the Early History of the 'Canterbury Tales'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June). Mrs. Dempster's article is divided into five main sections, the first of which deals with Manly's view of the 'physical conditions of Chaucer's writing', deduced from the manuscripts that have come down to us. She summarizes his opinions as follows: 'The first draft of a *CT* piece (tale, prologue or link) would be written by Chaucer perhaps on paper but quite possibly on waxed tablets; from that draft a copy, presumably on paper, would be made by

[6] *Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer for present-day readers, prepared by H. L. Hitchins. Murray. pp. xii + 128. 6*s*.

a hired scribe; the scribal copy would then be proofread by Chaucer; in many cases it would, at some time or other, be used by Chaucer for revision of his work'. The fact that Manly's reconstructed text of the original contains mistakes that could hardly, in his opinion, be attributed to Chaucer himself, led him to the conviction that the latest common ancestor (called by Manly the 'original') of the extant copies of almost every *Canterbury Tales* piece was a scribal copy, not an autograph. At the same time he held that these originals were written while Chaucer was still living, and by his order, one of the reasons for this belief being the signs of revision which he believed he detected.

Mrs. Dempster's second section summarizes Manly's view of the 'manuscript situation' at Chaucer's death. It is assumed that there existed in Chaucer's possession a set of copies of all the genuine pieces known to us (with the possible exception of some cancelled links), in various stages of completion. Though Manly is not explicit on the point, it seems certain that he agreed with Tatlock in thinking that this set contained no indications of the order of the *Tales*. In addition to this set, Manly believed that there were in the possession of friends of Chaucer (and probably also of their friends) other copies of some pieces—that there was, in fact (in Mrs. Dempster's words), 'Some form of restricted pre-1400 circulation' of the *Tales*. This belief Mrs. Dempster terms 'the most challenging of the new features in Manly's conception'. The chief evidence for it consists of manuscript variations in certain pieces which seemed to Manly to indicate 'descent from copies representing successive stages of composition'. (He apparently assumed that an early version of a piece would not have survived, unless a copy had got out of Chaucer's hands before he revised that piece.) He found further evidence in the make-up of some early MSS., particularly Hengwrt, where the order of *Tales* and the omissions suggested that the scribe had obtained his material piece-meal. Mrs. Dempster more than once expresses doubts about Manly's interpretations of those MS. variations which he took as indications of pre-1400 originals; but, on the other hand, she herself draws attention to the fact that some MSS., which, on other grounds, Manly believed to be derived in part from such originals, were owned, in the early part of the fifteenth century, by Chaucer's friends and associates—'exactly the people who would receive pre-view copies if anyone did'. She concludes her presenta-

tion of the evidence for pre-1400 circulation by stressing two points—first, that it would be possible to interpret the data in a different way from that favoured by Manly (as he himself realized); second, that belief in such circulation is fundamental to Manly's own conception of the early history of the *Canterbury Tales*. 'Extensive use of pre-1400 collections preserving traces of "early versions" ' accounted, in his opinion, for much of the variation in the MSS. and for most of the omissions and the peculiarities of arrangement in the early MSS.

The third section deals with the history of the text in the first decade or so after Chaucer's death, to which period probably belong three extant MSS. (Hengwrt, Ellesmere, and Harl. 7334) and the lost ancestors of the MS. groups *a b c d*. As Manly saw it, the task of the editors (or editor-scribes) of these MSS. was to collect the various parts of the *Tales* and to arrange them, and he discerned several stages in this process. According to him, MS. Hengwrt represented the first, and Mrs. Dempster makes clear the importance he attached to this MS., both for its text and for its order. The next stage is represented by Ellesmere and the lost ancestor of group *a* (the chronological order of the two is uncertain). These have the same order of *Tales*, 'almost certainly derived from one source, and very certainly an editor's post-1400 solution' (Dempster). Ellesmere is important because, so Manly thought, it is the only extant MS. which derives its texts of most pieces from copies in Chaucer's possession; yet he found its text to be, in many parts of the *Tales*, less reliable than Hengwrt. As Mrs. Dempster notes, 'his rejection of countless Ellesmere readings . . . is by far the biggest single cause of difference between his text and those of his predecessors'. Next in order Manly placed the ancestor of group *c* and MS. Harl. 7334, 'the earliest of extant "shop manuscripts" or "manuscripts of the commercial class" '. Finally come the ancestors of groups *d* and *b*, not necessarily produced in that order. This does not, however, complete the story of the MSS. of the first period, for Manly constantly has to refer in his classification tables to other MSS. in the same genetic groups as one or more of these seven, but not descended from any of them; and, in addition, there are, for most parts of the *Canterbury Tales*, independent groups which do not include any of these seven. It is therefore clear that Manly must have believed in the existence of a number of other early copies.

The situation in the period following (with which Mrs. Dempster's fourth section is concerned) is too complex for any chronological development to be traced. At least three quarters of the MSS. belonging to it bear signs of being shop-made, and, of these shop products, the majority are 'in the genetic group called "large composite group" . . . mostly as members, constant or temporary, of groups *c*, *d*, and *b*'. Their texts vary considerably in quality, some being very corrupt; but the group is not unimportant for the establishment of the text. The remaining MSS. of this later period are divided by Mrs. Dempster into two classes: first, MSS. copied by professional scribes but 'unconventional in various ways, and therefore attributed to professionals privately employed'; second, MSS. made by amateurs. To the first class belong almost all the textually important MSS. of the period (such MSS. as Gg 4.27, Ad. 35286). Mrs. Dempster notes that in various ways these MSS. show contact with the Ellesmere tradition, and that most of them were connected with friends or relatives of Chaucer (or their descendants). Of the 'amateur' MSS., a few were copied from texts either independently descended, or related to the best texts. The most interesting is Dd. the scribe of which, though he derived almost all his parts of the *Canterbury Tales* from the ancestor of the *a* group, supplemented this MS. from another so near the original that Manly thinks it is not impossible that it was Chaucer's own draft.

The extreme complexity of the manuscript affiliations in this period is, in Manly's opinion, largely due to the methods of the shop-scribes and the conditions under which they worked. While not minimizing this complexity, Mrs. Dempster stresses a fact which has perhaps been overlooked by students of Manly's work, that 'in spite of their fluctuating membership and of uncertainties as to details, the groups which Manly, with all due qualifications, calls "constant groups", rest on evidence most abundant and entirely conclusive'.

Lastly Mrs. Dempster sums up Manly's procedure in making his critical text. Her statement of his aims (made earlier in her article) makes it clear that, when, as in the *Franklin's Tale*, the genetic groups go back to one original unaltered copy, Manly's aim is to reconstruct this. When they do not, he aims at reconstructing the text of the 'latest common ancestor of the copies embodying Chaucer's latest intentions'. (It is stressed by Mrs.

Dempster that Manly's critical text is not affected by his theory of 'early versions'). In her fifth section she repeats that the critical text was 'established lemma by lemma by correlation and critical analysis of the (probable) readings in the manuscripts at the heads of the independent genetic groups as established by the recension for each piece', and implies that she has checked this statement by her own investigations. She concludes by recording her conviction that Manly's procedure is consistent 'in what seems, under the circumstances, to be the only possible sense of the words'.

This survey of Mrs. Dempster's article has indicated only the main points she makes in it, but it should be added that, particularly in her footnotes, there is to be found pertinent criticism of some of the details of Manly's work, and proof of much independent study of the evidence.

Publications concerned with individual parts of the *Canterbury Tales* include three on the *General Prologue*. Some observations on *Style and Structure in the Prologue to the 'Canterbury Tales'* (*E.L.H.*, March) are set down by Kemp Malone, who first notes that, whereas Chaucer begins in the 'high style', after l. 11 he gradually changes to the familiar. By speaking of himself, and addressing his readers, he makes the tone of ll. 19–42 'personal and conversational', using the tag ' ther as I yow devyse' (l. 34) as a spring-board from which to 'plunge into a *tête-à-tête*' with them. The whole series of portraits is divided into two parts by ll. 542–4, and within each part there are several sub-groups. Malone remarks on the care with which Chaucer makes the transitions from the story of the pilgrimage to the portraits, and back (ll. 35–42, 715–24), and admires the way in which the two passages balance one another.

Ann B. Fullerton, in *The Five Craftsmen* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) queries how men of such differing trades could all have belonged to the same guild and worn the same livery (cf. A 361–4). If they were London men—and at least their Cook would seem to have been so (cf. l. 382)—they could not have been members of the same trade guild, for in Chaucer's day there was one for each of the crafts they practised. There were, however, liveried fraternities of other kinds, such as parish guilds, and Miss Fullerton decides that the five craftsmen must have belonged to one of these, possibly one

connected with St. Thomas since they were all going together, in livery, to Canterbury. She makes a suggestion that Chaucer may have had in mind the fraternity of *Salve Regina*, which was certainly prosperous about 1370. This resulted from the amalgamation of two earlier fraternities, one of which, originating early in the reign of Edward III, in the chapel on the Bridge, had St. Thomas as its patron saint.

In *The Cook's Mormal and its Cure* (*M.L.Q.*, Sept.) Haldeen Braddy discusses the nature of the cook's mormal (l. 386), and decides that evidence from a contemporary medical treatise would appear to support the view that it was not a cancer, but an ulcer or running sore.

Paull F. Baum, in *Chaucer's Metrical Prose* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.), makes the interesting observation that the opening paragraphs of *Melibeus* contain a very large proportion of blank verse lines—so large that it is difficult to believe the blank verse was accidental. (To make his point clear, he prints B 2157–85 with the blank verse arranged in lines in the usual way.) Since later parts of the *Tale* show a much smaller proportion (though they still contain more than Chaucer's other prose works), it would seem that Chaucer tired of his experiment in metrical prose.

As a result of Miss Rickert's researches, the phrase 'goode lief' in the Host's comments on the tale of *Melibeus* (B 3084) is now generally regarded as a proper name. Ethel Seaton's discovery, announced in '*Goode lief my wyf*' (*M.L.R.*, April), that it is one form of the name of a popular Flemish saint, supports this view. St. Godeleva, the patron saint of St. Ghistelles, was born in 1052 and murdered at her husband's instigation in 1070. Two early lives of her are known, one written by Drogo, monk of St. Andrew's near Bruges, early in the twelfth century, the other anonymous and dating from the middle of the fourteenth century. Miss Seaton thinks Chaucer must have known of this saint, for there were close connexions between England and Flanders in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the Lords of Ghistelles, descendants of Godeleva's husband, took part in affairs which brought them into contact with the English. Moreover, the frequency with which the name Godelief (in various forms) occurs in Kentish records of the

thirteenth century is an indication that the saint was well known in England.

Miss Seaton is unable to decide whether Chaucer actually read either of the two extant Lives, but she notes that marital patience, the quality stressed in connexion with 'Goodelief', is emphasized in both Lives, and particularly in the anonymous one. This, if it does not prove Chaucer's direct knowledge of the Lives, at least suggests that in choosing this saint's name for the Host's shrewish wife, he was indulging his humour. When the Wife of Bath uses the name as an oath while enjoining patience on her husband (D 431), she perhaps insinuates that the situation in Godeleva's story is now being reversed.

In *Chaucer's Originality in the 'Nun's Priest's Tale'* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.) J. Burke Severs compares Chaucer's Tale of the cock and the fox with the version in the *Roman de Renart* which may have been its source, and is, in any case, closely related to it. The differences between them proceed, he thinks, from the different 'direction and purpose' which Chaucer has given his tale. In the *Roman de Renart* the cock is arrogant, and, though repeatedly warned of his danger, he refuses to heed, and so falls a victim to the fox's flattery. His folly is fully apparent to the reader, who has already been told about the fox. In Chaucer's tale, Chanticlere takes his dream seriously, considering it a prophecy of evil, but, after his discussion with Pertelote, who disbelieves in the significance of the dream, he grows amorous and allows himself to forget the warning he has had (cf. B 4341 ff.). His better judgment is over-ridden by his feelings for his wife. As Severs puts it, the moral of Chaucer's tale is 'Wommennes conseils been ful ofte colde', and it is significant that Chaucer apostrophises Venus, who should have protected Chanticlere. Severs holds that this change in the direction of the Tale explains all the other alterations Chaucer makes, for example, the omission of the first appearance of the fox, which would now be pointless.

Severs concludes that the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, which like the tales of the Marriage Group, deals with the relation of husband and wife, is, also like them, a 'document in the literature of anti-feminism', and, as such, appropriate in the mouth of a priest.

Attention is drawn by Arthur K. Moore, in *Chaucer and Matheolus*

(*N. & Q.*, 15 June), to a number of passages in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* which are paralleled in the *Lamentations* of Matheolus, and nowhere else. This work survives only in one continental MS., and it is not certain that it was known in England in Chaucer's day, but a French translation, by Jehan le Fèvre, seems to have been more widely disseminated and might have been read by Chaucer. Moore does not claim that Chaucer did know the work in either version, but since the *Lamentations* 'embraces three-fourths of the polemical matter of the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*', it is certainly of interest as an example of the anti-feminist literature with which he was familiar.

Margaret Schlauch's article, *The Marital Dilemma in the 'Wife of Bath's Tale'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June), traces the origin of the alternative, placed before the knight in the Wife's *Tale*, of having his wife foul and old but true, or young and fair and he must take his chance of her fidelity. In the analogues—Gower's *Tale of Florent*, the *Weddynge of Sir Gawen and Dame Ragnell* and the *Marriage of Sir Gawain*—the alternative is to have the wife fair by day and foul by night, or vice versa. This is a folklore theme, whereas the different dilemma in Chaucer's tale derives from Roman social satire and patristic denunciations of marriage. Miss Schlauch notes some relevant passages in Ovid and Juvenal, and illustrates more fully from ecclesiastical writers. Theophrastus, in *De Nuptiis*, has the contrast *pulchra*: *foeda*, paralleled by the complementary one *impudica*: *pudica*, and from him the dilemma passed to John of Salisbury, Alexander Neckam, Innocent III, and others. Jean de Meun, Deschamps (*Miroir de Mariage*), and Petrarch are among the writers known to Chaucer who expressed it in one way or another. Miss Schlauch remarks that the fact that the Chaucerian dilemma derives from works which are discussed and utilized in the Wife's *Prologue* tightens the connexion between her *Prologue* and Tale, and at the same time removes the *Tale* further from the analogues known to scholars—the popular romances, ballads and folk-tales. She reconsiders, in the light of her discovery, the supposed connexion between Chaucer's *Tale* and certain Old Irish stories of a hag who tests a hero and finally reveals herself as the Sovereignty of Erin.

Miss Schlauch claims further that the discovery of the learned origin of the dilemma throws some light on the question of

whether Chaucer really intended some of the *Canterbury Tales* to form a 'Marriage Group'. For her discussion of this problem students may be referred to her article.

In *Did Chaucer revise the 'Clerk's Tale'?* (*Spec.*, July) J. Burke Severs examines the evidence for the existence of a 'pre-*Canterbury Tales*', version of the *Clerk's Tale*, in which Manly and Rickert (see *The Text of the 'Canterbury Tales'*) were disposed to believe. The variations in the MSS. in the passages at the end of the *Tale* certainly suggest that Chaucer altered and expanded this part so as to make a good transition to the *Merchant's Tale*, but this is not evidence of revision of the *Tale* itself. Manly and Rickert thought that the division of the *Tale* into parts might indicate that it was originally written to be read to a special audience, but Severs notes that division into parts is found in a number of the MSS. of both the French and the Latin sources. Their other evidence consists of thirty variant readings, in which the *d* MSS. frequently agree, of a kind which, they thought, could not be attributed to scribes, and which they therefore assumed to be Chaucer's early readings. In the case of the *Clerk's Tale*, which is in general so near its sources, it is possible to test this assumption, since it would seem likely that the earlier reading would be closer to the source. Examining these *d* readings, Severs finds that, in a large number of them, the sources are 'so loosely paraphrased' that it is impossible to say whether they, or the readings of the standard text, are the nearer. Of the thirteen that afford a real test, the majority do not confirm Manly's and Rickert's view, since the readings of the standard text are closer to the sources than the supposed earlier (unrevised) readings.

Severs does not claim too much for his test, but limits himself to the statement that the case for Chaucer's revision of the *Clerk's Tale*, as set forth in Manly's and Rickert's 'Early and Revised Drafts', is 'weaker than would appear from their essay'.

The next three publications are concerned with works other than the *Canterbury Tales*. Roland M. Smith, in *The Limited Vision of St. Bernard* (*M.L.N.*, Jan.), discusses the identity of the Bernard referred to in l. 16 of *The Legend of Good Women* ('Bernard the monk ne saugh nat all, pardee!'), and inclines to Skeat's view that Chaucer meant St. Bernard of Clairvaux. He notes as significant

(*N. & Q.*, 15 June), to a number of passages in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* which are paralleled in the *Lamentations* of Matheolus, and nowhere else. This work survives only in one continental MS., and it is not certain that it was known in England in Chaucer's day, but a French translation, by Jehan le Fèvre, seems to have been more widely disseminated and might have been read by Chaucer. Moore does not claim that Chaucer did know the work in either version, but since the *Lamentations* 'embraces three-fourths of the polemical matter of the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*', it is certainly of interest as an example of the anti-feminist literature with which he was familiar.

Margaret Schlauch's article, *The Marital Dilemma in the 'Wife of Bath's Tale'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June), traces the origin of the alternative, placed before the knight in the Wife's *Tale*, of having his wife foul and old but true, or young and fair and he must take his chance of her fidelity. In the analogues—Gower's *Tale of Florent*, the *Weddynge of Sir Gawen and Dame Ragnell* and the *Marriage of Sir Gawain*—the alternative is to have the wife fair by day and foul by night, or vice versa. This is a folklore theme, whereas the different dilemma in Chaucer's tale derives from Roman social satire and patristic denunciations of marriage. Miss Schlauch notes some relevant passages in Ovid and Juvenal, and illustrates more fully from ecclesiastical writers. Theophrastus, in *De Nuptiis*, has the contrast *pulchra*: *foeda*, paralleled by the complementary one *impudica*: *pudica*, and from him the dilemma passed to John of Salisbury, Alexander Neckam, Innocent III, and others. Jean de Meun, Deschamps (*Miroir de Mariage*), and Petrarch are among the writers known to Chaucer who expressed it in one way or another. Miss Schlauch remarks that the fact that the Chaucerian dilemma derives from works which are discussed and utilized in the Wife's *Prologue* tightens the connexion between her *Prologue* and Tale, and at the same time removes the *Tale* further from the analogues known to scholars—the popular romances, ballads and folk-tales. She reconsiders, in the light of her discovery, the supposed connexion between Chaucer's *Tale* and certain Old Irish stories of a hag who tests a hero and finally reveals herself as the Sovereignty of Erin.

Miss Schlauch claims further that the discovery of the learned origin of the dilemma throws some light on the question of

have been the double robbery which Chaucer suffered in September 1390, and that the obscure phrase in the sub-title, 'Visage Sanz Peinture', may be a joke at the plaintiff's own battered face.

In an article entitled *Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers* (*Spec.*, April), Haldeen Braddy suggests that Chaucer owed some of the rewards which he obtained during Edward III's reign to the king's mistress, Alice Perrers. Braddy notes that men whom we know to be associates or friends of Chaucer were also associated with Alice Perrers in various transactions; he mentions in this connexion Sir Philip la Vache, Sir Lewis Clifford, Sir Guichart d'Angle and Sir Richard Stury. In transactions about property her name appears with those of several other people well known to Chaucer. Alice owned considerable property, and it is clear from the records that her assistance in such matters was sought by many. Braddy thinks that the rent-free lease of the house above Aldgate, which Chaucer received in 1374, may possibly have been granted to him at the recommendation of Alice, herself a land-owner in the district of Aldgate. It may be noted that Chaucer's loss of the lease in 1386, and his loss of the Comptrollership of Customs in the same year, coincided with the 'political eclipse' of Alice Perrers. In any case, there is little doubt that Chaucer must have been for many years in close contact with the king's mistress. Both were members of the king's Household in 1359, Alice is mentioned together with Chaucer and Philippa Chaucer as receiving gifts of clothing and other things on more than one occasion, and there is a possibility that one of her early relatives had connexions with Chaucer's grandfather, Robert Chaucer.

E. P. Kuhl, in *Chaucer and Westminster Abbey* (*J.E.G.P.*, July), considers why Chaucer should have been buried in the Abbey, and decides that it must have been because the new king, Henry IV, who regarded the Abbey as a national shrine, wished to honour him for his services to the State. Chaucer had welcomed Henry as king (cf. 'Lenvoy de Chaucer' at the end of *The Complaint to his Purse*) and Henry had granted him an annuity of forty marks. Moreover Chaucer had been under the patronage of Henry's father, John of Gaunt. Kuhl queries whether Chaucer, 'who had openly criticized Richard's mis-government in his *Lak of Stedfastness*, was not the new King's propagandist'.

Two references to Chaucer made by Carlyle are considered by Thomas A. Kirby in *Carlyle on Chaucer* (*M.L.N.*, March). In *J. Q. Adams and Chaucer* (ibid.), the same writer notes John Quincy Adams's use of a line from Chaucer in a poem which he addressed to Miss Emily Ward.

# V

# MIDDLE ENGLISH

## II. BEFORE AND AFTER CHAUCER

By GLADYS D. WILLCOCK

THERE is rather more to record for 1946 than has been usual lately in the field of medieval drama, particularly its earliest and latest phases. While there is not much to note on M.E. major works, such as the *Ancrene Riwle* and *Piers Plowman*, there has been a remarkable accumulation of work, both in books and articles, on cognate and comparative subjects: Anglo-Latin works of scholarship and information have been made accessible, the growing modern interest in medieval education has found fresh expression, Anglo-Norman studies have been actively pursued, connexions between medieval art and literature have been illustrated, some useful bibliographies have been compiled, Old French romance helpfully elucidates its English derivatives and parallels, and Geoffrey of Monmouth continues to be a main centre of interest in the Anglo-Latin field. In the following pages these cognate studies will be dealt with first. *Via* Old French sources and Geoffrey of Monmouth a transition will be made to Middle English romances. Then will follow moral, religious and miscellaneous poems, to be succeeded by prose and drama, with, finally, one or two general topics.

Treatment of many of the works of cognate interest must be very summary since, though in the aggregate they constitute a very significant illumination of the medieval background, the majority bear only indirectly on M.E. writings. Richard de Bury's *Philobiblion*[1] and John of Garland's *Stella Maris*[2] have both been made accessible by welcome new editions. An article by Marbury B. Ogle on *Petrus Comestor, Methodius and the Saracens* (*Spec.*, July) has this link with M.E. literature that, in the course of calling

[1] *The 'Philobiblion' of Richard de Bury*, translated by A. F. West. N.Y.: Philip C. Duchnes, 1945. $10.

[2] *John of Garland's 'Stella Maris'*, ed. by E. F. Wilson. Cambridge, Mass.: Med. Acad. of America and Wellesley College. $3.50.

attention to the importance of Methodius's Jewish materials, as disseminated through Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*, it finds in Methodius the explanation of the common M.E. identification of the Ishmaelites with the Saracens (Sara-kyne).

A good deal of work has been done in the last few years not only on medieval formal education, but on the whole question of literacy, on libraries, and on resources and habits in reading generally. The result has been to temper, if not to dispel, the condescension towards medieval equipment which used to be common form. John W. Adamson's *The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon*[3] belongs, in spite of its title, mainly to this chapter since, of the ten essays and lectures collected in this book, only one, the title-essay, is limited to the Anglo-Saxon field, and the rest move mainly within the medieval educational world. Chapter 2, 'Who was Asser?', is no exception, for it maintains the thesis that the Life of Alfred traditionally ascribed to the ninth-century Welshman, Asser, is, in fact, the work of a twelfth-century writer, using Florence of Worcester and not used by him. Of the remaining essays, those which are most pertinent to this chapter are 'Literacy in England in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries' and 'Medieval Education'; three others: 'A Medieval Publicist', '*De Disciplina Scholarium;* a Medieval Students' Handbook', and 'Hugh of St. Victor' are of comparative interest.

Medieval Universities in their daily life as well as in their curricula have been brought closer to us by Lynn Thorndike's sourcebook, *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages.*[4] This is a compendium of translations from University documents from the lifetime of Abelard onwards. Our own institutions and scholars contribute very little; Oxford supplies one item and some Anglo-Latin scholars, such as John of Salisbury, supply a few extracts. Paris provides most, not only because of its importance and prestige, but also because of the richness and accessibility of its records. Medieval universities, however, through the goings and comings of scholars and through the common base of Catholic doctrine,

[3] '*The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon*' *and other Essays on Education, Medieval and Modern*, by John William Adamson. C.U.P. pp. viii+167. 12*s.* 6*d.*

[4] *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages*, by Lynn Thorndike. N.Y.: Columbia U.P., 1944. pp. xvii+476. 30*s.*

were international institutions and a great deal in this book would be relevant to the experience of Chaucer's poor Clerk of Oxenford. Some extracts offer quite vivid local colour of life and daily doings, but the serious preoccupations of curricula, disputation, heresy-hunting provide the bulk. Two of the longest extracts, Pierre Dubois's[5] Scheme of Education (No. 59) and *De Commendatione Cleri* (No. 81), of which the Latin text is given as Appendix I, are of particular interest as illustrations of the scope of some medieval educational ideals. That, like other educational schemes, they remained ideals is no ground for condescension towards them.

Two works bearing (in part) on medieval art in connexion with literature are F. Wormald's *The Survival of Anglo-Saxon Illumination after the Norman Conquest*[6] and Margaret R. Scherer's *About the Round Table*.[7] The object of the latter is to illustrate by plates the expression in art of the Arthurian story from earliest times to the present day. For the earlier phases it draws by permission on some of the fine material assembled by R. S. and Laura H. Loomis in *The Arthurian Legend and Medieval Art* (see *Y.W.*, xix, 82).

In this chapter was noted last year (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 62) an article by D. W. Robertson, Jr., calling attention to resemblances between the *Manuel des Péchés* and two works by Walter de Cantilupe and Peter Quivil. A letter from Robertson (printed in *M.L.N.*, Jan.) puts forward a revised sequence of the episcopal decrees involved in the argument and expresses an expectation of further illumination from a forthcoming edition of the *Concilia*.

Anglo-Norman studies are still being fruitfully supported by The Anglo-Norman Texts Society, who this year published *An A–N Rhymed Apocalypse*, edited by Olwen Rees.[8]

Two bibliographies of differing scope appeared in 1946. The first is J. J. Parry's *A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Material for the Year 1945* (*M.L.Q.*, May); the second is a *Bibliography of*

[5] For Pierre Dubois, see also *The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon, above p. 85.*

[6] *The Survival of Anglo-Saxon Illumination after the Norman Conquest*, by F. Wormald. British Academy and O.U.P., 1944. 5*s*.

[7] *About the Round Table*, by Margaret R. Scherer. N.Y.: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1945. pp. 80. $2.00.

[8] *An Anglo-Norman Apocalypse with Commentary* ed. by Olwen Rees, with an Historical Introduction by Sir John Fox. A.-N. Texts, No. VI. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. xli + 103. 30*s*.

*English Translations from Medieval Sources*, by C. P. Farrar and A. P. Evans (see below, Chap. XV, p. 258).

The motives of the Grail and kindred stories are relevant to M.E. romance in whatever language they are preserved and studied. The O.F. *Perlesvaus* has been attracting attention lately. An article by Helen Adolph, *Studies in the 'Perlesvaus'; the Historical Background* (*S. in Ph.*, Oct. 1945), was not accessible in time for notice last year. In 1946 J. Neale Carman turned to religious symbolism in the same romance in his *The Symbolism of the 'Perlesvaus'* (*P.M.L.A.*, March). Pressing further along the line of some earlier studies, Carman crystallizes his thesis in the words: 'We have in the *Perlesvaus* a symbolical New Testament in romantic guise.' The details of his discussion have no close relation to any M.E. writing, but the question of these esoteric meanings has a very wide bearing. A modern commentator may have to go a long way round to establish that, for example, Gawain 'is' John the Baptist; an audience habituated to medieval scriptural and other exegesis might absorb double or triple meanings by 'second nature'.

The fact that in the Grail story the symbolism which is the subject of modern speculation is not, or cannot be assumed to be, deliberate (as in *Perlesvaus*), prescribes for the commentator an even longer way round. William A. Nitze, taking up the Grail story, says truly: 'Much ink has flowed under Arthurian bridges, perilous and otherwise' (*The Bleeding Lance and Philip of Flanders*, *Spec.*, July). Nitze juxtaposes two widely divergent interpretations of the Lance. According to one, the Lance (in the Chrétien-Wolfram stories) goes back to a Celtic (and pagan) Fairy Spear; according to the other, it is to be explained by the λόγχη of the Byzantine Mass and is a Christian sacramental spear, probably connected with the crucifixion-lance of Longinus. It is reasonably suggested that Chrétien conflated motives and stories of ultimately widely different origins and nature. Ink, as Nitze again says truly, will continue to flow as long as there is no substantial agreement on important issues. It is not difficult to imagine that Chrétien, in the pursuit of entertaining material, could 'conflate' more happily than modern scholars, driven by a unitary conception of truth, can agree. A part of the argument in this article links

up with the English *Sir Perceval*[9] whose author is seen by Nitze (following Rhys) as 'conflating' in his turn adventures from Chrétien and from the Breton traditions which had been Chrétien's main source.

The Bleeding Lance focuses divergent rays of pagan and Christian interpretation. Another type of divergence is illustrated by *Partonopeus de Blois* (and the corresponding English romance, *Partonope de Blois*). In *P.M.L.A.* (Dec.) Helaine Newstead reviews *The Traditional Background of 'Partonopeus de Blois'*. The question here is: have we a Breton tale of the well-known fairy-mistress type or a 'medievalizing' of the classical Cupid and Psyche story (with the positions of hero and heroine reversed)? The latter view has gained considerable currency and that the spirit and technique of the Breton lay could combine with a classical theme is shown well enough by *Sir Orfeo*. Miss Newstead, however, after a comparative survey of the relevant materials, comes down on the Celtic side of the fence: 'it is from this Irish-Welsh complex that *Partonopeus* stems.' That there may have been some infiltration from the classical story she does not deny, but evidence for this is strong in one (the lantern) episode only.

Elaine C. Southward's *The Knight Yder and the Beowulf-Legend* (*Med. Aev.*) traces a stimulating investigation which grew out of an attempt to explain a passage in the French *Lai du Cor* (*c.* 1150), where Guinevere, after an unsuccessful submission to the test of the Horn of Chastity, admits to having given a ring to an unnamed young hero who, in defence of Gawain, had slain a giant. This hitherto unidentified tale Miss Southward has been able to link with the story of Yder, son of Nut. Her exploration moves along the plane of folktale and legend, not of ritual and myth. It searches Scandinavian folktale, Anglo-Latin Chronicle (William of Malmesbury and the *Gesta Herwardi*), Celtic story-making and French romancing. *Via* a piece of saga-making by the English author of the *Gesta Herwardi* (*c.* 1150), she sweeps back to base her Yder-story on the Bear's Son folktale, not, of course, in the finished literary version of the *Beowulf*-poem, but in its much diffused, and

[9] For further comparative material on the Perceval story, see *Sir Percyvelle: its Irish Connections*, by Sheila Joyce McHugh. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edwards Bros. pp. vii+87.

therefore generalized, form. Points from this intricate discussion that are likely to be of special interest to students of M.E. literature with its background are: (1) additional evidence of contact between Scandinavian invaders of Northern England and Celtic storytellers in Strathclyde, Wales and elsewhere, as a result of which all sorts of stories were rendered assimilable by the Arthur-cycle; (2) a re-interpretation of the story carved on the Modena archivolt where one of the names is Isdernus (=Yder); (3) further illustration of saga-making in connexion with a native historical figure (Hereward) in post-conquest times (see also above, p. 61).

The story-making impulse was not, of course, the only cause of dilution of biographical veracity. The sequence of Lives of Edward the Confessor in Latin and English, in prose and verse, illustrate the part which the insatiable love of hagiology in combination with political and partisan interests could play in emptying out history and importing miracle. Eleanor K. Heningham in *The Genuineness of the 'Vita Æduardi Regis'* (*Spec.*, Oct.), sets herself to test the authenticity (i.e. literary authenticity) of the Latin *Vita Æduardi*. If it was, as it claims to be, written during the early troubles after 1066 by a devoted adherent of Godwine's daughter, then it was the basis, not only of subsequent Lives, but of the accounts of post-conquest events given by early chroniclers. The element of prophecy and miracle in it, however, has caused it to be impeached as a later forgery designed for political ends. In this article the imputations against its genuineness are examined in detail and refuted.

A miracle more or less does not, indeed, in the eleventh century tell either way; it would be one way of expressing the impact of events upon the mind. But myth-making of a sort about the Conquest has been by no means confined to those who experienced it. Tudor, Stuart and Romantic times left a plentiful crop of biased historical presentations which have entered into the popular view. Linguistic and literary students of the period who may feel the desire to brush up their history can turn to David Douglas's illuminating lecture *The Norman Conquest and British Historians*[10] and realize, in short compass, the nature and extent of the centuries-long process of distortion. Points particularly germane to

[10] *The Norman Conquest and British Historians*, by David Douglas. David Murray Lecture. Glasgow Univ. Publ., No. lxvii. 3*s*.

any close study of our early medieval period are the recognition of the clearer perspective already gained by the recent great advance in Anglo-Saxon studies and in process of achievement through further study of the Norman background; and the stress on the need for further exploration and co-ordination of the Norman effort (in the cultural as in other spheres) in this country.

Of all Anglo-Latin chroniclers the arch-distorter and speculator (in many people's view), Geoffrey of Monmouth, continues to exercise his fascination. This year it is his relation to subsequent chroniclers which is in the foreground of research on the *Historia Regum Britanniae*. The retrenchment of credulity in modern times was the subject of a recent study (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 63). Laura Keeler has carried this line of investigation back to late medieval times. In an article, *The 'Historia Regum Britanniae' and Four Medieval Chroniclers* (*Spec.*, Jan.), she sorts out differing degrees of credulity. The completely credulous she leaves on one side; the rest can be arranged in a sort of gradation: (1) those who (*faute mieux*) condense the *Historia* for a necessary brief Introduction on British history; (2) those who make limited use of it for a particular purpose—chiefly political; and (3) those who have moved to full awareness of its fabulous character. The four chronicles handled here relate themselves to this scheme as follows: (1) *Angliae Chronicon* of 'John the Historian', a German (*ad annum* 1350); (2a) *Annales Angliae et Scotiae*, 1292–1301; (2b) *Chronicon de Lanercost*, 1201–1346; (3) *Granarium de Viris Illustribus*, *c.* 1440, by John of Whethamstede, the 'first opposer of King Brutus'. With the last we are within hailing distance of the Renaissance. By him the *Historia* was frankly declared to be poetical rather than historical—a view angrily contested by Camden. That this should be so shows that simple chronological advance is not in itself a move towards the scientific.

In this article notice was given of a forthcoming book, *Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers*.[11] This appeared before the end of 1946 but was not available for this chapter.

Before the 'feole lese cunninge of þe Bruttes' is left too far behind it will be appropriate to mention a brief article on *Noreweie*

[11] *Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers*, 1300-1500, by Laura Keeler. Berkeley: Univ. Cal. Press. pp. viii+152. $1.75.

*and Galeweie in the 'Owl and the Nightingale'* (*M.L.R.*, Oct.), by Raymond Chapman, for if the author is right, a touch of Celtic 'gramarye' has been laid on this brisk and lively poem.

Chapman's suggestion arises out of a passage (MS. Caligula A. ix, ll. 905 f.) which has been much discussed as providing a clue for the dating of the poem. In the course of it the Owl crossly asks:

*Hwi nultu fare to Noreweie,*
*And singen men of Galeweie?*

In Arthurian romance northern countries were often identified with the Land of the Dead. To Chrétien, Galloway (before Gawain civilized it) was a land of terror. In Irish, Lochlann, earlier used to denote the region of the dread and evil Fomorians, came to be transferred to Norway. By laying full stress on these identifications, the Owl's injunctions to the Nightingale can be given a much more sinister implication than a wish for her to go and 'sing in the next street'. She is to take her song to a country where music will be of no account—

*þare beoð men þat litel kunne*
*Of songe þat is beneoðe sunne—*

to a bourne, in fact, from which no traveller returns. This is an attractive speculation; plentiful evidence has come forward in recent years that the Solway-region and other northern areas were countries of dread and bale. Indeed, one might go further and wonder whether the sequence of names in this passage—Irlonde, Scotlande, Galeweie, Noreweie—is or is not fortuitous variation.

The main body of M.E. romance is represented this year by one article on *Sir Gawain* and one on the Charlemagne and Roland material in the Auchinleck MS. Laurita L. Hill in *Madden's Divisions of 'Sir Gawain' and the Large Initial Capitals of MS. Cotton Nero A x* (*Spec.*, Jan.) recalls that the now accepted fourfold division of the poem depends entirely on Madden's authority; in his edition the four 'over-sized' coloured capitals were taken as marking 'fytts' of the narrative. These, however, are not the only large capitals in the MS. text. The latest E.E.T.S. edition reproduces all large capitals, but leaves all but the four 'non-functional'. The writer believes that the nine large capitals all indicate steps in the narrative and that size is irrelevant to the nature of the break

or transition; at the same time it is suggested that the 'oversized' capitals may show 'some awareness of the intricate structure of the narrative fabric'. The article is not entirely clear or conclusive; probably more space than was available would have been necessary to argue the relation of the capitals to the presumed dividing lines of narrative structure. It will be obvious that the interest of this article is by no means merely palaeographical. A hint is thrown out that at least once or twice the capitals correspond to a change of source. This, if it could be substantiated, would be an exceedingly interesting phenomenon.

What may be called by this time the Loomis-Walpole 'line' of Auchinleck studies (see *Y.W.*, xxiii, 85; xxv, 64; xxvi, 64) is now being taken up by other investigators. H. N. Smyser in *Spec.* (July) recalls the general situation with regard to '*Charlemagne and Roland*' *and the Auchinleck MS.* The name 'Charlemagne and Roland' was given by Gaston Paris to a composite tail-rhyme romance which no longer survives as a whole, but broken in two and preserved in different MSS.—part in the Auchinleck and part in the fifteenth-century Fillingham MS. The source of all is the O.F. 'interpolated pseudo-Turpin'. Between the O.F. sources and the surviving *disjecta membra* in M.E. 'there is a history of the loss and disarrangement of folios and revision to conceal damage'. Into this history Smyser intends to 'probe further'. The present article is detailed and heavily documented. In some points he differs from R. N. Walpole (e.g. as to the value and authenticity of the introduction to *Otuel and Roland*), but like him he believes that the loss and transposition of episodes in the original single *Charlemagne and Roland* are to be explained from the conditions determining the provenance of the Auchinleck MS. as a piece of commercial book-production, and not from any plan. This brings in the Loomis side of these Auchinleck investigations. Smyser would modify Mrs. Loomis's views in some details, but he regards her main thesis—that the Auchinleck MS. was a product of a fourteenth-century lay bookshop—as by now a 'secure hypothesis'. A very pretty piece of applied or practical bibliography is used to clinch a part of the argument.

There is less to record than usual on M.E. moral and religious verse. D. W. Robertson, Jr., in *Certain Theological Conventions in*

*Mannyng's Treatment of the Commandments* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) finds that this treatment reflects commonplace patterns of medieval theology. These are reviewed, Commandment by Commandment, and the reader is referred to the various sources of doctrine and explanation—St. Augustine, St. Bonaventura, Peter Lombard, etc. Robertson remarks that *Handlyng Sinne* may well contain less that is original than has commonly been supposed. It is not indeed the kind of work in which 'originality' in the modern sense is to be looked for. As this article shows, at least one 'reflection of daily life' can be traced to Peter Lombard who got it from St. Augustine. Even 'original' recourse to the prime authorities was by no means necessary.

There seems to be a pause in *Piers Plowman* studies this year. J. A. W. Bennett's short article *Lombard's Letters* (*M.L.R.*, Oct. 1945) which was omitted last year may be used to fill the gap. The reference in B-version, *passus* v, ll. 251–2

> *And with Lumbardes lettres I ladde gold to Rome,*
> *And toke it by taille here and told hem there lesse*

contains, so Bennett thinks, a more specific satiric point than has been recognized. From the time of Gregory IX (1227–41) the papacy used Italian bankers for the transport and exchange of money; this included the use of 'letters' or bills of exchange. Some evidence is given of the corruption which soon became rampant. Earlier in *passus* v, Lombards are bracketed with Jews for cunning in clipping coins, and elsewhere Jews are described as Lombards if they came from Italy. 'Lumbardes lettres' would convey to anyone an evil savour of financial chicanery.

An entertaining short poem 'Lament of the Monk' or 'The Chorister's Lament' is well worth the short article—*The Chorister's Lament*, (*Spec.*, April)—devoted to its transcription, translation and comment by Francis Lee Utley. The poem is a late fourteenth-century insertion in a thirteenth-century MS. (Arundel, 292). It was printed in *Reliquiae Antiquae* (1845), but by editors ignorant of the Guidonian musical nomenclature which is vital for its interpretation. It is a sort of conversation-piece (though the speeches of 'Dan' Walter, William and the Master are not very clearly demarcated), the theme of which is a young monk's wrestlings with his

Music-master and the mysteries of 'solmisation'. It is a gay, vivid piece. The music-pupil cowers uncomely in cloister, he roars as a rook, he hurls at the notes and wins no more in the end from his Master (clearly French or French-speaking) than 'que vos ren ne vawt'. It will be perceived that the poem has the full lexicographical vigour of the alliterative tradition. It is of interest to students of language and of music; many musical terms appear here for the first time so far as is known. Is there a misprint ('it' for 'i' = 'I') in line 2 of the transcription?

In this context a very brief notice can be given of the account by Curt F. Bühler in *A New MS. of the M.E. Tract on Proportions* (*Spec.*, April) of a MS. in his possession (a fifteenth-century miscellany on mathematical subjects) containing a version of the tract on Proportions included in the musical treatises discussed by Sanford Meech (*Spec.*, vol. x). Bühler believes this tract to have been originally a mathematical treatise adapted for musical purposes. He reminds us that academic or theoretical music was a branch of mathematics. The general context of these tracts is medieval education.

Before leaving fourteenth-century verse, Gower's share in an article by Norman Callan, *'Thyn Owne Book': a Note on Chaucer, Gower and Ovid* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.), may be briefly mentioned (for Chaucer, see above, p. 66). The article is a plea for more attention by commentators to the literary significance of the results of comparison between Chaucer's and Gower's relation to Ovid as their source and exemplar. It is implicit in the design, also, to hold the scales fairly between Gower and Chaucer. It would be a surgical operation to detach Gower from the close comparison made here; he is shown as possessing 'the good qualities of his limitations'; he 'knows what he is doing'. He lacks the Chaucerian irony, but he is never the slave of his material. He is a true story-teller, lucid and direct; even his prolix passages illustrate the 'astonishing flow of his versification'.

There is not much to record on fifteenth-century verse. The Notes to the E.E.T.S. edition of *The English Poems of Charles of Orleans* have appeared (see *Y.W.*, xxii, 75). The Notes to the Text are supplemented by: (1) a section on 'The Relation between

the French and English versions'; (2) a Note on the metre of the English poems; and (3) a brief list of Glossarial corrections and additions. According to the Prefatory Note to the E.E.T.S. edition (1941), a second volume of Notes by Robert Steele (editor of the Text) and Mabel Day, and a study of the rhymes by Marjorie Daunt, was then planned. Vol. II as we have it scarcely corresponds to this plan. We have the Notes, plus the section above referred to as (1); the single page on the metre (limited to line-structure) seems to have been substituted for the projected study of the rhymes.

Earlier M.E. prose is represented chiefly by Ragnar Furuskog's *Collation of the Katherine Group MS. Bodley 34* (*Studia Neophil.* Uppsala, vol. xix, Nos. 1 and 2). The purpose of this exacting investigation is to collate with photostats of MS. Bodley 34 the latest edition of each of the M.E. texts collectively known as 'the Katherine Group'. Thus, *St. Margaret* is compared with Frances Mack's E.E.T.S. edition of 1934, *Sawles Warde* with R. M. Wilson's Leeds edition (1938) and so on. The modern editions, however scholarly in their apparatus, differ in the extent to which they modernize the text (e.g. in punctuation, elimination of nonce-forms or what seem to be palpable eccentricities or lapses). Users of these texts can now correct or modify what they find by the results here assembled of a re-examination of the MS. *via* photostats. Light has been thrown on many doubtful words and letters. There is a very useful preliminary section on the actual forms of letters in the MS. and some of the difficulties to which they give rise. Throughout the collations great attention is paid to palaeographical detail, to erasures, deletions, etc. This is a strenuous investigation, an endeavour to get as close to every stroke or mark in the MS. as a photostat will take one.

'Mandeville' seems to have lain fallow for many years. In a series of five articles in *N. & Q.* Malcolm Letts pursues the man and his marvels, or rather he pursues, first, three of the marvels and then the man and the Mandeville-tradition. The three marvels are the Dry Tree (13 July), the Liver Sea (10 Aug.) and the Ark on Ararat (5 Oct.). The method of comment is identical throughout; each marvel is a detached *mirabilium*, i.e. it is not viewed as part of a general approach; it is narrated or described, the sources, possible or probable, are reviewed, any interesting additional details are

added, and links with other literary uses (e.g. in romances) are noted. Of the three marvels annotated the second—the Liver Sea—is the most interesting in itself and for its associations. It is the clotted sea referred to in Prester John's 'letter'. It was used by Grail-romancers and enters into the story of St. Brendan; echoes of its legends survive in stories of the Sargasso Sea. It is vividly employed by the author of the German twelfth-century poem, *Herzog Ernst*. Its geographical proximity (in some authorities) to the Magnetic Mountain made it a thrilling menace to romantic shipping.

The article on 'The Man' (which might usefully have made an Introduction to the marvels) comes fourth in the series (16 Nov.). This is an extremely condensed review of the material on author and language dug out by editors and commentators, since the *Travels* became an object of a serious critical study (after Nicholson's work in 1870). Letts adds his preference; the writer of the 'Travels' was Je(h)an de Bourgoyne and the original language was French. The whole work as commonly described in the English tradition is enveloped in the spurious. No Sir John Mandeville had any hand in it or could be a 'Father of English Prose'; the 'Travels' are fantastic and hearty lying.

In the last of these articles, *Truth or Fiction* (28 Dec.), the 'Mandeville' tradition is surveyed from the English versions, with their incompatible accounts of the book's provenance, down to the beginning of serious scholarship. To Robert Burton, Mandeville was a loud liar, but even in the early nineteenth century there was still a certain will to believe. A conclusion that emerges from this review is that the 'Travels' were not only lies in themselves but the cause that lies were in other men.

The *Golden Legend* has been attracting a good deal of attention this year. In *Spec.* (April) Sister Mary Jeremy, in an article *Caxton's 'Golden Legend' and Varagine's 'Legenda Aurea'*, raises anew the question of Caxton's equipment for the discharge of his task as editor and translator. Caxton declared he was using for his most ambitious undertaking a Latin text *plus* an English and a French translation. Opinions differ as to whether he could translate Latin at all. The following are the most interesting points that emerge from the comparison of his English with the Latin: (1) Caxton cannot be held to have bowdlerized his version. Many of the grosser stories which he omits are later accretions. (2) His 'most regret-

table' omission is of passages where Varagine intimates doubt, or 'sifts' contradictory evidence; Caxton seems to take no interest in these workings of the critical spirit. (3) His distortions of the Latin sense or substance seem to be examples rather of 'psychological' than of grammatical error. In general this study supports the views of those who minimize Caxton's initiative and critical equipment. His version is held to be less accurate than the English rendering made before 1438.

Three Notes on the *Legenda Aurea* by Robert F. Seybolt may be mentioned here—very briefly as they have less connexion than the above with actual M.E. writings. *Fifteenth Century Editions of the 'Legenda Aurea'* (*Spec.*, July) is entirely bibliographical, and consists mainly of a list designed to contribute to the establishment of the history and authenticity of the fifteenth-century printed texts. *The 'Legenda Aurea', the Bible and the 'Historia Scholastica'* (also *Spec.*, July) considers the relative popularity of the three texts concerned from the evidence of early editions. A point of general interest is that Seybolt's analysis shows that the extent of Bible printing has been exaggerated. It was not, as is often supposed, the most often printed book in the early days of printing; the *Legenda Aurea* heads the list. A third Note, *The 'Adriatic Port' in the 'Legenda Aurea'* (*Spec.*, Oct.), explains expressions like *portui Adriato* (with many complicated variants) in the legend of St. Nicholas and identifies it with Andriaca by the help of Strabo's 'sea of Adria' (which reached from Sicily to the coast of Lycia) and other clues. The forms of an old Scottish version (*c.* 1350) and an independent English Legendary (*c.* 1285–95) are included with the Continental evidence.

In the field of medieval drama work has been more active than for some time past. Hrotsvitha's plays are of general cognate interest to all students of this subject. It is, of course, necessary to be sure that Hrotsvitha existed and that the pieces associated with her name have the antiquity in medieval dramatic history that has been assumed for them. Hrotsvitha as a tenth-century 'dramatic' author was 'exploded' by Aschbach in 1867, after which she was, on the whole, put together again; in the present century she seemed to be gaining 'integrity' or reality of existence from the discovery and identification of portions of her work in MSS. Recently, however, we have witnessed a new onslaught on the authenticity of

the Hrotsvitha material (see Zoltán Haraszti: *More Books*, Bulletin of the Boston Public Library, 1945, xx, 87–119, 139–73). E. H. Zeydel in an article, *The Authenticity of Hrotsvitha's Works* (*M.L.N.*, Jan.), poses the questions which the sceptics must answer and calls attention to the fact that, so far, no attempt has been made to bring modern techniques of examination to bear on the MS. remains.

If the sceptics are right then the late fifteenth-century edition of Hrotsvitha's *Works* would be itself a forgery by Celtes and his circle, and the MS. fragments discovered would also have to be forgeries 'planted', presumably, in support of the edition. Zeydel has been working on Hrotsvitha and the German Humanists (see *The Reception of Hrotsvitha by German Humanists after 1493*, *J.E.G.P.*, July, 1945). In a later Note in *M.L.N.* (April) he recalls that in the prose Introduction to the plays as given in Celtes's edition (1493–1500) 'Hrotsvitha' introduces herself by playing in Latin on the Low German meaning of her name: *ego clamor validus Gandeshemensis*. That *clamor validus* translates the two elements (*hr(u)ot*, 'din', 'noise' and *swið(i)*, 'strong', cf. O.E. *swiðe*) of which the presumed nun's name is compounded, had been spotted by Jacob Grimm. If this 'clue' suggests some rather heavy-handed German humanist 'wit', Zeydel is nevertheless on strong ground when he doubts whether Celtes and his friends, though to some extent 'Germanists', could have the philological equipment to devise (correctly) this etymological word-play.

Of our own M.E. cyclic plays, the Towneley Cycle provides material for two Notes. Helge Kökeritz in *Some Marginal Notes to the Towneley 'Resurrection'* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) finds it remarkable that all available editions of medieval plays should be so inadequately glossed. The exact meaning of many of the details of expression is thus likely to elude the average student. After some general illustrations, Kökeritz selects for demonstration purposes the Towneley *Resurrection*, a piece of average difficulty, and offers a list of revised notes.

In *The Towneley 'Peregrini', an Unnoticed Step towards the Vernacular*, (*M.L.N.*, April) E. M. Clark endeavours to explain the 'peculiarly formless and undramatic' play in question as a step in the evolution from Latin Liturgy to vernacular drama. A few sur-

viving examples (e.g. the Trèves *Visitatio Sepulchri*) probably illustrate the actual first step; here, vernacular paraphrase alternates with Latin text. In the Towneley *Peregrini*, instead of an alternation (involving duplication) of Latin and English, we find an apparently unmotivated repetition of each thought or statement from the liturgical base. If we assume the existence of an earlier stage resembling the *Visitatio* alternation, this repetition could be ascribed to re-translation of the Latin statements without removal of the earlier paraphrases. When these duplicated translations are distributed amongst different speakers, a kind of 'pseudo-dialogue' emerges. This is ingenious, though not perhaps very clearly expressed. There are some points on which we should like a word or two more—as to the amount of accident or design involved in this process (though there may well be little or no evidence here) and as to the significance of this dialogue-building by duplicated translation.

It is long since there has been occasion to notice in the chapter a full-scale book on medieval English drama. *Mysteries' End* by H. C. Gardiner, S.J.,[12] offers what many may find a challenging view of the final phases of the mystery cycles. Though the date of 'Mysteries' End' falls somewhere late in the sixteenth century, the book is considered in this chapter, for, as the author repeatedly stresses, his subject is the *medieval* and religious drama; he is not concerned here with any transitional or Renaissance types.

Many people who have 'done' English literature carry in their minds a rough evolutionary notion of the development of drama from church to churchyard, to street and market-place, to the hall, the inn yard and, ultimately, the theatre—a picture of gradual secularization, proceeding as by a law of nature. This easy analogy with natural evolution Gardiner will not accept. He denies that the transference from church to churchyard and then to the village green was a secularization; 'the plays were religious in origin and religious they remained'. He deprecates our modern over-emphasis on 'humour' and 'realism' in the mystery plays in the endeavour to find evolutionary 'origins' for Elizabethan secular comic motives. The thunderings of the Fathers against the degenerate pagan drama of their day have been falsely generalized

[12] *Mysteries' End: an Investigation of the Last Days of the Medieval Religious Stage*, by H. C. Gardiner, S.J. Yale U.P. and O.U.P. pp. viii+142. 20*s*.

into a persistent distrust by 'the Church' of the *religious* drama nourished in its own bosom; in such generalizations the phrase, 'the Church' has been loosely used with insufficient distinction between central authoritative pronouncement and pastoral reproof of local error and abuse, and with insufficient distinction, too, between what was proper for cleric and lay folk. Nor will he attribute the ultimate disintegration and decline of the medieval drama to the slow pressure of new literary interests. 'The change did not go on at the bottom, but was imposed, coldly and ruthlessly, from the top.'

The villain of the piece is the Reformation; perhaps one should add, for this country, a Reformation that worked itself out under a series of Tudor monarchs with their lust for uniformity and centralization. Yet in countries where no comparable Reformation took place the old religious drama decayed—ultimately, even in Spain. From Chapter II we gather that the Council of Trent had something to do with this. The Reformation enforced a re-examination of conscience and the Church was compelled to return to the attitude of the Fathers. The rulings of the Council about images allow one to infer a colder, more cautious attitude towards the drama. Thus, directly in Protestant areas, indirectly elsewhere, the Reformation attacked and triumphed.

It will be clear that the book has its polemic aspects, but it is not to be imagined that it confines itself to establishing anything so obvious as that a Protestant Reformation proved inimical to a Catholic drama. The medieval guilds are also involved; Gardiner will not concede that it was a failing corporate spirit which, even when some financial stringency had set in, helped to destroy their traditional drama. This chapter is less substantial and convincing than some others; the chapter on the Council of Trent, though interesting, may seem to many readers a little thin and wire-drawn. The deliberate isolation for the purposes of study of the religious drama from competing literary or cultural interests sometimes seems to leave certain questions in the air. But whether its conclusions be accepted or not, this book is an interesting investigation, and by no means lacks human 'body'. The medieval religious stage is seen as rich in human values, built into the round of the seasons, closely knit with city and small-town life and the corporate activities of craftsmen. The book is intended to balance excessive concentration on origins. Above all, it is right that the dangerously easy

evolutionary and biological analogies we employ should be challenged and scrutinized from time to time (see also below, p. 117-18).

This chapter may be concluded by two essays of more general scope. H. S. Bennett has added to his efforts to take us back to the medieval reader and his books a complementary article, *Medieval Literature and the Modern Reader* (*Essays and Studies*, vol. xxxi). With Trevelyan in his *English Social History*, he wonders whether most of us understand our ancestors as well as we think we do. 'Only the medieval scholar has the keys to that complex which makes up the medieval mind and society.' Bennett's illustrations of the kind of recondite knowledge we need to get the full point and flavour of quite familiar passages apply all to Chaucer, but his main query becomes all the more insistent the further we move from well-annotated editions.

A delightful essay by J. S. P. Tatlock, *Medieval Laughter* (*Spec.*, July), has been saved up to make a pleasant finale to this chapter. It is of wide relevance though most of its illustrative material is taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth and our earliest medieval phase. Tatlock has been roused by M. Louis Cazamian's dictum: 'Modern humour hardly came into its own until the Renaissance; prior to that time the mental complexity which it requires was not very widely diffused.' Cazamian is generalizing about the vernaculars. There, Tatlock finds humour in O.E. litotes (he might well go further) and, in M.E., plenty of 'the developed sense of the absurd'. His big point is, however, that we can obtain no just and comprehensive view of the medieval mind, quality and character from vernacular literature alone. The vernacular was not, in the main, the medium of a full mind speaking to its equals. It was, very largely, used for a literature of instruction, of 'talking down'. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there was in Latin a mass of brilliant and entertaining literature. The laughter of Henry II, as recorded in two anecdotes, leads to a consideration of the need for humour in reading Geoffrey of Monmouth, writing for aristocrats, who were not literal in their approach. Examples are given of his lighter touches: his fun with names (Vulteius Catellus = Puppy-Face?), his enjoyment of his own fantastic episodes, his 'warning off' William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon. In short, it is probably true that his lies were not fabricated with half the solemnity with which they have since been 'detected'.

# VI

# THE RENAISSANCE

By FREDERICK S. BOAS

BEFORE dealing with 1946 publications within the scope of this chapter of *Y.W.* mention has to be made of a 1945 publication not available for notice in Volume XXVI. The aim of *Renaissance Literary Criticism*, by Vernon Hall, Jr.,[1] is 'not to review once again all the ideas of the Renaissance critics, but rather to examine that portion of their criticism which was directly affected by the social and political ideas of their age'. The book is divided into three sections: Italy, France and England, in each of which their six chapters run parallel. After a detailed examination of the critical output in these countries Hall reaches some general conclusions in which England and France are more closely allied than Italy.

'The thinking of the critics . . . was dominated by the aristocratic viewpoint . . . they assumed that monarchy, or the aristocratic republic, was the ideal form of government.' But an awakened national feeling in France and England gave strength to the movement in favour of the vernacular, instead of Latin, as the literary language. Among the dramatic forms tragedy was ranked highest since it dealt with the fortunes of lofty personages, and the demand that 'the style, costuming, and stage setting be suited to the exalted rank of the characters illustrates the social nature of the criticism. Comedy was concerned with the middle, and farce with the lower classes. Tragi-comedy was often condemned for violating "decorum" by mixing classes. The epic was regarded as the greatest of poetic forms, and was intended, in *The Faerie Queene*, to present a pattern of nobility. Scorn was expressed for the unlearned writers of ballads and other popular forms'.

Hall's generalizations, of which only a partial summary is here given, will need further testing, but his study is well documented and suggestive.

Bearing also upon English studies, though primarily of wider

[1] *Renaissance Literary Criticism: A Study of its Social Content*, by Vernon Hall, Jr. New York: Columbia Univ. Press. pp. ix+260.

range, is M. T. Herrick's *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531–55.*[2] Herrick's main aim is to call attention to a group of commentators and translators in the early half of the sixteenth century who began the fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian elements upon which Renaissance critical theories are chiefly based. They included Parrhasius, Paccius, Robortellus, Madius and Philippus who, as Herrick shows, deserve part of the credit that has gone to their better-known successors, Scaliger and Castelvetro. In a review of Herrick's study in *English* (Autumn 1947) the present writer indicated the main lines of the contributions of the different members of the early group to Renaissance literary theory, of which the most important outcome was the list of dramatic rules, including the Unities. Herrick also gives a somewhat too brief account of the influence of these precepts upon English critics from Sidney to Dryden.

The detailed article by Eloise Pafort on *A Group of Early Tudor School-Books* (*Library*, March) is mainly of bibliographical importance and is dealt with in Chapter XV (p. 259). But it may be useful to state here that these school-books include John Stanbridge's *Parvula-Vulgaria*; *Sum, Es, Fui* and *Gradus Comparationum*; Robert Whittinton's *De Heteroclitis Nominibus*; *Lucubratines*; *De Nominum Generibus*; *Tullyes Offyces*, in Latin and English; *Expositio Hymnorum* and *Expositio Sequentiarum*; Johannes Murmellius's *Composita Verborum*. A brief account is given of the contents of each of these books and, in some cases, of the particular schools and forms in which they were used.

In his lecture on *The Renaissance and its Influence on English Medicine, Surgery and Public Health*, noticed last year in *Y.W.*, xxvi, 78, Sir Arthur S. MacNalty drew attention to the appointment of Sir Thomas More as one of the Commissioners of Sewers responsible for the improvement of London's water supply. Sir Arthur has now elaborated his study of the social and practical sides of More's very varied activities in a paper on *Sir Thomas More as Public Health Reformer* in *Nature* (23 Nov.), the abstract of a Chadwick lecture. More was largely influenced by Linacre,

[2] *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism*, by Marvin T. Herrick. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press. pp. vi+117, $1.50 (paper); $2.00 (cloth).

equally renowned as a physician and a classical scholar. In his household Sir Arthur mentions three members who were studying medicine, Margaret Gigs, foster-sister of his own daughter Margaret; Dr. John Clement, who became President of the Royal College of Physicians, and Richard Hyrde, whose study of Greek attracted him to medicine.

In *Utopia* Sir Arthur finds 'a comprehensive programme of social medicine which, written in the sixteenth century, expresses many of the aspirations of to-day'. When London suffered from a virulent attack of 'sweating sickness' in 1517 More shrewdly realized that there was 'double the peril in the relapse that was in the first sickness'. When the other fell disease, the plague, attacked Oxford in 1518 the King from Abingdon gave Sir Thomas charge of the counter-measures, which took the form of notification and segregation. He was also a protagonist in hospital reform. As Sir Arthur sums up: 'The more one delves into State papers of Henry VIII, the more one reads Sir Thomas More's books, treatises and letters, and studies the account of his work in the letters of Erasmus and other contemporaries, the more one marvels at his wisdom and his outlook upon hygiene and public health'.

A similar recognition of More's remarkable foresight into modern problems informs H. W. Donner's comprehensive *Introduction to 'Utopia'*.[3] Though published in England, the book was printed in Sweden, and is from the pen of a professor in Abo Akademi. It is a testimony to the interest to-day in More's social speculations in Scandinavia.

Donner lays stress on the importance of *Utopia* in its first Latin dress. 'It was in its original crisp and pregnant form that *Utopia* first gained approval and was received with enthusiasm by all the best wits of Europe, and in the form originally given it by More it still shows to the happiest advantage. . . . Latin was to him a living language, capable of development according to the requirements of the age and of a topical subject. . . . When style was still a necessary complement to learning, the author of *Utopia* became recognized as one of the three foremost scholars of Europe.'

But in an age when Latin is no longer an international means of communication, Donner is obliged to quote from Robynson's

[3] *Introduction to 'Utopia'*, by H. W. Donner. Sidgwick and Jackson. pp. x+119. 12*s.* 6*d.*

English translation, and he gives a somewhat more detailed analysis of its contents than so familiar a work requires. Among its sources he notes details in Vespucci's accounts of the natives of the New World and Peter Martyr's description of the West Indies. These blend with reminiscences of Plato and other classical writers and of St. Augustine and Pico. The Utopian institutions are founded on reason, and Donner agrees with R. W. Chambers that they present a picture of the best state of society to which men can attain without revelation. But More was too much of a practical reformer to think that such ideals set in a romantic framework could be quickly realized. Donner therefore combats the view of the German scholar Oncken who sees in the work a declaration of policy, including a defence of 'imperialism'. Nor is it a plea, as Karl Kautsky argued, for a Communist revolution.

In a *Y.W.* notice only the main lines of Donner's suggestive Introduction can be indicated. With the wealth of references in its Notes it deserves the attention of all students of More's thought and influence.

Mention may be briefly made of a book which has not come to hand by Arthur E. Morgan, *Nowhere and Somewhere: How History makes Utopia and How Utopia makes History* (Univ. of N. Carolina Press). Morgan draws parallels between the social system in *Utopia* and that under the Incas in Peru.

A different aspect of More occupies Sister M. Thecla in *S. Thomas More and the 'Catena Aurea'* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.). By quoting parallel passages she shows that in his last work against a nameless 'heretike' before his imprisonment, and in his treatises written in the Tower, he makes quotations or translations not direct from St. Augustine but from the condensed version in the *Catena Aurea* of St. Thomas Aquinas.

In the opinion of the editor of a limited reprint of Sir Thomas Elyot's *Of the Knowledge which maketh a Wise Man*,[4] More figures there under the disguise of Plato in a series of five dialogues with Aristippus, intended as a warning to Henry VIII represented by the Sicilian tyrant, Dionysius. Plato argues that man, if he is

[4] *Of the Knowledge which Maketh a Wise Man*, by Sir Thomas Elyot, ed. by Edwin Johnston Howard. Oxford, Ohio: Anchor Press. pp. xxxiv + 260. $5.00.

to be truly wise, must recognize the central position that he occupies in the scale of being, and must not violate his place by allowing his spiritual part to be subdued by his senses. He must not question God's ways even if they involve suffering.

A review of this book by John Butt (*R.E.S.*, July 1947) indicates its importance among hitherto unrecognized Elyot's writings, as testifying to his desire to interpret the classics to his countrymen, and to reconcile Christian and pagan teaching.

As a background to the speculative theories of More and Elyot brief reference may be made to an article by W. Gordon Zeeveld on *Social Equalitarianism in a Tudor Crisis* (*Journal of the History of Ideas*, Jan.), The crisis was the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, when, according to Zeeveld, the conservative northern men of all ranks were rising in defence of the traditional social order of 'degree', while the King and his Council maintained that 'the meanest man', if chosen by the Crown, was on a level with those of long descent. The new bureaucrat was ousting the feudal lord.

And for the period immediately following similar reference may be made to Edith Sitwell's *Fanfare for Elizabeth*,[5] with its vivid reconstruction from contemporary sources of the social and political atmosphere in which the future queen's girlhood was spent.

Dom Hilary Steuert calls attention to the significance of *The English Prose Style of Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, 1557* (*M.L.R.*, July). He gives a summary of the chief phases of Watson's life: Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and a leading humanist; chaplain to Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester; Master of St. John's College; Dean of Durham; Bishop of Lincoln; deprived of his bishopric under Elizabeth, and in custody or imprisonment till his death in 1584. In mentioning his tragedy, *Absalom*, Steurt does not refer to the MS. of the play on that subject in the British Museum which may be his.

It is however with his two prose works that Steuert is specially concerned. He claims that they have been overlooked by literary historians of the period, and that they entitle him to an honourable place in the list of contemporary prose writers. The first is *Twoo Notable Sermons . . . before the Quenes highnes, concerning the reall presence of Christes body and bloude in the blessed Sacrament*

[5] *Fanfare for Elizabeth*, by Edith Sitwell. Macmillan. pp. vii + 202. 12*s*. 6*d*.

(1554). This, as Steuert states, has both the virtues and defects of learned sermons composed for oral delivery. It is at times too prolix and overloaded with citations. But at its best, as in two passages which Steuert quotes, his style 'shows an almost faultless command of rhythm and a use of language unspoilt by oratorical emptiness'. In an interesting set of parallels he compares Watson's style in *Twoo Notable Sermons* with passages from Cranmer's writings, and puts them at least on a level.

Watson's other work is *Holsome and Catholyke doctrine concerning the Seven Sacraments . . . set forth in maner of shorte Sermons.* Here the style is more level and furnishes examples of 'clear expository prose'. Steuert claims for it a share of the praise which Saintsbury and others have bestowed on Hooker, whose *Polity* was not written till ten years after Watson's death.

Paul L. Wiley discusses *Renaissance Exploitation of Cavendish's 'Life of Wolsey'* (*S. in Ph.*, April). As More's reputation after his death grew into that of martyr and saint so Wolsey became identified with that of the worldly, vicious prelate, raised on high and then deservedly brought low by the turn of fortune's wheel. For different reasons both Catholic and Protestant propagandists contributed to this representation. George Cavendish's *Life*, written from the intimate standpoint of his gentleman-usher, and finished in manuscript *c.* 1557, was intended to correct this accepted tradition. It succeeded in showing Wolsey not in caricature but as a credible human being. But Cavendish did not recognize in his master the statesman of international level, and succeeding chroniclers turned passages in his artless narrative to uses he had not foreseen.

The first borrower, however, Stow, in his *Annales* (1580), as Wiley points out, remains generally faithful to Cavendish's attitude, and the effect of his treatment was 'to make Wolsey the most prominent figure in the period of Henry VIII, and to contribute to history a new biography, a "character" '. In the second edition of Holinshed (1587) he remains the central figure, but there is more concession to the popular tradition of the Cardinal as an 'example of pride and arrogance'. Wiley then analyses the respective relations to Cavendish in their histories of Speed (1611), Godwin (1616), and Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1649). The tendency to honest reproduction of their source increased. On the other hand, in the first edition of the whole biography, *The Negotiations of*

*Thomas Wolsey, the Great Cardinal of England* (1641), the propagandist animus is revived. The text is hacked by anonymous Puritans who turned it into an anti-episcopal tract directed against truth. As Wiley comments, 'That the memoir of a Catholic and servant to a cardinal should reach print finally as a weapon against ecclesiastical rule must certainly be counted an ironical detail of literary history'.

Charles T. Prouty, besides editing *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*,[6] has contributed to the volume an article on *Whetstone's 'The Discourse of Rinaldo and Giletta' and Grange's 'The Golden Aphroditis'*. He traces the debt of the first part of *Rinaldo and Giletta* to Gascoigne's tale, *Adventures of Master F. J.*, and of the second part to Ariosto's account of the loves of Ariodant and Genevra. Prouty shows that Whetstone introduces into his narrative imitations of poems in *Adventures of Master F. J.*, and other echoes of Gascoigne's technique. But he is inferior to his model because 'his interest was not in telling a story or in displaying character, but in presenting as much as possible of those stereotypes of love behaviour and love language as he could'. It was this interest also, as Prouty illustrates in detail, that led him in the second part of his story to make alterations in Ariosto's account of the troubles of the lovers in *Orlando Furioso*.

Between John Grange's *The Golden Aphroditis* and the *Adventures of Master F. J.* there are numerous parallels of phraseology and situation. In addition, as Prouty points out, they 'were writing original narratives which concealed the identity of several persons prominent in the courtly world'. He suggests that the lady whom both Gascoigne and Grange allude to as having a scar on her forehead was Catherine Bridges, Lady Sands. But Grange is inferior to Gascoigne because in the rhetorical style of his long drawn-out conversations in his tale the interest in narrative and character is apt to be lost.

T. O. Mabbott in *Gascoigne on Marcus Aurelius and 'Boemia'* (*N. & Q.*, 24 Aug.) suggests that when Gascoigne states that

*Golden Marcus*
*Bare witness of Boemia, by credit of his work,*

[6] *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*, ed. Charles T. Prouty. Columbia: Univ of Missouri. pp. 191.

the lady was Faustina, the emperor's wife, when he praised extravagantly in his *Meditations* I, 17, though she had a bad moral reputation. She was the daughter of Antoninus Pius, one of whose names was Boionius, connected with the tribe of the Boii who gave Bohemia its name. Hence Gascoigne may have transferred the name to her.

J. G. Tilney-Bassett, continuing his investigations on Edmund Tilney, Master of the Revels (see *Y.W.*, xxv, 56), had a note in *The Library* (Sept.–Dec. 1945) on *Edmund Tilney's 'The Flower of Friendshippe'*. He shows by comparison between the 1568 copy in the British Museum and Malone's similarly dated copy in the Bodleian that Malone was mistaken in thinking that his was the first edition. It corrects various misprints in the British Museum copy, which thus was earlier, and it is followed by the 1571 edition.

The larger part of Paul H. Kocher's article on *Uses of the Bible in English Astronomical Treatises during the Renaissance* (*H.L.Q.*, Feb.) deals with publications later than the limits of this chapter and is noticed below (see p. 161). But Kocher begins with references to the three first English adherents of Copernicus, Robert Record, John Dee and Thomas Digges. In seeking to show that the heliocentric system did not contradict Scripture 'their strategy with respect to the Bible was that of Copernicus himself: to be as silent as possible about it', except to allege that the defenders of the Ptolemaic system misinterpreted the scriptural texts upon which they relied. Record in *The Castle of Knowledge* (1556) speaks of Lactantius, the orthodox protagonist, being 'seduced' by 'men too hastie to be good judges'. Dee in his preface to Billingsley's *Euclide* (1570) warned men not to let mistaken interpretation of the Bible deter them from studying God's wisdom in his creation. Digges in his 'Addition' to the *Prognostication Everlastinge* (1576) expounded the Copernicus system in terms of Christian piety, but without any reference to the Scriptures.

The recent successive studies of John Skelton by J. L. Lloyd (*Y.W.*, xix, 107-8), W. Nelson (*Y.W.*, xx, 72–3) and Ian Gordon (*Y.W.*, xxiv, 81–3) are discussed by R. G. Howarth in the Australian periodical *Southerly*, VI, ii (1945). Under the title *Scholarship and Skelton* it is in form a review of Gordon's work, but it traces

the steps by which the fame of Skelton in the century that has elapsed since Dyce's edition has been rescued from the obloquy to which it was consigned by Pope's epithet, 'beastly'. Skelton's verse can now be rightly appreciated as reaching back to the native English alliterative metre and forward to the 'sprung rhythm' of G. M. Hopkins.

The article on *John Skelton, A Conservative* by Th. Tillemans in *English Studies* (Oct.), a journal edited in Groningen, with collaboration in Lund and Basle, is significant in that it shows the revived appreciation of Skelton has spread to the Continent. Tillemans seeks to show that what he calls 'the ego-element', characteristic of Renaissance humanism, is absent or restrained in Skelton's work. Even in the *Garlande of Laurell*, where it is chiefly present, it is pushed into the background by medieval devices. 'Skelton leaves everything to be settled by Dame Pallas, as he is too dull-witted to speak for himself.'

As in *The Canterbury Tales* the pilgrims meet on a footing of equality, so in Skelton's works the characters move on the same plane. Even in *Philip Sparrow* the elegy, according to Tillemans, suffers from the mistress getting as much attention as the bird, and from an exaggerated 'Gothic' expression of scorn. But he admits that in *The Bowge of Courte* and *Elynour Rumming* racy Tudor elements modify the medieval tradition.

J. A. W. Bennett gives proof of *The Early Fame of Gavin Douglas's 'Eneados'* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.). There are five extant MSS. falling into two distinct groups, and the evidence of variant readings makes it necessary to assume the existence of lost intermediate texts prior to Copland's first printed edition (1553), which was considerably anglicized. Surrey took over a number of northern words from Douglas for his own translation of Virgil, and King James seems to have borrowed a simile from him in his *Reulis and Cautelis*. John Norden in 1614 ranked him with Chaucer and Gower. The philologists of the seventeenth century quarried in his translation as 'a treasury of ancient words'. The further tributes which Bennett quotes from eighteenth-century sources scarcely come under the heading of 'early fame'.

W. Beattie contributes to the textual interpretation of *Gavin*

*Douglas's 'Palice of Honour'* (*T.L.S.*, 23 Feb.). No MS. of the poem s known, but there are three early editions, T. Davidson's (*c.* 1540), I. Ross's (*c.* 1553), W. Copland's (1579). The margins of the copy of the 1579 edition in the National Library of Scotland contain a number of sixteenth-century MS. emendations, often aimed at 'improving sense or rhythm or both'. Of these Beattie gives salient examples.

Margaret Church discusses *The First English Pattern Poems* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.). She defines pattern poetry as 'verse which by the varying length of its lines forms a picture or design'. She traces this literary fashion back to the *Greek Anthology* which in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries became known to English travelers on the Continent, partly through French imitations. Stephen Hawes, who was versed in French, appears to have been the first to write a pattern poem in *The Convercyon of Swerers* (1509) where the pattern takes the form of a pair of wings.

The next 'pattern' poet, Richard Willis, was a Greek scholar and was more directly indebted to classical influence. His *Poematum Liber* (1573) included verses in the form of an altar, a sword, an egg, a pear, an axe, and a reversed pyramid. From Willis Miss Church passes to the author of *The Arte of English Poesie* who, she thinks, turned further east than Greece for the source of his patterns which she would ascribe to Oriental origin.

Hallett Smith discusses *English Metrical Psalms in the Sixteenth Century and their Literary Significance* (*H.L.Q.*, May). He states that the history of the development of English poetry would not be complete without some account of the vogue in the sixteenth century of translating the Psalms into English verse, and points out that there were 180 editions of the Sternhold and Hopkins metrical version down to 1640.

Hallett Smith examines the reasons for translating the Psalms into verse instead of prose. In the first place it was known to men of learning that in Hebrew they were in poetic form. Secondly, they were thus more easily memorized, especially in the 4-3-4-3 ballad stanza. Thirdly, Sternhold, as he stated in the dedication of the first edition of his psalms to Edward VI, wished to let the young King judge of their music when sung by others than the translator. Smith holds that Anthony Wood was not justified in

asserting that Sternhold thought 'that the courtiers would sing them instead of their sonnets'.

Smith gives an account of Coverdale's *Goostly Psalms*, Wyatt's seven penitential psalms in *terza rima*, Surrey's four psalms during his last imprisonment. But the popular favour, especially of 'the Puritan section, was caught by the version to which Sternhold contributed 40, Hopkins 60, and others 50, including 26 by Thomas Norton. All used the same 'common metre', constituting 'a body of verse that was plain, bare, regular in beat, iambic, strictly measured'. It thus became 'a force, working for that direct, plain, "mere English" quality against the lavish, ornamental, stylized manners which more than once threatened to dominate literary expression'.

Smith proceeds to discuss two later important versions. One is by Archbishop Parker, most of whose renderings are akin to those of Sternhold-Hopkins, but diversified by more elaborate verse schemes. The other is by Sir Philip Sidney and the Countess of Pembroke, which following the example of Marot in French, exploited a large variety of metrical forms.

Hallett Smith also contributes to *H.L.Q.* (Aug.) a detailed study of *The Art of Sir Thomas Wyatt*. He begins with an account of the various forms in which poems by Wyatt have been preserved, *The Court of Venus*, *Tottel's Miscellany*, The Devonshire, Egerton and Harington MSS., and discusses briefly the editorial and critical work thereon from G. F. Nott in 1816 to Sir E. K. Chambers in 1933.

The questions that Smith raises have to do with the nature of Wyatt's poetry, and what it is trying to do, and in especial with 'the meaning and significance of the roughness of much of his versification'. Smith holds that this roughness was deliberate, and that Wyatt's revision of it was not to gain smoothness. Proof of this he finds in the Epigrams. He compares Epigram 14 in the Devonshire version beginning, 'Cruell desire my master and my foo', with the later Egerton version and its alterations, alike in Wyatt's hand. Smith infers that Wyatt's main interest was not in gaining smoothness, but in 'the rhetorical organization of the poem, the way in which the argument progressed, the alternation of tone which would be most consistent with the meaning he was trying to convey'. His objective was 'the improvement of the general strategy of the poem'.

Smith therefore does not agree with Chambers that Wyatt intended to give his sonnets smoother form. He compares his version of Petrarch's '*Amor, che nel pensier mio vive e regna*' with that of Surrey, and finds in the former an energy and vividness which more than balance the easy flow of the latter. In the three verse epistles Wyatt does not show himself as (in Warton's phrase) a polished satirist, but as a master of a racy semi-colloquial style.

In the Songs and Lyrics Smith finds that Wyatt's most distinctive characteristic is his frequent and subtle use of the refrain, of which striking instances are given. Other of their metrical and verbal features are discussed and a distinction is drawn between the tradition which Wyatt inherited in this field and his novel contribution to it. While Smith raises some debatable issues his article is a valuable contribution to his subject.

In the gloss to the September eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calendar* E.K. mentions amongst Gabriel Harvey's 'most rare and very notable writings' his *Ode Natalitia*, of which nothing more has been known. Warren B. Austin in *Gabriel Harvey's 'Lost' Ode on Ramus* (*M.L.N.*, April) records his discovery of an apparently unique copy of this work in the Cambridge University Library. It is entitled *Ode Natalitia . . . In Memoriam P. Rami, optimi et clarissimi virj.* It was printed by T. Vautrollier and dated 1575. Harvey's name does not appear but the epistle to the reader is signed 'A.P.S.', i.e. *Aulae Pembrochianae Socius*, which confirms E.K.'s attribution.

The title is explained by Harvey's statement that the ode was written during the Christmas holidays, in the morning and afternoon of St. Stephen's day, though Austin questions whether this is to be taken literally. He gives a description of the two Latin verse eclogues of which the ode consists, ending with an impassioned appeal to professors of eloquence and philosophy to spread the Ramist methods in England. Thus it is now established that Harvey anticipated by some years the impulse which Sidney gave to the influence of Ramus by his patronage of William Temple.

Almost simultaneously in *T.L.S.* (9 March), under the heading *Gabriel Harvey*, Harold S. Wilson was making a similar announcement about the authorship of the copy of the *Ode Natalitia* in the Cambridge University Library. Wilson, who has recently given an

account of Harvey's *Orations on Rhetoric* and been co-editor of his *Ciceronianus* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 81–2), suggests that the *Ode* might serve as an introduction to these.

With her attractively produced edition of *Parts added to 'The Mirror for Magistrates' by John Higgins and Thomas Blenerhasset*[7] Miss Lily B. Campbell has crowned her long labours on the text of *The Mirror*. From various indications she has been able to sketch Higgins's earlier career. Born about 1545 and educated at Oxford he spent two years as a teacher of grammar and the two next in a revision of Richard Huloet's Latin-English Dictionary. Then he proceeded to enlarge Udall's *Flowers from Terence* and *The Mirror for Magistrates*. It was in 1574 that he published his sixteen additional 'tragedies' under the equivocal title for a supplement, *The First parte of the 'Mirour for Magistrates'*. What it meant was that Higgins, acting on a suggestion by Baldwin in the original *Mirror*, had turned back to relate the hapless fortunes of the legendary earliest British worthies from Albanact, son of Brutus, to Nennius who routed Caesar but died from his wounds. The British Museum copy of this 1574 *First parte* also contained an additional tragedy, of Irenglas, which was included in a second edition of this volume in 1575.

In 1587 Higgins issued a composite and greatly enlarged edition of *The Mirror for Magistrates* under the original title. As Miss Campbell's arrangement clearly shows, eight new tragedies were interspersed among the previously printed seventeen of *The First parte*, including three completely rewritten, followed by a block of fifteen so-called classical tragedies. The four additions to the Baldwin version of *The Mirror* Miss Campbell had already included in her 1938 edition of it.

Higgins, however, did not add any of the tragedies in the so-called *The Seconde part of the Mirour for Magistrates* by Thomas Blenerhasset, a young soldier stationed in Gernsey. He sent the MS. of his twelve tragedies, from that of Guidericus, King of Britain, who refused tribute to Claudius Caesar, to that of Harold, privately to a friend and they were printed in 1578 without his knowledge. Their most striking feature is the unrhymed six-foot

[7] *Parts added to 'The Mirror for Magistrates' by John Higgins and Thomas Blenerhasset*, ed. from original texts in the Huntington Library, by Lily B. Campbell. pp. xii+512. 42*s*.

iambic metre of Cadwallader's 'Complaint', and Blenerhasset's defence of it against 'the Gotish Kynde of ryming'. Miss Campbell in her scholarly introductions to the Higgins and Blenerhasset texts traces their later fortunes at the hands of Richard Nicolls and Joseph Haslewood.

In a review article, *Miss Lily Campbell and 'The Mirror for Magistrates'* (*N. & Q.*, 29 June), the present writer gave a short summary of her previous work on *The Mirror* from 1932 to 1938. He suggested that in her critical estimate of Higgins, whom she accuses of having begun the 'disintegration' of *The Mirror*, she had done him rather less than full justice. But he gratefully recognized that by her long and happy industry she had settled one of the most complicated series of Elizabethan textual problems.

In *French Farce and John Heywood*[8] Ian Maxwell adventures further along a path for which the trail was blazed by Karl Young in an article in *Modern Philology* in 1904. Young indicated that *The Pardner and the Frere* and *Johan Johan* were based on French originals. Maxwell holds that throughout his dramatic career Heywood was influenced by the general tone and technique of the contemporarily Gallic stage. He therefore begins his treatise with a short study of its different comic aspects, the 'farce', the 'sottie' and so forth.

Maxwell is most convincing in clinching Young's argument that *Johan Johan* is derived from *Pernet qui va au vin*. He shows that in *Pernet* the phrase *chauffer la cire* means both to chafe wax and to wait for something advantageous. The husband is to soften wax for an image that will bring him wealth. *Pernet* is thus evidently earlier than *Johan Johan* where the wax is merely softened to mend a leaking pail. Maxwell also lays greater stress than Young on the connexion between *The Pardoner and The Frere* and the *Farce d'un Pardonneur*, which also influenced *The Four P.P.*; and he suggests affinities between *Love* and *Wether* and French farce. But he is careful to claim that Heywood always made his theme his own.

Edwin S. Miller discusses in detail *Roister Doister's Funeralls*

[8] *French Farce and John Heywood*, by Ian Maxwell, Melbourne Univ. Press in association with O.U.P. pp. 175. 12*s*. 6*d*.

(*S. in Ph.*, Jan.). When Roister Doister declares that he will die because Dame Custance refuses his suit Merrygreek in Act iii, 3 pretends to perform the duties of a priest in seeing him out of life. The Latin tags marked for the audience five stages in the imagined progress of Roister Doister from sick-bed to grave (1) commendation of the soul to God at the moment of death, (2) vespers for the dead, (3) matins for the dead, (4) Mass for the dead, (5) burial service.

Miller further claims that Merrygreek intoned the service like a priest conducting a funeral. Some of the lines do not appear in the text of iii, 3, but are printed at the end of the play as 'The Psalmodie' and 'The Peale of Belles'. Others are duplicated or approximated in the psalmody. That they were intended to be sung or intoned is shown by their being placed along with 'Certaine songs to be sung by those which shall use this Comedie or Enterlude'. An incongruous effect was produced by interruptions by the 'corpse'.

Miller, however, questions whether a satiric effect was intended, and suggests that this depends on the date of the play.

> 'If it was performed about 1548, when the Roman liturgy was officially out of favor, the audience may have sensed and Udall may have intended satire upon it. If the play was performed after . . . January, 1549 but before the accession of Mary . . . when a funeral according to the old rites was illegal and punishable, then the mock rites must have been considered at least a mildly insinuative form of either sedition or satire. . . . If, on the other hand, the play was performed as late as the end of 1553, when Roman liturgy was officially in favor, the audience probably sensed and Udall probably intended no satire, but simply a time-worn but timely literary convention.'

The last sentence scarcely carries conviction, nor does the more sweeping assertion that at no date would 'anybody in the audience have been much offended, even though he sensed satire, for everybody was laughing rather than feeling critical'.

The aim of Leslie M. Oliver's paper on *William Wager and 'The Trial of Treasure'* (*H.L.Q.*, Aug.) is to prove from internal evidence that this morality is from the same pen as *Enough is as Good as a Feast* and *The Longer thou Livest the more Fool Thou Art*. These two pieces are known to be by William Wager, and Oliver shows that in many respects *The Trial of Treasure* is strikingly parallel to one or both of them. A passage of seventy-

four lines in *Trial of Treasure* beginning 'When Solon was asked of Cressus the King' is almost identical with one in *Enough is as Good.* Two nonsensical speeches by the Vices in these plays are akin in metre and manner, and each introduces the weathercock on St. Paul's steeple. The three plays are remarkably rich in oaths and imprecations; their verse forms are almost identical and their prologues are similar in type. Each is strongly Calvinistic and anti-Catholic in tone. Though internal evidence alone is sometimes deceptive Oliver makes out a good case.

*Latin Drama in Renaissance England* is the title of a paper read by Tucker Brooke at the New England Renaissance Conference in 1940. It was found among his papers after his lamented death and is printed in *E.L.H.* (Dec.). Brooke stresses the importance of the Latin plays performed at the Universities and the Inns of Court in keeping up the level of dramatic composition during the period of about thirty years before 1580 when there was a comparative dearth of English pieces of good quality.

Brooke then gives a short account of William Gager's Latin plays, from *Meleager* (1582) to *Ulysses Redux* (1592), including songs and lyrics in quantitative metres 'so various and delightful that they may help to explain why even Spenser and Sidney doubted in the 1580's whether English prosody . . . should not reform itself on Latin lines'. In illustration Brooke gives his own renderings of some of these lyrics in parallel metres in English.

The main features and the special trend of *Mysteries' End* by H. C. Gardiner, S.J., have been treated in the preceding chapter (pp. 99–101). But as a considerable part of this important work deals with the fortunes of the religious drama during the period from Henry VIII to the earlier years of Elizabeth, some further notice of it may fitly close the present chapter. Gardiner brings out, perhaps over-stresses, the tug-of-war between the authorities in Church and State, who were anxious mainly for political reasons to suppress or severely limit the religious plays, and the common folk, especially in the north and west, who clung to the traditional pageants, and were at times abetted by mayors and other local officials. Thus side by side with the growth of Tudor secular drama till the second decade of Elizabeth's reign the great medieval cycles retained in part their activity.

Gardiner records their last phases. In York the Dean, Hutton, was their strong opponent, but in 1569 the Corpus Christi cycle, with corrections seen in the MS., was performed for the last time, and similarly the Paternoster play in 1572. A document discovered by Gardiner in the Diocesan Registry at York, and printed for the first time, is an order of the Commissioners dated 27 May 1576, permitting the performance of the Wakefield Corpus Christi play at Whitsuntide, provided nothing be played 'which tende to the maintenuance of superstition and idolatrie or which be contrarie to the lawes of God and [*sic*] or of the realme'. This is the first documentary evidence of Wakefield as a cycle centre, and strengthens, as Gardiner urges, its claim to be the *locale* of the Towneley plays.

At Chester the cycle was performed in 1571 and 1575, with the sanction on either occasion of the city's mayors who had to appear before the Privy Council and be reprimanded. At Coventry the account-books testify to the continuance of the pageants till 1579, but when in 1584 John Smythe of St. John's College, Oxford, was paid for a tragedy, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, to take the place of the old craft play, it marked the end of the religious cycle era.

# VII

# SHAKESPEARE

By ALLARDYCE NICOLL

THE suggestion, tentatively put forward in the 1945 'Shakespeare' section of *The Year's Work*, that some recent contributions to the study of Shakespeare indicate both a reaction against the 'realist' approach and a desire for a fresh orientation seems to have been justified. The year 1946 has brought with it several further writings which serve to support and confirm the suggestion made twelve months ago.

In his *Explorations*,[1] L. C. Knights has an essay entitled *Shakespeare and Shakespearians* which is an eloquent plea for a union of scholars and critics designed to enunciate, in terms comprehensible to others than specialists, the significance of the plays for our own generation. Although far different in approach, Kenneth Muir's *The Future of Shakespeare* (*Penguin New Writing*, No. 28) may be associated with this study, as may Evan John's letter on *Shakespeare's Angels* in the *T.L.S.* (19 Oct.). Both attack vigorously and deplore the preoccupation of scholarship with what John calls the 'lowlands and mud-flats'; both utter a trumpet-call for ascent to the heights and the achievement of a fresh re-valuation of the poet.

Nor are these writers alone. In a stimulating article, *A Caveat for Critics against Invoking Elizabethan Psychology* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.), Louise C. Turner Forest takes up the lance in opposition to those who speak glibly about Elizabethan 'thought' concerning this or that and whose interpretation of Shakespeare is bound and limited by their 'realistic' or 'scientific' assessment of his age. Such pseudo-scientific assessment, Miss Forest argues, can be applied only 'momentarily'. 'Obviously', she asserts, 'what the modern expositors have done is to produce a latter day synthesis of Elizabethan psychological lore by putting together passages that seem to fit, choosing only those that will sustain the structure

[1] *Explorations: Essays in Criticism mainly on the Literature of the Seventeenth Century*. Chatto and Windus. pp. xii+198. 10*s*. 6*d*.

they erect, and discarding the rest.' Even more significant are the articles which N. Orsini has been contributing to *Anglica*. In *La critica shakespeariana: sguardo d'insieme* (Feb.) he interestingly takes under review a number of recent critical writings and, while rejecting the dogmas of 'historical' criticism, calls for a new approach which will take the 'historical' in its stride. In a later study, *La pregiudiziale storicista nella critica di Shakespeare* (April–June), Orsini returns to the attack. 'L'idea che la poesia del passato si debbe giudicare solo secondo le idee del passato' is to him anathema; to believe that an age's poetry must be related to the intellectual thought of that age implies a confusion of poetry and ideas. There is, Orsini insists, a necessity to study Shakespeare's plays not in relation to other works of their time but in and for themselves.

With these crusading essays go a number of others which, even if they do occasionally employ the 'historical' method, seek to explore the workings of Shakespeare's mind and to elucidate his images. Here comes Edward A. Armstrong's study of the poet's 'image-clusters'.[2] Although at times one may suspect that Armstrong stacks his cards rather heavily and although final assessment of his results can come only after minute checking of the arguments adduced, this is a stimulating book, endeavouring to delve below the surface of consciousness and to suggest that in Shakespeare's mind were stored, unknown to himself, a number of associated concepts each involving several key words. Use of any one of such words was, in Armstrong's opinion, likely to start the train and to conjure forth from the poet's brain the others in the series. Of particular interest is the evidence Armstrong gives that sometimes the particular word held its significance for Shakespeare rather for its sound than for its meaning: thus in one cluster-series 'drone' refers to a bee, in another related series it becomes the wail of the bagpipes; 'pistol', referring to a firearm, may become transmogrified into Pistol, a character.

In a communication on '*Like Images*' (*T.L.S.*, 1 June) Muriel St. Clare Byrne calls attention to *1 Henry IV*, IV, i, 100—'Glitter-

[2] *Shakespeare's Imagination: A Study of the Psychology of Association and Interpretation*, by Edward A. Armstrong. Lindsay Drummond. pp. 191. 10*s*. 6*d*.

ing in golden coats like images'—and, pointing to the fact that the reference is to sepulchral effigies, not to saints' vestments, comments on the significance of this for Shakespearian imagery in general. Other writers seek for understanding in an examination of the sources of the imagic content. Thus Ethel Seaton, in '*Antony and Cleopatra*' *and the Book of Revelation* (*R.E.S.*, July), suggests that the cosmic imagery of *Antony and Cleopatra* may be traceable to a reading or a hearing of the twenty-first chapter of *Revelation*; I. J. Semper similarly endeavours to track down Hamlet's 'Yes, by Saint Patrick' (*T.L.S.*, 3 Aug.) to *The Golden Legend* of Jacobus de Voragine, following an attempt made by Clarence Brownfield (*T.L.S.*, 25 May) to relate it to Holinshed's account of St. Patrick's Purgatory; J. E. Hawkins, in *Lear and the Psalmists* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) thinks the 'Blow, winds' tirade is influenced by memories of *Psalms* 144, 4; perhaps somewhat forcedly, Harry Lewin, writing on *Falstaff Uncolted* (*M.L.N.*, May) discusses the references to horses in *Henry IV*; James A. S. McPeek, in *The Genesis of Caliban* (*P.Q.*, Oct.), thinks we 'must conclude that Caliban owes his main features to the fusion in Shakespeare's mind of the 'laesy hag-seed Chorle', in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, 'and the specific characteristics' of the Freckled Beast called forth by the Hag herself. One of the most interesting essays in this kind is A. T. Hatto's '*Venus and Adonis*'—*And the Boar* (*M.L.R.*, Oct.), in which the image of the boar is traced from its original concept of virility to the time when, in Shakespeare's mind, a stain of 'foulness' begins to sully its virtuous associations.

Within the same general sphere comes a number of studies concerned chiefly with the political implications of the plays, many clearly showing an interest in what Shakespeare has to say on this subject which may be of value to our times of troubled political belief. John Laird sees the histories as one homogeneous whole,[3] with Bolingbroke's crime as the core of the philosophical action. There is, he thinks, at once acceptance of war as inevitable and horror at its results. More definitely related to the trend mentioned above is Robert Speaight's essay on Shakespeare's political beliefs.[4] Basically Speaight finds Shakespeare a pessimist when he contem-

[3] *Philosophical Excursions into English Literature*. C.U.P. 12*s*. 6*d*.

[4] *Shakespeare and Politics*, the Wedmore Memorial Lecture, by Robert Speaight, with a Foreword by F. S. Boas. R.S.L. pp. 20. 1*s*. 6*d*.

plates political man: it is only 'in his final play and within its metaphysical framework' that the poet 'permits himself to hope'. There are many acute comments here, in a paper which deems Shakespeare possessed of a peculiarly 'concrete imagination' which made him 'quick to see that, where power was in question, the formulas of philosophy were dead letters even if they were inspired by live principles'.

Akin to this is W. A. Armstrong's *The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant* (*R.E.S.*, July). The Elizabethan concern with the moral problems of kingship is here discussed, special emphasis being laid on the twin evils—refusal to accept even tyranny so long as it has a legal basis, and ambition leading towards usurpation, 'The distinctive quality of the tyrant of Elizabethan tragedy can be ascribed to the atmosphere of dynastic nationalism in which he was conceived' (see also below, p. 162).

In *'Timon of Athens' and the Cash-Nexus* (*Modern Quarterly Miscellany*, No. 1) and in the same journal's *The Social Background of 'King Lear'*, Kenneth Muir and C. H. Hobday respectively discuss two plays in social-political terms of leftist flavour. The early Shakespeare, thinks Muir, showed a passionate belief in order; by 1600, however, he begins to doubt the structure that had seemed so assured during his earlier days, and in *Timon* there floods forth all his horror at realizing that money is the basis of his society. How easily Shakespeare may serve to buttress any cause is shown by Muir's reference to some early comments made on *Timon* by Karl Marx, which become expanded and intensified in the statement of *Das Kapital*—'Shakespeare was one of the spiritual godparents of the "Communist Manifesto".' In another essay on the same play, *'Timon of Athens': A Reconsideration* (*R.E.S.*, April), A. S. Collins treats it as an experiment in a kind of Elizabethan morality drama, with the characters conceived not as persons but as personifications: he regards the 'Three Strangers' scene and that of Alcibiades before the Senate (III, ii and III, v) as the key episodes in the tragedy. Somewhat related to this is E. C. Pettet's *'The Merchant of Venice' and the Problem of Usury* in *Essays and Studies*, Vol. xxxi.

No doubt the same interest explains the attention being paid to such plays as *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus and Cressida*—

plays which are now being explored for their moral significances. Guy Boas thus relates the latter drama, in *'Troilus and Cressida' and the Time Scheme* (*New English Review*, Nov.), to *Arms and the Man* and *The Silver Tassie*, while V. C. Clinton-Baddeley calls it *Shakespeare's Bitter War Play* (*Radio Times*, 22 Nov.). These are 'popular' essays: weightier are several studies of *Measure for Measure*. In *'Measure for Measure' and Christian Doctrine of Atonement* (*P.M.L.A.* Dec.) Roy W. Battenhouse finds Shakespeare writing a parable in which a lord of men disguises himself, becomes one of the common run of humanity and reveals himself in a second coming: even the Duke's wooing of Isabella is here construed as part of a divine romance. For Battenhouse Angelo is the Adversary, a fallen Angel: for W. M. T. Dodds, writing on *The Character of Angelo in 'Measure for Measure'* (*M.L.R.*, July), he assumes less symbolic proportions. Dodds sees him as an uncompleted tragic figure, a man of high ideals who to his horror discovers in himself unsuspected depths. Edith Sitwell also discusses this drama in *A Note on 'Measure for Measure'* (*Nineteenth Century*, Sept.). Its theme, she thinks, is God's justice and man: Angelo once more is considered as of tragic proportions, Isabella seen as a hypocrite. 'Even in the midst of the filth, the miasma arisen from the hidden dirt of humanity—in this play where only the man condemned has an innocent heart'—Shakespeare 'judges not as the judge judges, but as the sun falling round a helpless thing'.

No doubt the range of these diverse studies is wide, yet there seems to be justification for viewing in them a groping towards a larger appreciation of Shakespeare's works and, in particular, towards an interpretation in terms of modern life.

Along with these, of course, should be taken another group of essays which, while not specifically concerned with such issues as dominate in those already mentioned, seek to analyse and interpret either single plays or groups of plays. Thus John Palmer turns, in what is unhappily the last work we shall receive from his pen,[5] to examine certain characters in Shakespearian comedy—Berowne, Touchstone, Shylock, Bottom and the Beatrice-Benedick pair. Throughout, his analysis is based on an awareness of Shakespeare's supreme irony and on a recognition that the frontiers of tragedy

[5] *Comic Characters of Shakespeare*. Macmillan. pp. xv + 135. 8*s*. 6*d*.

and comedy in these plays are very close. 'Shakespeare's refusal', he says,

> to draw any clear distinction between a comic character, at whom a wholly reasonable person may laugh, and a tragic character, with whom a normally sensitive person must feel in sympathy, was not the deliberate decision of an artist consciously pursuing a method, but the natural expression of his imaginative reaction to human nature.

The spirit of satire is far off from the scenes in which these characters appear and each gives to his particular play its peculiar tone: *Love's Labour's Lost*, because of Berowne, is utterly unlike such a comedy as *Les précieuses ridicules*; to burlesque Bottom is to miss the significance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*; and a failure to see Touchstone as indeed the touchstone for *As You Like It* means an ignoring of Shakespeare's essential comic purpose. This is a stimulating book, even although it manifestly lacks the final revision that might have been given to it by its author had he lived to see it through the press.

The attention given to Berowne by Palmer finds praise from an anonymous writer on *Berowne as Shakespeare* (*T.L.S.*, 16 Nov.), who suggests that in *Love's Labour's Lost* more of Shakespeare's conception of comedy may be found than in the later plays. David L. Stevenson attempts to analyse part of this conception as it is exemplified particularly in that comedy as well as in *As You Like It* and *Much Ado*.[6] The bantering spirit in which romantic ideals of love and courtship are treated here is seen as reflecting an aspect of humanistic thought, leading to 'a general revaluation of existence'. After surveying various influences, notably the spirit of Ovid, amorous controversy in medieval literature, Chaucer's treatment of love and romance attitudes towards courtly devotion, Stevenson seeks to demonstrate that Shakespeare comes as culminating figure in a Renaissance search for a solution to the inevitable conflicts resulting from the intrusion of these influences in a new world. It is in this search that Lyly plays so important a part, and on Lyly Shakespeare founds his early comic style. From the first experiments Stevenson essays to trace Shakespeare's developing concepts until they become confused and bitter in

[6] *The Love-Game Comedy*, by David Lloyd Stevenson. New York: Columbia U.P. pp. xii+259. $3.25.

*Troilus and Cressida.* John W. Draper presents another portrait of a comic character in *Falstaff: A Fool and a Jester* (*M.L.Q.*, Dec.).

Besides Palmer another, and a still greater, critic leaves us lamenting his death. Harley Granville-Barker was a man who came as near as any to giving this age a balanced modern idea of Shakespeare's value, and his loss is indeed a blow to critical scholarship. The present study of *Othello*[7] is, alas, almost the last of his brilliant prefaces. Obviously considering *Othello* a less satisfactory tragedy than any of its three great companions, Granville-Barker views it as a drama dominated by the falling of a noble and able man through the machinations of a stupid charlatan, and this concept he expounds with his customary lucidity and verve. Not least valuable in this volume, however, are two sections not concerned with character evaluation—one which presents what must be the finest contribution ever made to Shakespeare's treatment of time, and another in which the critic discusses the peculiar speech-rhythms of Othello and Iago.

An approach towards the interpretation of Iago fundamentally similar to Granville-Barker's is made by John R. Moore.[8] Utilizing his experiences with army students at Shrivenham, Moore pictures this character as an inferior, dishonest man of the kind to be found in any regiment, so poor in his soldiering and so crassly ignorant that none can think him capable of active or dangerous knavery. In *An Othello All Too Modern* (*E.L.H.*, March) E. E. Stoll animadverts on an article published by Leo Kirschbaum in 1944; in this essay Stoll attacks the 'new critics' and defends Othello's essential nobility. In a further essay, *Mainly Controversy* (*P.Q.*, Oct.) the same writer, dealing specifically with an article by W. W. Lawrence, restates his attitude towards 'psychology' in works of dramatic art. An interesting example of the kind of handbook provided for Soviet producers of Shakespeare appears in a volume devoted to *Othello*, containing a literal translation and commentary by M. M. Morozov, a critical 'analysis' of the tragedy by the same author, a translation of Cinthio's tale by I. V. Semenov and

[7] *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, by Harley Granville-Barker. Fourth Series: *Othello*. Sidgwick and Jackson. pp. x+225. 15*s*.

[8] *The Character of Iago*, in *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild* (see p. 108).

an account of various productions from the time of Kean to the present day.

On *The Theory of 'Hamlet'* James Feibleman writes in the *Journal of the History of Ideas* (April). This interesting paper calls for a philosophically 'realistic' explanation of the hero—a man who 'understands the nature of the two ontological orders' but who is constantly driven to impulsive action. Another stimulating essay on Hamlet's character appears in L. C. Knights's *Explorations* (see above, p. 119): here Hamlet is seen as an objective study of the author himself. Erland Lindbach treats this character as a study in the rather heavily overworked Oedipus complex in *Hamlet i psykoanalytisk belysning* (*Studier Tillägnade Anton Blanck*, 29 Dec.) and carries the psycho-analytic criticism a stage further still by finding *Hamlet* coloured by Shakespeare's own personal Oedipus complex occasioned by his father's death in 1601. J. M. Nosworthy writes on *The Structural Experiment in 'Hamlet'* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.). Interestingly he treats the players episodes as a polite rejoinder by Shakespeare to attacks made on the Globe company, but at the same time holds that the advice to the players is ironically directed at that company itself—a kind of paternal admonition. The original *Hamlet*, he believes, had the play-within-the-play at the end, performed by the King and his court: a relic of this is the presentation of Lucianus (intended for performance by Hamlet) as nephew of the King. In *Hamlet and Fortinbras* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) William W. Lawrence examines the background of the drama. The judicial combat referred to between the kings of Norway and Denmark would, he thinks, have seemed to Elizabethans something vital and nor merely a piece of story-book procedure. Young Fortinbras, in Lawrence's view, was introduced to the stage version by Kyd, but the exact political canvas was left with indeterminate outlines lest it take attention away from the main story. So far as Hamlet's delay is concerned he thinks the causes are complex, shifting from act to act.

G. S. Griffiths argues (*Essays and Studies*, Vol. xxxi) that *Antony and Cleopatra* is not to be interpreted in the Bradleyan manner but rather as a kind of 'orgiastic dance'.

Problems relating to Shakespearian tragedy fill the pages of the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, Vols. 80–1, which resumes publication this

year under the editorship of Max Deutschbein. Paul Meissner writes on *Gestaltung und Deutung des Tragischen bei Shakespeare*, and Max Deutschbein, besides contributing an interesting essay on *Shakespeares Hamlet und Montaigne*, contributes a detailed analysis of *Der Hamletmonolog 'To be or not to be'*—a valuable study of the dramatist's thought processes. In a separate pamphlet published by the Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, the same author presents an acute examination of *Die kosmischen Mächte bei Shakespeare*.

In a well-conceived essay, *A Technique of Motivation in 'Romeo and Juliet'* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), H. E. Cain stresses the importance of a dominant lyric theme in the play—the 'simple figment that Death is rival to the lovers of Juliet'. In the same journal (Oct.) E. J. West examines *The Use of Contrast in 'The Merchant of Venice'*, expressing the belief that the strong dramatic quality of the play depends on a series of balanced episodes introduced into the action. Shakespeare's frequent utilization of *The Plot Device of False Report* is surveyed by John C. McCloskey (Oct.). Gustav Fredén in *The Tide of Verona* (*Studier Tillägnade Anton Blanck* 29 Dec.) discusses the dramatist's methods in comedy by examining the first Launce scene in *The Two Gentlemen*: the atmosphere is, he notes, that of the London docks and its infusion into the air of Verona he relates to a similar dramatic device familiar in the mystery plays. V. Frederic Koenig's *A New Perspective on the Wager Cycle* (*Mod. Phil.*, Nov.) is concerned with the variants of the folk tale used in *Cymbeline*.

During 1946 two new volumes have been added to the New Cambridge Shakespeare, the two parts of *Henry IV*.[9] Already, of course, Dover Wilson had presented some of his views regarding the history of the text in an article contributed to *The Library* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 97), while in *The Fortunes of Falstaff* (see *Y.W.*, xxiv, 101) he had given his ideas concerning the action and meaning of these two plays—which he insists were conceived as one and must be appreciated as a unity: 'everything leads up to the inevitable finale, as inevitable and as much foreseen by the audience from

[9] *Henry IV, Part I.* pp. xlvii+210; *Henry IV, Part II.* pp. viii+231, ed. by John Dover Wilson. C.U.P. 8*s.* 6*d.* each.

the beginning as the death of the hero in a tragedy'. Men in Elizabeth's time, Dover Wilson stresses, knew

> that the only security for England against internal strife and the "envy of less happier lands" was a Prince who, with divine right on his side, that is, with a clear title to the throne and the sceptre firmly in his grasp, could be the leader of a unity and harmonious common weal, in which noble, merchant, yeoman, and peasant worked together for the good of the whole. Such a Prince was Queen Elizabeth; such is Shakespeare's Harry Monmouth.

It is in this spirit that Shakespeare conceived his double drama.

Sixteen plays edited by the late George L. Kittredge have been re-issued with a preface by Arthur C. Sprague: they are collected here for the first time in a single volume.[10] The introductions are pithy and well designed to give a student-reader the facts he needs as preface to the play, and the notes are excellent. What is inevitably missing is the all-essential fire of Kittredge's personality.

Among diverse textual studies issued during the year several call for greater or less attention. Janet Spens, writing on *The Prince in the Tavern* (*T.L.S.*, 24 Aug.), takes issue with Dover Wilson regarding his interpretation of certain lines in *1 Henry IV*, II, iv and incidentally criticizes him for some of his interpolated stage-directions. A still more vigorous attack on the same lines is made by Richard Flatter in *Modern Stage-Directions in Shakespeare* (*S.A.B.*, July): 'when I read Shakespeare', he remarks, 'I do not wish to be interrupted; nor does he. Majesties should be listened to in silence.' In '*With Sir John in it*' (*M.L.R.*, July) J. H. Walter discusses the epilogue to *2 Henry IV* and argues that originally *Henry V* contained some Falstaff scenes, that representations were made by Oldcastle's descendants and that this character was omitted in the Folio version, his adventures being given to Pistol and the gaps being made good by the invention of Fluellen and Gower.

*The Cancel in the Quarto of '2 Henry IV'* (*Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild;* see above, p. 108) is examined by James G. McManaway. He deduces from the evidence available that the extra scene found in some copies of the quarto was added after,

[10] *Sixteen Plays of Shakespeare*, ed. by George Lyman Kittredge. Boston: Ginn and Co. pp. x+1,541.

but only shortly after, the whole edition was printed. He hazards the suggestion that Shakespeare himself may have raised objections when he found that an entire episode had been cut. It may here be noted that for this problem Dover Wilson's suggestion is that the scene appeared on a leaf of Shakespeare's manuscript which by chance had been omitted when the text was sent to be licensed. R. U. Altick, in '*Conveyers*' and '*Fortune's Buckets*' *in* '*Richard II*' (*M.L.N.*, March), tries, perhaps rather forcedly, to give a new interpretation to Richard's lines toward the close of the play.

The finding of a new set of 1619 quartos has been heralded by a descriptive booklet[11] published by Messrs. Hodgson, the auctioneers (see also below, p. 263).

The *T.L.S.* has acted as host to a group of lively controversialists in a debate about *Twelfth Night's* '*The Youngest Wren*'. Raymond Chapman (15 June) defends Theobald's reading of 'the youngest wren of nine' by reference to a similar use of 'of nine' by John Heywood: M. R. Ruhl (29 June) supports this by alluding to Spenser's 'mournefulst Muse of nyne' and C. Gwyn follows suit by drawing attention to proverbial phrases in which 'nine' appears. In the same play R. F. Rattray argues, not very convincingly, for '*Aguecake*' (*T.L.S.*, 5 Oct.) in place of 'Aguecheek'. Another little flurry concerns '*Doll Tearsheet*': following a reference in a leading article, *The True Prince* (24 Aug.), Roberta F. Brinkley draws attention to Coleridge's emendation of Tearsheet as Tearstreet (21 Sept.). This is further discussed by Audrey Jennings (5 Oct.) and A. de Quincey (12 Oct.). Still a further, but less fruitful, debate, mainly on 'the anvil of my sword' in *Coriolanus* IV, v, 115, appears in earlier numbers of *T.L.S.* (2 and 23 Feb., 9 and 16 March).

In *An Explanation of the Brook-Broome Question in Shakespeare's* '*Merry Wives*' (*P.Q.*, July) David M. White argues that Shakespeare changed the name of Brook (at II, i, 93 and elsewhere) to Broome when revising the play for a court performance

[11] *The Remarkable Story of the Shakespearian Quartos of* 1619. *Being a Brief Record of the Unveiling of a Puzzle in Shakespearian Bibliography and an Account of the Unlooked-for Discovery of a* '*Set*' *of the Quartos of* 1619. Hodgson and Co. 1*s*.

of November 1604, because he wished to avoid any topical allusions to, or even the suggestion of partisanship with, Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham, one of the leading figures in the 'Main Plot'. Edmund H. Fellowes, in *'It was a lover and his lass': Some Fresh Points of Criticism* (*M.L.R.*, April), shows that the MS. copy of the song now preserved in the National Library of Scotland is based on Morley's text and interprets the Folio's 'both in a time' as meaning 'in unison'. Percy Simpson disposes of a *Supposed Crux in 'The Tempest'* (*R.E.S.*, July) by showing that Ferdinand's 'Most busie lest, when I do it' has 'lest' for 'least' and an 'emphasising' comma. Thomas P. Harrison, Jr., in *Flower Lore in Spenser and Shakespeare: Two Notes* (*M.L.Q.*, June), refers to Henry Lyte's *Newe Herball* (1578) for the purpose of showing that 'Love-in-idleness' (*M.N.D.*, II, i, 166) may mean a rose. In *The Beast-eating Clown, 'The Two Noble Kinsmen'*, III, v, 131 (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) Helge Kökeritz explains 'beast' as 'beest' from O.E. *beost*, meaning inferior milk. *Edmund's Nativity in 'King Lear'* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.) is elucidated by Johnstone Parr.

S. A. Small discusses *The 'King Lear Quarto'* (*S.A.B*, Oct.) in an article that is mainly a review of Kirschbaum's study (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 93): in *The Staging of 'King Lear'* (*R.E.S.*, July) W. W. Greg presents a modification of his earlier belief that the Folio's act and scene divisions of this play were Shakespeare's own. Salvador de Madariaga, discussing *A Passage in 'Hamlet'* (*T.L.S.*, 31 Aug.), proposes several rather far-reaching emendations in IV, iv, 23–30. In *Shakespeare's Hypothetical Marginal Additions* (*M.L.N.*, Jan.) Leo Kirschbaum takes issue with Dover Wilson's arguments concerning lines supposed to have been written in the margin of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and other plays.

Rossiter's edition of *Woodstock* is dealt with in another section of the *Y.W.* (see below, p. 145–6, but its Shakespearian interest deserves at least mention here, as does that of Henry R. Hoppe's *'John of Bordeaux': A Bad Quarto that Never Reached Print* (*Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*). The latter shows that the text of this play is the result of an effort on the part of a company to construct a prompt copy by a kind of joint dictation (from memory of the lines) to a scribe. The handing down of the ownership of the dramas is interestingly surveyed by G. E. Dawson in *The Copyright of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works* (*Studies in*

*Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*): this covers the period from 1623 to 1774.

Source studies are represented by several articles. Roland M. Smith examines '*King Lear*' *and the Merlin Tradition* (*M.L.Q.*, June); particular attention is here given to the 'Wild Man of the Woods' myth exemplified in *Tom a Lincolne*, the *Vita Merlini* and *Buile Suibhne*. *Henry IV, Parts I and II, and Speght's First Edition of Geffrey Chaucer* (*S.A.B.*, April) occupies the pen of Thomas H. McNeal; he endeavours to prove that Shakespeare read Speght's 'life' just before writing the second part of *Henry IV* and that to this we owe the inclusion therein of Gower and Skogan. Dorothy A. Evans, in *Some Notes on Shakespeare and* '*The Mirror of Knighthood*' (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), concerns herself mainly with *Much Ado*.

Besides Granville-Barker's comments on speech forms in *Othello* (see above, p. 125), this new field of investigation gains two contributions from John W. Draper. Writing on *Changes in the Tempo of Desdemona's Speech* (*Anglica*, Aug.), he endeavours to prove that there is a marked diminuition of speed in the heroine's lines as the play advances. The dangers inherent in this method of study are shown by two contradictory sentences on a couple of pages (pp. 149 and 150): we are first told that 'in the early part of the play Desdemona's speech is somewhat slower than the Elizabethan theatrical norm', while later 'in the first two acts, Desdemona speaks with a normal tripping speed'. Not both can be true, if either! In *The Tempo of Shakespeare's Speech* (*English Studies*, Aug.) Draper examines those parts assigned by legend to the dramatist himself and finds them all to be marked by slow dignified utterance. This, he suggests (on rather doubtful foundation), might be used to assess whether Shakespeare did or did not take a particular part conjecturally assigned to him. Here may also be noted three associated articles in the 1945 volume of the *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*—Draper's *Signior Brabantio's Humor* (Dec.) and *Speech-Tempo and Humor in Shakespeare's Anatomy* (Oct.), and Angelina Guido's *The Humor of Juliet's Nurse* (March). These humours are identified, respectively, as the choloric, the phlegmatic and the mercurial.

A valuable survey of the evidence relating to the dedication of

the Sonnets has been prepared by Paul V. Rubow (*Shakespeare's Sonnets, Orbis Litterarum*, IV, 1–2). After examining diverse practices in Elizabethan dedications and discussing Thorpe's shady career, he decides that W. H. was in all probability merely the person who procured the copy for the printer; another of the books issued by Thorpe had been dedicated, Rubow notes, to a fellow-publisher. Suggestions for emendation are presented by Denys Bray in *Difficult Passages in the Sonnets Re-examined* (*N. & Q.*, 18 May and 7 Sept.). Barbara A. MacKenzie rather sentimentally relates the poems to the (supposed) facts of Shakespeare's life and proposes a rearrangement of their order.[12] The biographical element in the Sonnets, L. C. Knights insists (*Explorations*, see above, p. 119), is their least important feature. Ranjee G. Shahani stresses his belief that *The Phoenix and the Turtle* (*N. & Q.*, 7 and 21 Sept.) is a poem worthy of greater attention and treats it as a threnody 'offering divine honours to the mutual loyalty of married souls'.

In the biographical sphere, several studies have appeared during the course of the year. Sir E. K. Chambers' lectures on the materials available for students of sixteenth and seventeenth-century authors are much to be welcomed.[13] His summary of the various sources of documentary information is precisely what young researchers need, and his remarks on the nature of evidence are, as one might expect, both cogent and wise. After examining the types of records (tenurial, ecclesistical, municipal, occupational, court, national, administrative, legal and personal) he discusses, interestingly, the attitude the biographical researcher may be expected to take towards floating legend and such evidence as may be inferred from the works themselves

The religious background of the Shakespeare family is surveyed afresh by John Henry de Groot.[14] Cautiously he sets out to prove nothing about the dramatist's own personal beliefs, but he does attempt to demonstrate that the young Shakespeare must have

[12] *Shakespeare's Sonnets: Their Relation to His Life.* Cape Town: Maskew Miller. pp. x+82. 7*s.* 6*d.*

[13] *Sources for a Biography of Shakespeare*, by E. K. Chambers. O.U.P. pp. 80. 6*s.*

[14] *The Shakespeares and 'The Old Faith'*, by John de Groot. New York: King's Crown Press. pp. ix+258. $3.00.

been exposed to strong Catholic influence and that he shows a sympathy towards that faith in many parts of his literary work. Accepting the spiritual testament of John Shakespeare as genuine and tracing relics of the old creed at the Grammar School and elsewhere, de Groot concludes that, while the available evidence cannot be used to prove that Shakespeare was a practising Catholic, it does supply grounds for the opinion that the poet absorbed more of Catholicism in the course of his development than is generally believed and that throughout his mature years he retained a genuine esteem for certain aspects of the Old Faith.

In his new Life of Shakespeare,[15] Fernand Baldensperger starts, as any true biographer should do, with 'Le Warwickshire, "coeur de l'Angleterre" '. Baldensperger's study seeks to trace the poet's spiritual development, from the early experiments, through 'les incertitudes du pouvoir et de l'amour', to 'les tragédies de la conscience et de la cité divisées' and 'les messages suprêmes'. This is a stimulating book.

For Abel Lefranc,[16] of course, Shakespeare is not Shakespeare at all: and this latest volume is written in an endeavour, by the presentation of evidence, old and new, to press the argument for Derby's authorship of the plays. No one can deny that Lefranc is learned in Elizabethan literature; and at the same time no objectively minded scholar can fail to regret that so much learning and so much ingenuity have been expended on a theme so fruitless as this. From the common run of Baconians and others Lefranc stands apart and unquestionably he has succeeded in bringing forward a number of (at first sight) peculiar parallels; but these parallels of his are always susceptible of interpretations different from those he gives to them and might be set alongside scores of others, based on plays wholly outside the Shakespeare canon, which, if brought into the picture, would either completely alter the composition of his picture or reduce it to chaos.

In association with Lefranc's work may be taken two essays, by

[15] *La vie et l'oeuvre de William Shakespeare*, par Fernand Baldensperger. Montréal: Les éditions de l'arbre. pp. 255.

[16] *A la découverte de Shakespeare*, par Abel Lefranc. Paris: Editions Albin Michel. pp. 598.

R. C. Churchill and Alfred Westfall respectively, designed to explode the Baconian myth. In *The Baconian Heresy: A Post-mortem* (*Nineteenth Century*, Nov.) Churchill engagingly traces the development of Baconianism and concludes by demonstrating that hardly any two writers are more opposed to one another, in spirit and in style, than this pair of authors. Westfall's article, *It Started with a Bullfight* (*Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*), similarly surveys the surrealistic ground traversed by the Baconians and ends amusingly by discussing the 'unexpected attack in their rear' delivered by devotees of other candidates for Shakespeare's chair.

In *N. & Q.* (26 Jan.) D.O. draws attention to the mis-statements concerning *O.E.D.* references in Melsome's *Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy*; further notes by the same writer, and to the same purpose, appear in later issues of the same journal (9 and 23 Feb., 6 April, 15 June) and to these should be added another communication in the issue of 9 March.

In *Links with Shakespeare* (*N.&Q.*, 21 Sept.) H. A. Shield provides some notes on Daniel Nicholas, one of the witnesses in the Mountjoy case, showing that his family in 1619 became related by marriage with that of the Lucys of Charlecot.

In *Moonlight at the Globe*,[17] Ronald Watkins stresses the importance of presenting Shakespeare under theatrical conditions akin to those for which he originally wrote his plays. Sir Barry Jackson makes a plea for more amateur performances of plays by Shakespeare and other Elizabethan dramatists in *Fifty Years of Stratford-on-Avon* (*Drama*, Summer), and in *The Apparel Oft Proclaims . . .* (*Theatre Arts*, Dec.) presents a reasoned defence of 'Shakespeare in modern dress'. Harcourt Williams discusses the value of a copy of *Romeo and Juliet* in which an admirer had noted details of *Harry Irving as Romeo* (*Theatre To-day*, Winter). Julius Brestl's *The Sun's Bright Child*[18] is a fictional survey of Edmund Kean's career. G. B. Shaw's revision of *Cymbeline* is now pub-

[17] *Moonlight at the Globe:* an essay in Shakespeare production based on a performance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* at Harrow School, by Ronald Watkins, Foreword by R. W. Moore. Michael Joseph. pp. 136. 9*s*. 6*d*.

[18] *The Sun's Bright Child: The Imaginary Memoirs of Edmund Kean*, by Julius Brestl. Hammond, Hammond. pp. 192. 15*s*.

lished,[19] and Emlyn Williams brings the dramatist on the boards as at least a walk-on character in *Spring 1600*.[20] Of interest in this connexion is Herman Closson's *Shakespeare*:[21] this gives Shakespeare a key part—indeed the play starts with a scene in which he is rehearsing George and Ann (the latter designing to startle London's playgoers by substituting for a boy-actor) in the balcony scene of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Incidentally, Shakespeare's plays enter into a valuable account prepared by Gösta M. Bergman of production method at Stockholm's Royal Theatre in the nineteenth century.[22] *Shakespeare on the Ante-Bellum Charleston Stage* (*S.A.B.*, Jan.) is the theme of W. Stanley Hoole. In making reference to M. Rulikowski's *Shakespeare na scenach polskich* attention may be drawn to the number of Shakespearian items contributed to the newly established Polish theatre journal, *Teatr miesocęznik*, wherein this article appears. Rulikowski thus surveys Shakespeare's fortunes on the Polish stage (No. 5), Wiktor Hahn writes on his influence on Polish drama (Nos. 1–2), J. Iwaszkewicz gives a new translation of a scene in *Hamlet*, Józef Maśliński discusses Gordon Craig's ideas of Shakespearian production, Hahn deals with the earliest presentation of *Hamlet* at Lwow in 1797, and L. H. Morstin discusses *Timon* (all in No. 4–5). In *Shakespeare in Russia* (*Soviet Literature*, April–May) Alexander Anikst surveys the fortunes of the plays from A. Sumarokov's *Hamlet* of 1750 down to the latest translations of Pasternak and his companions. In *Voks Bulletin* (No 5–6, Moscow) V. Kemenov discusses *Shakespeare on the occasion of the 330th Anniversary of his Death*. The impression made by the Old Vic's *Richard III* on occupation troops in Germany is chronicled by Commander J. Bennett Nolan in *Shakespeare Crosses the Rhine* (*S.A.B.*, April).

New early allusions to Shakespeare, certain or probable, continue to be reported. G. P. V. Akrigg, in *Middleton: An Allusion to*

[19] *Geneva, Cymbeline Refiinished & Good King Charles*, by Bernard Shaw. Constable. pp. 234. 7*s*.6*d*.

[20] *Spring* 1600, *A Comedy in Three Acts*, by Emlyn Williams. Heinemann. pp. 99. 6*s*.

[21] *Shakespeare, ou La Comédie de l'Aventure*, par Herman Closson. Bruxelles: Editions Universitaires. pp. 126.

[22] Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt. pp. 420.

*the Shakespere First Folio* (*S.A.B.*, Jan.) thinks there is a reference to the 1623 volume in the commendatory verses prefixed to *The Duchess of Malfi*. A 1689 '*Black as the Moor of Venice*' has been noted by Robert A. Aubin (*T.L.S.*, 13 July). Homer Nearing, Jr., presents several possible allusions (occurring in a manuscript poem by George Daniel) in '*Yorke in Choller*' *and Other Unrecorded Allusions to* '*Richard II*' (*N.&.Q.*, 8 Aug.). Paul S. Dunkin notes a variant issue of Lee's *Caesar Borgia* (*N.&.Q.*, 12 Jan.) which adds to an already recorded allusion to Shakespeare the lines placed on his tomb at Stratford.

The influence of Shakespeare on later authors both at home and abroad has attracted some attention during the year, especially in the pages of *S.A.B.* Walter Wadepuhl surveys the theme of *Heine and Shakspere* (April), Robert J. Kane discusses *Tolstoy, Goethe, and* '*King Lear*' (Oct.), Irving Ribner examines *Dryden's Shaksperian Criticism and the Neo-classical Paradox* (Oct.), *Dickens' Knowledge of Shakspere* is probed by Edward V. Vandiver, Jr. (July), while Robert H. Wilson discusses *Brave New World as Shakspere Criticism* (July). To *R.E.S.* (July) Robert B. Heilman contributes an essay on *Falstaff and Smollett's Micklewhimmen*, and C. B. Young draws attention to verbal parallels in '*St. Agnes Eve*' *and* '*Cymbeline*' (*T.L.S.*, 6 April). The 'enthusiasm' that led to the Mary Cowden Clark concordance is reflected in Claire McGlinchee's *Romance in a Reference Book* (*S.A.B.*, April).

Among the new volumes of translations which have been received, pride of place goes to Mario Praz's edition of the whole works, the second and third volumes of which have now appeared.[23] This collection includes a number of new versions as well as several formerly published texts now carefully revised. Each play is introduced by a short factual note by the editor. Well printed and attractive in format, these books will assuredly be welcomed by Italian readers. A still more attractive format–with the use of a quality of paper which only a few European countries can now enjoy—appears in Allan Bergstrand's translation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.[24]

[23] *William Shakespeare: Teatro*. Firenze: Sansoni. Vol. ii, pp. 1,294; Vol. iii, pp. 1,167.

[24] *En midsommarnatts dröm* . . . ny svensk oversattning av Allan Bergstrand. Stockholm: Bröderne Lagerströms Forlag. pp. 145.

# VIII

# ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

By FREDERICK S. BOAS

THIS chapter begins by noticing three publications of a general character dealing with various aspects of dramatic history from the later years of Elizabeth to the Restoration. Then follow notices of books or articles on individual dramatists or plays.

A chapter on plays in *A Christ Church Miscellany* by W. G. Hiscock[ covers generally, as quotations and notes fully show, part of the ground surveyed by the present writer in his contributions to the history of University Drama. But Hiscock, who is assistant-librarian at Christ Church, has supplied additional interesting items and corrections of a few details. It is surprising to find, from an entry in January 1579–80 of a payment of ten shillings 'to the Countesse of Essex men for paines taken in the quire the last holie daies', that during the absence of the choir in plague time at Wallingford, their place was taken by a touring company for the Christmastide celebrations.

In connexion with the performance of plays by William Gager during the visit of Alasco, the Prince Palatine, in June 1583, Hiscock gives some new information. According to the Vice-Chancellor's Accounts, George Peele, as producer, was paid xviii$^{li.}$ (misprinted in *University Drama in the Tudor Age*, p. 180, as xviii$^{d}$). But in the Ch. Ch. disbursement book there is a receipt by him (facsimiled by Hiscock) for xx$^{li}$, dated 26 May 1583. For the 'high-place', from which Mercury descends in *Dido*, Act III, there is a payment of 6*s.* 8*d.* 'for the felling of 4 timber trees . . . for the heaven & oth$^{r}$ new buildings on the stage', etc. When Gager's *Meleager* was revived when the Earl of Leicester, as Chancellor, visited Christ Church in January 1584–5 a payment of £1 to the Earl of Oxford's musicians for their pains 'at y$^{e}$ tragedie' *inter alia* is a hitherto overlooked reference in the accounts to the revival. Towards the costs of three plays by Gager, including *Ulysses Redux* at Shrovetide, 1591–2, Hiscock quotes two entries

[1] Printed for the Author at O.U.P. pp. xx+260.

showing that the college contributed part, while the remainder was shared by several graduates.

An entry of a different kind in 1595 is of five shillings added by the College to a collection made among the undergraduates 'for Stratforde upon Avon', where a number of houses had been burnt. It would be pleasant to be able to support Hiscock's conjecture that the Christ Church acting circle paid homage to Shakespeare with their relief for the town of his birth, but this is contrary to the consistent attitude of the academic authorities towards the professional companies. And similarly doubtful is another conjecture that the mention of a loan of '3 Satyrs Sutes with 3 hornes' may relate to a performance of Jonson's masque, *Oberon*, at Christ Church before or during 1613.

Hiscock's entertaining survey continues till the production of Ibsen's *The Wild Duck* in 1945. An editor of Kyd may note with gratification the reprint of the programme of the performance of *The Spanish Tragedy* in the Ch. Ch. Upper Library on 4 and 5 March 1932.

F. S. Boas has now supplemented his *Introduction to Tudor Drama* and *Introduction to the Reading of Shakespeare* a third volume[2] concerned with the dramatists 'whose work falls mainly or entirely between the accession of James and the Restoration'. The new volume of this notable trilogy has for one of its advantages that it avoids injurious comparisons and suggestions of 'decline from the Tudor apex', asserting the right of each Stuart playwright to be considered on his own merits. The result, in each instance, is the sort of balanced and positive appreciation which was to be desired. Besides taking into account the latest biographical studies and critical estimates Boas has brought his own wide experience and dramatic perception to bear upon his material, and there is much profit to be had from his analyses of plots or characters and from his connoisseurship in matters of dramatic technique and style.

He gives a preliminary sketch of elements in the social and intellectual conditions of the time by which the Stuart dramatists were affected, and a helpful account of the dramatic companies. Thereafter the individual contributions are surveyed, from Chap-

[2] *An Introduction to Stuart Drama*, by Frederick S. Boas. O.U.P. pp. viii+443. 15*s*. This notice has been supplied by Professor L. C. Martin.

man and Jonson to Ford, Shirley, and Brome; and there are final chapters on Masques and University Plays, Drolls and Operas. The treatment is business-like but never perfunctory, and, in fact, nothing is more salient than the ardour which has sustained the writer in his exacting task and which makes his book not merely a source of knowledge but a stimulus to fresh or renewed enjoyment.

In a paper on *Charles Lamb and the Elizabethan Dramatists* (see *Y.W.*, xxv, 96) the present writer concluded that Lamb understood those of the Stuart age better than those of the Tudor. R. C. Bald in *Charles Lamb and the Elizabethans* (in *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*) draws no such distinction but considers that Lamb's attitude towards Elizabethan playwrights was influenced by the defects of the later eighteenth-century plays. 'They represent the penultimate stage in the decline of a tradition which had come down to Lamb unbroken from the seventeenth century.... In some respects Lamb's contemporaries were still trying to do the same things as the Elizabethans had done, and he went to them to find done well what his contemporaries were doing badly.' It is well to be reminded of this even if one takes with some reservation Bald's conclusion that 'in some of the notes to the *Specimens* Lamb is for us a better critic of the drama of his own age than of the dramatists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries'.

Turning to individual dramatists we have to mention first a correction by Don Cameron Allen (*M.L.N.*, Nov.) of his previous *Note on Lyly's 'Midas'* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 104). He there attributed the notion of the earth as an egg to Rabbi Saadia ben Gaon. He now has found that it is of classical origin, occurring in Aratus, Eusebius, Macrobius and others.

Paul H. Kocher's contributions in periodicals to Marlovian research have been noticed in recent volumes of *Y.W.* He has embodied his main conclusions together with a novel and challenging interpretation of the dramatist's outlook in a study in book form of *Christopher Marlowe*.[3] The fundamental thesis of

[3] *Christopher Marlowe: A Study of his Thought, Learning, and Character*, by Paul H. Kocher. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press and O.U.P. pp. x+344. 20*s*.

this work is that Marlowe was a highly subjective writer, that 'his plays are projections of some of his particular ideas and passions', of which religion, and not drama, in Kocher's view, was the chief concern.

In this first section of his book Kocher seeks to find support for his argument in the statements of Kyd, Chomley and Aldrich; in the Baines Note; and in the plays, including Marlowe's treatment of 'witchcraft' in *Doctor Faustus*. It is above all in the Baines Note that Kocher finds 'the master-key to the mind of Marlowe', showing that 'his utterances represent a carefully designed attack on Christian dogma'. Whatever Marlowe's 'atheism' may have signified, Kocher here gives exaggerated value to the evidence of an informer of whom what seems to be known is little to his credit. And in the light of some of the finest passages in *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus* Kocher has the candour to admit that 'however bitterly Marlowe may have hated Christian dogma, there were some elements in it, notably its teachings about God, which could enlist the highest fervour of his imagination'.

In the chapter on 'politics and ethics' Kocher shows good reason for discounting the influence of Machiavelli on Marlowe. On the dramatist's astronomical knowledge, which does not include the Copernican theory, light is thrown from contemporary scientific text books. Similar light is brought to bear upon his allusions to the art of war from treatises of the period. But Kocher again turns to exaggeration when in the chapter on Marlowe's humour he asserts that his laughter came from the worst side of his nature. The work as a whole is one in which genuine scholarship and lucidity of style are given a perverted bias.

In *Marlowe's 'Astronomy and Skepticism'* (*E.L.H.*, Dec.) Francis R. Johnson develops further a theme discussed by him in *Marlowe's 'Imperiall Heaven'* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 106–7). He urges that any interpretation of the astronomical system expounded by Mephistophilis in *Doctor Faustus*, Act II, ii, must not start from the simple formula Copernicus *versus* Ptolemy. 'Marlowe is not reverting to the Aristotelian cosmology but is presenting an unorthodox sixteen-century modification of the current Ptolemiac astronomy.' In its conventional form, as set forth in many of the text books, this included ten moving spheres plus the motionless empyreal heaven. Two of the ten, the crystalline and the *coelum igneum* had

been introduced to account for the procession of the equinoxes and the supposed 'trepidation'. Mephistophilis dismisses these as 'fables'. As Johnson states, 'Marlowe's position is that of the skeptical, empirical school among Renaissance astronomical writers, who refused to accept a system containing any sphere void of visible bodies whereby man could directly observe its motions'.

Marlowe's view is derived, directly or indirectly, from the *De motu octavae sphaerae* of Augustinus Ricius, published in 1513 at Trino in Monferrato. He rejected the ninth and tenth spheres and postulated that the assemblage of eight spheres is turned about as a unit once every twenty-four hours, receiving its motion from a supreme 'intelligence'. It will be seen how closely Mephistophilis's answers to Faustus accord with this.

As Johnson points out, even if Ricius's treatise was not available to Marlowe, the views in it had been popularized by the Frenchman Finé in his *De Mundi sphaera*, first printed in 1542 and widely circulated for fifty years. Other sources may have been works by Giuntini, Clavius and Agrippa, of which Johnson gives particulars in his valuable article.

Leo Kirschbaum contributes an important article on *The Good and Bad Quartos of 'Doctor Faustus'* to *The Library* (March). A succession of editors from A. Dyce in 1850 to Tucker Brooke in 1910 based their text of the play on the 1604 quarto. Percy Simpson in a paper in *Essays and Studies*, vol. vii (1921) exposed the numerous defects of this quarto. In the light of this and of other considerations, including the quotations from the play in *The Taming of a Shrew*, the present writer in his edition (1932) took the 1616 quarto as his basis, though thinking it probable that some of the scenes in it were the 'additions' for which Henslowe on 22 November paid William Birde and Samuel Rowley £4.

Kirschbaum now goes further and puts forth the view that A, the 1604 text, is a bad quarto of B, the 1616 text, and that B is close to Marlowe's original version. He starts from the borrowings in *A Shrew*, and in especial from the scene between Wagner and the Clown, where the two opening speeches except for 'pickdevantes' instead of 'beards' are echoes of B. He goes through the whole scene in its two versions almost word for word and claims that A 'shows every single sort of stigma to be found in a reported

version' and that 'it follows that A must be a bad quarto and that B must be a good quarto.

Kirschbaum then turns to Act IV, v, where the horse-courser enters wet after the horse which Faustus had sold him had turned to hay in a pond. The version in A, ll. 35–45, anticipates B, Act IV, vi, ll. 33–45, a scene which A omits. Therefore, Kirschbaum argues, this scene vi must have been in the version B which A inadequately reported. Perhaps his most telling point is gained from the quotation in *A Shrew*, IV, ii, 60–1

> *This angrie sword should rip thy hateful chest*
> *And hewd thee smaller than the* Libian *sands,*

which apparently is a variant of *Doctor Faustus*, IV, iii, 73–4

> *And had you cut my body with your swords*
> *Or hew'd this flesh and bones as small as sand.*

This scene is found only in B, and if there is an echo of it in *A Shrew*, it must have belonged to the play of 1594, together with the following scene, of which there is apparently another echo in the 'three Doctor Faustuses' passages in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, II, v, 68–71.

For Kirschbaum's further arguments that the passages found only in B which introduce Bruno at the papal and imperial courts in Acts III and IV belong to the original text of the play, as also the episodes omitted by A in Act V, readers must be referred to the article. Any scholarly contribution to the textual problems of *Doctor Faustus* deserves careful consideration. But it may not unfairly be thought that Kirschbaum overplays his hand. If B goes so near to reproducing the original text of the play, why did it in 1616 omit the 1602 'additions' by Bird and Rowley? And on this hypothesis does not internal evidence, however critically scrutinized, suggest that Marlowe had a collaborator when writing his first version of *Doctor Faustus*?

A different approach is made by J. M. Nosworthy in his discussion of *Some Textual Anomalies in the 1604 'Doctor Faustus'* (*M.L.R.*, Jan.). He holds that 'it is probably safe to say that all extant versions of the play are defective, and that the terms "Good" or "Bad" Quartos can scarcely be used appropriately of any of the

early texts'. Nosworthy quotes thirteen passages, nearly all varying from one to three lines, which are found in A, and are either omitted in B or replaced by a different reading. Some of these are metrically unsatisfactory, some grammatically questionable, some dispensable, and some are peculiar in other ways. He rejects theories of interpolation or corruption, and suggests, though somewhat tentatively, that the A text derived from a MS. in Marlowe's first draft of the play, and the B text from a second draft which he did not live to complete and which may have been revised by Rowley. In any case he urges that a satisfactory solution of the textual problems 'can only lie in a painstaking reconstruction of the hypothetical manuscripts'.

W. W. Greg in *The Damnation of Faustus* (*M.L.R.*, April) does not deal directly with textual problems, but takes from the 1604 and 1616 quartos respectively what best illustrates the points he wishes to make. While regarding it as obvious that not all the play as we have it is Marlowe's, he does 'not believe that as originally written it differed to any material extent from what we are able to reconstruct from a comparison of the two versions in which it has come down to us'. Greg sees 'no reason to doubt that it was he who planned the whole, or that his collaborator or collaborators, whoever he or they may have been, carried out his plan substantially according to instruction'. Thus whatever may be the imperfections in the execution, the logical outline of the gradual deterioration of Faustus's character is there.

The chief novelty in Greg's paper is his interpretation of the Helen scenes. He emphasizes that throughout the play 'spirit' has the meaning of devil. Thus when Faustus seeks to repent, and the Bad Angel retorts, 'Thou art a spirit; God cannot pity thee', it is implied that Faustus through his bargain has taken on the infernal nature, though he has still a human soul. So when the Emperor asks Faustus to present Alexander and his paramour before him the Doctor answers that he cannot present their 'true substantial bodies', but 'such spirits as can lively resemble' them. Similarly when the students ask to see Helen, and Mephistophilis brings her in; and again when Faustus craves to have her as his paramour that her 'sweet embraces' may extinguish all thoughts of repentance, Greg holds that she appears as a spirit, that is, a devil. 'In making her his paramour Faustus commits the sin of demonialty, that is,

bodily intercourse with demons . . . [Marlowe] did not shrink from depicting, besides Faustus's spiritual sin of bartering his soul to the powers of evil, what is, in effect its physical complement and counterfeit however he may have disguised it in immortal verse'. Whether such verse could have been inspired by such a conception is another problem for debate by future editors of the play.

In *Some Light on 'The Jew of Malta'* (*M.L.Q.*, March) Leo Kirschbaum claims that the friar scenes in Acts III and IV were already in the play in 1592, and that this is an argument against later drastic revision of the play. He quotes the lines in Act II, iii, 175–202 in which Barabas describes his own villainies to Ithamore—an account, in Kirschbaum's view, not to be taken seriously. He agrees with Bullen that Aaron's catalogue of his crimes in *Titus Andronicus*, V, i, 124–44 is an imitation of Barabas's speech, though the details are remarkably different. The most significant item is in the lines,

> *Oft have I digd up dead men from their graves,*
> *And set them upright at their deare friends dore,*

which seems to be an echo of the episode in *The Jew of Malta*, Act IV, ii, where Barabas and Ithamore set the dead friar, Bernadine upright against the door. If so, the friar scenes are part of the original version and not added, as some critics hold, by Heywood.

In *Y.W.*, xvii, p. 152, there was a notice of the Malone Society's edition of the MS. play *John of Bordeaux or the Second Part of Friar Bacon*, of which the probable date is about 1592. To the *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild* Harry R. Hoppe contributes an article, *John of Bordeaux, A Bad Quarto that never reached Print*. In a detailed examination of the play he finds a number of bad text characteristics. Among these are shortness of text, about 1,720 lines compared with an average of about 2,160 in good text plays; faulty verse-lining; erratic speech-ascriptions; misbearings; repetitions; recollections and anticipations.

Hoppe's view is that the MS. represents a memorial reconstruction of the text. He suggests that when a company was on tour with the play in its repertory, it lost some of its actors, and those who remained contrived to dictate 'from memory to one of their number to create a passable prompt copy'. Whether this be accepted

or not, Hoppe's analysis of the play's textual peculiarities will be found helpful.

Mary G. M. Adkins discusses *The Genesis of Dramatic Satire against the Puritan, as illustrated in 'A Knack to Know a Knave'* (*R.E.S.*, April). In this piece, *c.* 1592, Miss Adkins finds 'the earliest extant play containing specific and, in terms of later development, conventionalized satire against the Puritan'. It was probably one of the rejoinders to the Martin Marprelate tracts of 1588–9. The satire against the Puritans is contained in the portraiture of the Priest, one of the four sons of the Bailiff of Hexham, whose vices of hypocrisy and avarice are exposed by Honesty.

Miss Adkins aims at proving that the stock Puritan character, as it appears in *A Knack to Know a Knave* and persisted for the next half-century, had its origin in medieval literature. She traces its prototype from Chaucer's Pardoner onwards to allegorical figures in moralities and early interludes, though she admits that while avarice is the predominant attribute of the characterization in the Middle Ages it becomes later secondary to hypocrisy. She maintains that there is no evidence to charge the Puritan preacher of the 1580–90's with either of these vices, though they might be more fairly laid against some of his lay brethren in the rising commercial middle class.

The most elaborate work in 1946 on a single play was A. P. Rossiter's edition of the B. M. Egerton MS. 1994 ff. 161–85.[4] Lacking a title-page and a last leaf this play has been variously named by its editors. Halliwell-Phillipps called it *A Tragedy of King Richard the Second* (1870); W. Keller, *Richard II, Erster Teil* (1899); Miss Frijlinck and W. W. Greg *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second, or Thomas of Woodstock* (Malone Reprint, 1929). Rossiter's choice of *Woodstock* alone is not happy as that title has become consecrated to Scott's novel. But Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, is the central figure of the play, opposed to the King and his favourites and Chief Justice Tresilian.

Rossiter prints the piece in modernized spelling but in the main with the MS. punctuation. He has embodied, marked with a marginal dagger, MS. corrections of the script, and, similarly marked,

[4] *Woodstock: A Moral History*, ed. by A. P. Rossiter. Chatto and Windus. pp. vi+ 255. 15*s*.

later emendations in italics. Then follow a section on the text, textual notes, general notes, an appendix on source materials, and a glossary. Rossiter has spared no pains in providing an informative *apparatus criticus*.

Furthermore, in what is too modestly termed a 'preface' of 76 pages, he has discussed the play in its varied aspects and relations. Only some of these can be noted here. The dramatist's chief source was Holinshed, with some details from Stowe and perhaps Grafton. But he treated them very freely, in particular transforming the ambitious Woodstock into the 'plain Thomas', the champion of popular rights. And the chronicler's account of the 'blank charters' gave only a hint for the lively scene when they are brought to Dunstable.

Rossiter has illustrated in further detail than has hitherto been done the echoes in *Richard II*, especially in the scene where Gaunt dies, of the anonymous play. He also takes the view that Marlowe was indebted in *Edward II* to the *Woodstock* dramatist instead of vice versâ. But with the uncertainty of the *Woodstock* play's date, which Rossiter places *c.* 1591–4, this can be merely speculation. In spite of some incongruous lapses into facetiousness, Rossiter's work is a welcome addition to Elizabethan scholarship.

To *English* (Summer) J. M. Nosworthy contributes a wholehearted appreciation of *Henry Porter*, and his only surviving play *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon*. As Porter is termed 'Gent.' on the title-page of the comedy, and as it contains references to Oxford and numerous scholastic allusions, Nosworthy thinks it probable that Porter was a University man and was for a time a schoolmaster. He is first mentioned in Henslowe's *Diary* on 16 December 1596 and for the last time on 26 May 1599. He died on 7 June from a wound received in a duel.

Of Porter's other plays, written in collaboration or singly, only the titles are known, but Nosworthy claims for *The Two Angry Women* a distinctive place outside the general drift of Elizabethan dramatic endeavour, an 'honourable isolation'. He gives an abstract of its plot and suggestive comments on its qualities of characterization and style, as compared with later domestic dramas. He has done useful service in calling attention to its special merits, though one may question the claim that in *The Two Angry Women* Porter 'achieves perfection and approaches greatness'.

Edgar H. Duncan who has previously written on alchemy in Jonson's masque, *Mercury Vindicated* (see *Y.W.*, xxiii, 130–1), now discusses *Jonson's 'Alchemist' and the Literature of Alchemy* (*P.M.L.A.* Sept.). He gives quotations from the speeches of Subtle and Sir Epicure Mammon containing a series of seemingly fantastic allusions to what this pseudo-science can effect. Duncan then shows that these have their counterpart in contemporary alchemical treatises. Among these are Paracelsus's *De Colica*, W. Bloomefield's *Blossoms*, Ripley's *Compound*, N. Flamel's *Hieroglyphicall Figures* and Arnald's *Rosarium*. Use also is made of Aristotle's *Meteorologica* from which passages were quoted in alchemical treatises. Duncan's summing-up is 'that Jonson did not, in this play, essentially alter or exaggerate the bizarre conceptions and marvellous claims of alchemy, that his characters make no more extravagant assertions regarding it than writers of alchemical treatises make for it themselves'.

In a Note on *The Castle of the Rosy Cross: Ben Jonson and Theophilus Schweighardt* (*M.L.R.*, April) Percy Simpson shows the source of the allusions in the anti-masque of *The Fortunate Isles, and their Union* (ll. 99–102):

> *The Castle in the aire, where all the Brethren*
> Rhodostaurotick *live. It flies with wings,*
> *And runnes on wheeles: where* Julian de Campis
> *Holds out the brandisht blade.*

Jonson's authority was the Rosicrucian expositor whose *Speculum Sophicum Rhodo-Stauroticum* was published in 1618. The British Museum copy was not available when Simpson wrote, but there is in the Bodleian a Latin version in MS., of which the first chapter describing the college supplied Jonson's details. On p. 45 of the MS. is a coloured picture of the castle, including an armed figure of Julian de Campis, or Julius Sperber of Dessau, a writer on mystical subjects.

Ernest W. Talbert in *The Interpretation of Jonson's Courtly Spectacles* (*P.M.L.A.*, June) takes the view that Jonson has been misjudged when he is accused of flattery in the passages in his Masques, Barriers and Entertainment which extol the virtues of King James and his Queen and others of royal or lofty station.

Talbert argues that the principle underlying these panegyrics is, as Bacon expressed it, '*laudando precipere*; when by telling men, what they are they represent to them, what they should be'. In the introduction to *Hymenæi* Jonson declares that 'the inward parts of these inventions should have a *voice* 'taught to sound to present occasions', i.e. the particular circumstances of the performance; and also a *sense* 'to lay hold on more remou'd *mysteries*', i.e. inculcate doctrines *de regimine principum*. Talbert looks upon the apparently flattering tributes in the Masque as motived by 'the general interest of the Renaissance in political precepts and advice to rulers and Jonson's own sympathetic attitude towards the divine right of Kings'. Moreover Jonson held also the Renaissance doctrine that it was the function of poets to safeguard society and that therefore they had a special claim on the care of the King and the Court.

In support of his thesis Talbert quotes in detail from the Masques, in particular from *The Masque of Augurs*. Even if not fully accepted his views throw new light on the subject.

With reference to G. E. Bentley's *Shakespeare and Jonson: their Reputations in the Seventeenth Century* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 100 and 115) W. W. Greg in *Shakespeare and Jonson* (*R.E.S.*, Jan.) notes that the evidence of quotation 'and allusion' should be supplemented by that of printing. He gives statistics of the printing up to the Restoration of individual plays, and of collected editions in the seventeenth century of the two dramatists. These are all in favour of Shakespeare, and Greg concludes that 'writers might praise and quote Jonson; it was Shakespeare that people read. Hence many more allusions to his characters than to Jonson's'.

Allan Holaday writes on Heywood's '*Troia Britannica*' *and* '*The Ages*' (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct.). He discusses the two divergent views (1) of A. M. Clark that Heywood's series of mythological plays, *The Golden Age* and its successors, were a dramatization of his poem *Troia Britannica* (1609); (2) of F. G. Fleay, in part supported by W. W. Greg, that the *Ages* were revised versions of plays noted in Henslowe's *Diary* as performed by the Admiral's men in 1595–6.

Holaday submits that the evidence points to an intermediate conclusion. He agrees with Clark that *The Golden Age* is simply a stage version of the first five cantos of *Troia Britannica*. But in

*The Silver Age* only the first Act is a dramatization of a part of canto six, and the other Acts have little relation to the poem. In *The Brazen Age*, Act IV, dealing with the Mars-Venus story, seems to be based upon the poem but otherwise there is little connexion. The two *Iron Ages* show in parts more resemblances to the poem, but there are also vital differences.

On the other hand the stage-directions in the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages* contain references to properties listed by Henslowe as used in two 1595 Hercules plays. Thus 'Ierosses [Iris's] head and raynbowe' have their counterpart in 'Enter Iris with a habit' and 'Jupiter appears . . . under a Rainbowe'. And a large number of Henslowe's other properties correspond with stage-directions in these two *Ages*. The properties for the 1596 *Troy* throw less light but, broadly speaking, it is Holaday's conclusion that Heywood made more limited use of *Troia Britannica* than Clark holds and, excepting *The Golden Age*, drew upon the 1595–6 Admiral's men's plays.

Freda L. Townsend makes a claim for *The Artistry of Thomas Heywood's Double Plots* (*P.Q.*, April) which she finds that many critics have failed to recognize. She examines three groups of Heywood's plays. The first includes *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, and *A Challenge for Beauty* in which the two plots illustrate the same central theme. In the second, consisting of *Fortune by Land and by Sea* and *A Maidenhead Well Lost*, the plots have a cause-and-effect relationship. In the third, comprising *The Captives* and *The English Traveller*, there is no thematic or causal relationship between the two, but the artistry lies in the success of the timing and the sequence of scenes. For her detailed analysis of the plays in these various groups students must be referred to Miss Townsend's article.

William Peery in *Nathan Field's Dates* (*M.L.R.*, Oct.) points out that he was baptized on 17 October 1587, but that the date of his birth is unknown. So also with the date of his death. In a letter of Sir William Trumbull, between 5 and 15 June 1619, he mentions a report that Field had a child by Lady Argyll, but does not allude to him as dead. On the other hand he did not play in *Barnavelt* in the August of that year. His death may have been between these dates.

Peery has various other notes on Field and his plays. In *Who 'thrusts the Boy out'?* (*N. & Q.*, 12 Jan.) he points out that when in the duel scene in Act IV of *Amends for Ladies* 'the maid' disguised as a page is slightly wounded, Proudly bids his brother Frank 'take the boy away' and Q. 1 has the stage-direction 'Fr. thrusts the boy out'. Q. 2 changed 'Fr.' to 'Pr.', which editors have expanded into Proudly. Peery rightly claims that it is Fr[ank] that is meant.

Peery discusses *The Portrayal of Woman in the Comedies of Nathan Field* (*S.A.B.*, July). Contrary to the generally accepted view he argues that *A Woman Is a Weathercock* is not an anti-feminist play. While quoting from it some of its well-known passages of invective against the female sex Peery contends that its 'fable' or plot has a different tendency. Though in the main action Bellafront appears for the time to be fickle she proves to have a good heart. 'If Field's primary purpose in *A Woman Is a Weathercock* was to indict women for inconstancy, when he gave the Bellafront-Scudmore romance a happy ending he defeated his purpose.' Even less marked is the inconstancy of her sisters, Katherine and Lucida.

Peery pushes his contention so far as to claim that in its fable the play is 'not an indictment against, but a defence of, women'. Why then did Field call his second play *Amends for Ladies*? Even if it is not exactly an antidote to *A Weathercock*, it is somewhat paradoxical to assert that both plays have an identical general purpose.

In discussing *The Influence of Jonson on Nathan Field* (*S. in Ph.*, July) Peery goes far to deny that influence. He finds that Field is not a 'corrective satirist' like Jonson. Nor is his realistic portrayal of contemporary life any more akin to Jonson's than it is to Middleton's. Also, as Peery seeks to show, in the technique of his plot-construction he is closer to Middleton than to Jonson. And in respect of 'humour' characters, while Jonson works them out in detail and differentiates them, Field uses abstractions and differentiates them only in externals.

Mary G. M. Adkins discusses *The Citizens in 'Philaster', Their Function and Significance* (*S. in Ph.*, April). She suggests that *Philaster* is an exception to the general run of Jacobean plays so

far as in its political aspect the citizens are the dominant force. It is due in the main to them that the usurping King is deposed, Pharamond's designs defeated, and Philaster, the rightful heir, restored. As Miss Adkins shows by a series of quotations, 'their importance is announced in the first scene and referred to at occasional intervals: the audience is not only not allowed to forget them, but is compelled to think of them as being an integral part of a well planned play'. Philaster in especial treats them with respect and courtesy.

Miss Adkins further points out that the significant passages quoted by her are generally assigned to Beaumont, and she suggests that he may have been one of those who sensed that the winds of change were blowing, while plays from Fletcher's sole hand indicate the he was uncompromisingly royalist.

In an article on *The Early Life of George Chapman* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 109–11) Jean Robertson brought documentary evidence in support of the inscription which associates Chapman in his youth with the household of Sir Ralph Sadler, one of the Queen's Privy Council. She quoted from a Bill of Complaint brought by Chapman against John Wolfall in April 1608 and the defendant's answer. Chapman, it is asserted, had borrowed money from Wolfall by a bond dated 12 July 1585, to furnish himself for attendance on Sir Ralph Sadler, had not repaid the debt, had been absent for a time overseas, and had in February 1599–1600 been arrested and imprisoned at Wolfall's seat.

Mark Eccles, working independently, had in print but not yet published an article on similar but more comprehensive lines which has now appeared as *Chapman's Early Years* in *S. in Ph.* (April). He quotes more fully from the Record Office documents and transcribes Chapman's draft petition to Lord Ellesmere now in the Folger Library. He agrees in essentials with Miss Robertson, but while she thinks that Chapman in 'perennial poverty' still owed the money, Eccles has little doubt that Chapman had the right on his side. He shows from other sources that Wolfall, in conjunction with the Nicholas Skeres or Skyres who was present at Marlowe's death, had victimized other young men devoted to 'fruitless and vague poetry', including Matthew Royden and Thomas Lodge and had twice been pillioried.

From another chancery suit Eccles throws light on Chapman's

family connexions. His maternal grandfather was George Nodes, sergeant of the buckhounds to Henry VIII and his successors. He had two daughters, Joan and Jean, of whom the former married Thomas Chapman of Hitchin, the poet's father. George Nodes was survived by his widow, formerly Margaret Grimston, through whom Chapman was thus related to Edward Grimston whose *General Inventory of the History of France* had furnished material for several of his plays.

Chapman's interest in astrology is emphasized by Johnstone Parr in an article on *The Duke of Byron's Malignant 'Caput Algol'* (*S. in Ph.*, April). In *The Conspiracy of Charles, Duke of Byron*, Act III, ii, the Duke, anxious about the issue of the treacherous course on which he has embarked, visits the astrologer La Brosse in a disguise which the 'magician' sees through. He tells Byron that the natal horoscope about which he inquires contains a *Caput Algol*, and when the Duke compels him to explain its meaning, the answer is:

> *Then briefly this: the man hath likely done*
> *An action that will make him lose his head.*

The *Caput Algol*, as Parr shows by quotations from contemporary astronomical treatises, was a fixed star in the head of Medusa, cut off by Perseus, and when it was conjoined with Sol or Mars or Luna in a horoscope it foreshadowed decapitation. Parr therefore does not agree with T. M. Parrott that this interview is a digression, but regards it as 'a highly dramatic scene in which the playwright has obviously made much of the stars as the motivating power behind Byron's catastrophe'.

In *Tourneur and the Stars* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.) J. M. S. Tompkins calls attention to astrological influence in another play. In *The Atheist's Tragedy* D'Amville's scepticism of the divine government of the world takes the form, as Tompkins points out, of denying this influence at two important turning-points of the action, 'first, when he has accomplished the murder of his brother, and secondly, just before the strokes of God's vengeance begin to rain on him'. After the murder he derides the stars as 'senseless in their operations' instead of being governors of sublunary creatures, and is rebuked by an outburst of thunder and lighning. Later, in Act V, he declares

that the gold pieces in his hands, not the stars in heaven, are the stars which are the ministers of fate, whereupon the ghost of his brother appears to him, and the bodies of his sons are brought in, one dead, the other dying.

In an article in *R.E.S.*, Oct. 1931, Mark Eccles showed that Thomas Middleton matriculated from Queen's College, Oxford, in April 1598 (see *Y.W.*, xii, 182). In *N. & Q.*, 8 Oct. 1938, Mildred G. Christian quoted a passage from his pageant, *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity* in which he wishes the College all happiness (see *Y.W.*, xix, 143). Miss Christian in *M.L.R.* (Feb.) in a note on *Middleton's Residence at Oxford* shows from a document, cited by Eccles in another connexion, that the dramatist was in Oxford for over three years. In a deed enrolled on 12 December 1601 he pledged the half of the Curtain property that he had inherited in return for money paid by his brother-in-law for his maintenance in the University of Oxford, 'where I am now a student'.

In *Notes on Bang's Edition of 'The Blind Beggar of Bednal-Green'* (*English Studies*, Oct.) William Peery points out a number of minor inaccuracies, mainly of punctuation and spelling, in W. Bang's Louvain reprint (1902) of the 1659 quarto of Chettle and Day's play.

Allan H. Stevenson in a series of articles has dealt with various aspects of Shirley's residence in Dublin and of the publication of his plays (see *Y.W.*, xxiii, 121; xxv, 108–9; xxvi, 119). He continues his investigations in an article on *Shirley's Dedications and the Date of his Return to England* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.). He dissents from A. H. Carter's view that the dedication of the play, *The Maides Revenge*, dated 1639, proves that Shirley had returned to London late in 1639 or before 24 March 1639/40 (see *Y.W.*, xxiv, 127).

The dedication is to Henry Osborne, who three times in July and August 1639 endorsed letters forwarded to Wentworth from Dublin to Naas, and who has plausibly been identified as the elder brother of Dorothy Osborne. It was after Osborne's return to London in the autumn that Shirley wrote the dedication in which he spoke of the play's favourable reception 'on the English stage', and alluded to the Court wherein 'you live'. Such phrases would be suitable if the dedication were written in Dublin and

forwarded to the printer, but not if written in London. It does not therefore furnish evidence of Shirley's return to England before 24 March. On the other hand, as Stevenson has previously argued, the dedication of his play *The Opportunity* in 1640 to Captain Richard Owen, in whose ship he had come back from Ireland, dates his return to London in the latter part of April.

# IX

# THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE

## I. THE LATER TUDOR PERIOD

By D. J. GORDON

THE year 1946 has seen rather less work than previously on Spenser. We notice, in this order, articles on the life, the minor poems and *The Faerie Queene.*

In *H.L.Q.* (Aug.) Alexander C. Judson examines in turn the nine *Seventeenth-Century Lives of Edmund Spenser*—though, as he says, only by courtesy can some of them be called 'Lives' at all—from Camden's in his *Annales* to Winstanley's in his *England's Worthies* (1684). He points out the errors, the provenance of their information, and discusses the interesting issues that are sometimes raised. He concludes with some reflections on why no adequate life in fact appeared.

We know of *Spenser's 'Stemmata Dudleiana'* only through two passages in the Harvey-Spenser letters. In an article with this title in *N. & Q.* (12 Jan.) William H. Orwen attempts to discover something about the nature of this lost Latin work. It must have been, he holds, 'a genealogy written to gain the patronage of a powerful but newly elevated family': their ancestry was a matter of some concern to the Dudleys. Orwen suggests a connexion with Harvey's *Gratulationes* (1578), a collection of Latin verses by Harvey and others assembled to celebrate the Queen's visit to Audley End. The book opens with a poem by Harvey on the Dudley arms. A reason for not publishing the *Stemmata Dudleiana* may have been that it contained allusions to a possible marriage between Elizabeth and Leicester, in which case it would not have been issued after 1579, when Leicester's marriage with the Countess of Essex became known.

The identity of the flower into which the dead Astrophel is

transformed has eluded the commentators on Spenser's poem of this title. Thomas P. Harrison, Jr., in *Flower Lore in Shakespeare and Spenser* (*M.L.N.*, June) suggests that Spenser's flower may have sprung from his reading the accounts of the classical Hyacinthus and the hyacinth proper in Henry Lyte's *Newe Herball.*

Roland M. Smith continues his investigations of the Irish element in Spenser. In *P.M.L.A.*, 1935 (see *Y.W.*, xvi, 238) he had proposed an Irish origin for the name Duessa. Now, in *A Further Note on Una and Duessa* (*P.M.L.A.*, June) he lists instances of the Irish use of Una and Du(bh)essa, and concludes that 'Duessa' is a 'normal English spelling of an Irish name, of the sort to be expected in 1590'. And Smith also devotes an article called *Irish Names in 'The Faery Queene'* (*M.L.N.*, Jan.) to arguing that certain names whose provenance has either been unknown or misunderstood are in fact Irish in origin.

James Lyndon Shanley's *Spenser's Temperance and Aristotle* (*Mod. Phil.*, Feb.) is an attempt to refute a view put forward by Padelford and followed by later scholars, namely, that Spenser's Guyon really represents the Aristotelian 'Continence' rather than the 'Temperance' he appears to be. Shanley holds that this view has been too uncritically accepted. He begins by questioning the accuracy of Padelford's interpretation of the distinction Aristotle makes between Temperance and Continence; and having set out his own interpretation he then discusses in its light the trials of Guyon. He believes that Guyon cannot be simply described by Continence or by any one term taken from Aristotle because Spenser was not working within the limits of any one of the Aristotelian categories.

*Virtuous Duplicity in 'The Faerie Queene'* is treated by Charles E. Mounts in *M.L.Q.* (March). After enumerating and examining cases in which virtuous characters depart from the strict truth Mounts decides that such deviations, when not intended to harm any good person, are not disapproved of: only temporizing in matters of religious truth is frowned on.

Don Cameron Allen's *A Note on Spenser's Orology* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) indicates that in *The Faerie Queene*, V, ii, 28, 1–5, Spenser

may be referring to an old and current doctrine that the earth in its primitive shape was much smoother and less indented with mountains and valleys.

Very little has been written on the poets of the period apart from Spenser. But it is interesting to have Helen E. Sandison's *The Vanytyes of Sir Arthur Gorges Youthe* (*P.M.L.A.*, March). This is a preliminary report on the recently acquired B. M. Egerton MS. 3165, which contains the 'lost' poems of Sir Arthur Gorges (*c.* 1557–1625)—the 'sweet layes of love' praised by Spenser in *Colin Clout*. When Miss Sandison wrote, the MS. was not accessible owing to wartime conditions and it still awaits full examination. Its history is still obscure, but it was written, in part at least, before Gorges' death in 1625. Parts of it are in his own hand. It contains some one hundred and ten poems, mostly brief; and the bulk of the material dates from Gorges' youth, although there are some pieces from the reign of James I. There are both original works and translations. Some of them had been published—anonymously—in *The Phoenix Nest* and *The Poetical Rhapsody*. Sir Arthur shows no signs of having been sensitive to changes in poetical modes: his work belongs firmly to the sixteenth century in style and feeling.

A note by John Sparrow in *The Library* (Sept.) on late seventeenth and early eighteenth century editions of Sir John Davies's *Nosce Teipsum* contains interesting material not only on the survival of Davies—and on the reasons for it—but on the history of the reputation of Elizabethan poets.

Lisle C. John writes on *Ben Jonson's Epigram CXIV to Mistresse Philip Sidney* in *J.E.G.P.* (April), pointing out the identity of the lady to whom the poem is addressed, 'Philip', daughter of Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester, a family which received numerous tributes from Ben Jonson. He also gives biographical information about her.

The theme of Freda L. Townshend's *Sidney and Ariosto* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) is the relationship which she believes to exist between the *Arcadia* and the *Orlando Furioso*: the latter work provided 'a structural pattern by which Sidney could write and re-

write his *Arcadia*'. This was the pattern of the romance, whose aim was unity in variety: a controversial subject for the Italian critics. Miss Townshend holds that Sidney's use of the technique of 'suspense' (the breaking off of a narrative at a crucial point) in the first *Arcadia* was taken over from Ariosto; and she points out that this was a recognized method in romance: Giraldi had commented on it. So too, she finds, that Sidney has learned from Ariosto the trick of elaborating his story by setting his chief characters in adventures that run off at a tangent from the main action. Miss Townshend, however, concludes that to search in the *Arcadia* for exact imitation of Ariosto is not fruitful.

The article in which Donald J. McGinn pursues his studies of the complicated problems that have their centre in the Marprelate controversy is too long and intricate to be summarized here. McGinn sets out to interpret *The Allegory of the 'Beare' and the 'Foxe' in Nashe's 'Pierce Pennilesse'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June). He agrees with McKerrow that the Bear stands for Leicester, and finds the clue to this part of Nashe's allegory in that notorious pamphlet *Leicester's Commonwealth*, which he thinks Nashe was deliberately following. He traces connexions in the use of symbolical animals. In the second part the allegory of the Bees is to be interpreted in the light of Nashe's part in the Marprelate controversy, and his one contribution to it, the *Almond for a Parrat*, gives the key: the Bees are the Bishops; the Fox is either Martin or Cartwright, and the chameleon is Penry.

Writing on *John Eliot's 'Ortho-Epia Gallica' and Du Bartas-Goulart* in *S. in Ph.* (April) Chandler B. Beall demonstrates that this French-English conversation manual (1593) was considerably indebted to Du Bartas and to Goulart's commentary on Du Bartas's *Babylone*. So Eliot, interesting in so many other ways, was also one of the pioneers of the great English interest in Du Bartas.

*Queene Elizabeth's Translation of Boethius's 'De Consolatione Philosophiae'* is somewhat severely handled by Geoffrey B. Riddehough in *J.E.G.P.* (Jan.). He lists mistranslations not hitherto recorded and comments on the harshness of the Queen's prose style—particularly evident in her renderings of Boethius's metrical passages. But more severe is his treatment of the E.E.T.S. edition,

which he castigates for its errors and inadequacies. For he does find that the Queen's style reflects her mind, that turns of phrase reflect personal attitudes.

E. T. Davies's *The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker*[1] is a brief account addressed not to the specialist but to the layman, and to the layman who is still concerned with the relations between Church and State and with the Anglican position as stated by Hooker: a statement not yet irrelevant.

One hundred years ago, in 1846, the Hakluyt Society was founded. And in 1847 its first two publications were issued—*The Observations of Sir Richard Hawkins, Knt.*, and *Select Letters of Christopher Columbus*, two books which initiated the great series that still continues. For a hundred years historians of every kind, and not least historians of English literature, have been indebted to the enthusiasm and work of this Society. And the debt is increased by the volume which the Society has issued to celebrate its centenary.[2] Surveys of the careers of Hakluyt and Purchas are contributed by J. A. Williamson and Sir William Foster; there is a very valuable guide—far more than a bare bibliography—of *English Collections of Voyages and Travels, 1625–1846*, by G. B. Crone and R. A. Skelton; there is an essay on the history of the Society by Sir William Foster and a note on *The Present and the Future* by Edward Lynam. There is also a complete list of the Society's publications.

Very useful indeed for the study of early seventeenth-century prose is Don Cameron Allen's edition of the *Essayes* of Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger, of which the first part appeared in 1600 and the second part in 1601. In a brief introduction Allen discusses the life—not very long, disorderly, and distinctly unsuccessful—and the work of Cornwallis, and gives the necessary bibliographical information about the text of the *Essayes*.[3]

[1] *The Political Ideas of William Hooker*, by E. T. Davies. London: S.P.C.K. pp. xi+98. 6*s*.

[2] *Richard Hakluyt and his Successors*, ed. by Edward Lynam. The Hakluyt Society. pp. 192+lxviii. 18*s*. 6*d*.

[3] *Essayes by Sir William Cornwallis the Younger*, ed. by Don Cameron Allen. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xxiii+265. 26*s*.

No one could pretend that Cornwallis was a great writer: his essays rarely rise above the level of the current commonplace, neatly enough put together, and sometimes vivaciously and with a personal idiosyncrasy, but not with great distinction. Nor was he a man of profound knowledge. Allen thinks that he was 'in a fashion, self-educated'; and the traces of his reading are easily visible. It is not surprising to find in the list that Allen gives of the sources of the quotations in the essays such frequent references to Seneca and to the *Lives* and *Moralia* of Plutarch. But Cornwallis had also read his Italians: we find Machiavelli and Guicciardini, Petrarch and Sanazzaro; and, what is more surprising, a knowledge of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata.* Cornwallis seems to have got the idea of writing essays from the reading of some MS. translation (but not Florio's) of Montaigne. And Allen's claim that what Cornwallis wrote in 1600 is a more finished essay than Bacon was to achieve before 1612 can be admitted.

Why was there a gap of about fourteen years between Casaubon's edition of Theophrastus' *Ethical Characters* (1592) and the first tangible English reference to them that has been traced—Jonson's in *Volpone* (1605); why did the later characters follow Overbury rather than Hall who had modelled his *Characterismes of Vices* closely on Theophrastus? Wendell Clausen seeks to answer these questions in his *The Beginnings of English Character Writing in the Early Seventeenth Century* (*P.Q.* Jan.). He points out that Theophrastus' reputation was that of an Aristotelian, a philosopher and scientist and that his fame as a character writer derives from the later vogue of the form. He argues that Casaubon's first edition did not in fact circulate in England in the sixteenth century, that there is no evidence that would support the assumption that it did. And Hall, Overbury and Earle borrow from characters only included in Casuabon's 1599 Edition. This, he holds, is the edition that was known in England, and it began to be known about 1605. In a few years we have the *Volpone* allusion, followed by Hall's collection, by Overbury's, and by Healey's translation (before 1610). Clausen believes that Jonson himself was responsible for the vogue and that he influenced Overbury in the composition of his characters. The reason for the comparative neglect of Hall's book he finds in Hall's moralistic and rhetorical aims; Overbury's book reflected the Jonsonian

humour and was more akin to the taste of the time. Clausen goes so far as to say that 'Jonson dominated the beginnings of Character-writing through his friendship with Overbury'.

To *Studies in honour of A. H. R. Fairchild* Charles F. Mullett contributes a detailed account of *Hugh Plat: Elizabethen Virtuoso.* Plat, a man of means, a Cambridge graduate and a member of Lincoln's Inn, was knighted in 1605 for his contributions in vernacular prose to the experimental and practical science of his day in varied fields. He was a popularizer of knowledge on husbandry, horticulture, mechanical arts, cookery and housewifery. His writings thus illuminate the social and cultural background of Elizabethan life. Mullett discusses each of them in turn from the *Floures of Philosophie* (1572) to *Floraes Paradise* (1608) and adds a useful bibliography.

To turn to treatments of more general themes. Henry Stegemeier's *Problems in Emblem Literature* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.) touches on English material and has an admirable range of bibliographical references.

Note has been made above (see p. 109) of the earlier references in Paul H. Kocher's discussion of the *Use of the Bible in English Astronomical Treatises during the Renaissance* in *H.L.Q.* (Feb.). He finds that the new astronomy met with considerably less theological opposition here than on the Continent, and that in fact a sharp conflict between the new science on the one hand and the Bible on the other did not emerge. However references to Scripture did constrain some of those who felt compelled to give up the old world picture to stop short of the Copernican views and to accept the system of Tycho Brahe or Gilbert as being more easily reconciled with scriptural texts. And after 1600 scientists felt compelled to take some account of Scriptural statements: they generally argued either that the cosmology of the Bible was not to be taken as literal description, or that, anyhow, the relevant texts could be made to agree with the findings of the new science.

Celeste T. Wright marshals in review *The Elizabethan Female Worthies* (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.)—those female equivalents of the more famous nine men. There was however no standard list of women.

But Miss Wright tells us about those most often mentioned by Elizabethan and Jacobean writers—drawing her information from an astonishing variety of sources—and seeks to discover what qualities they have in common, what was found praiseworthy in them.

The nature of tyranny and the tyrant and the duties of his subjects to him were favourite subjects with Elizabethan writers. W. A. Armstrong studies certain elements in *The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant* (see above p. 122). He illustrates the political behaviour required of the subject to the tyrant—obedience to a tyrant who is a rightful hereditary king, resistance to a tyrant who has won his place by foul means—ideas about the tyrant's specific vices, about his misery and fate and about the motives that have impelled him to seize power. His instances of the occurrence of these ideas in literature are mostly taken from the field of drama.

Christopher Hatton, Queen Elizabeth's dancing chancellor, has perhaps had less than justice done to him by history. Such at any rate is the contention of Eric St. John Brooks in his new life of Hatton.[4] And certainly he maintains it with success. Hatton emerges from these pages as a much more solid and important figure than had been realized, even if never in the first flight—and Brooks does not make exaggerated claims. His rise to power, his acquisition of properties, his complicated financial transactions—which involved him both with Drake and with the tangle of monopolies—his relations with the Elizabethan religious policy, his part in the handling of the conspiracies against Elizabeth, in the affair of Mary Queen of Scots, his ambitious building programme (for Hatton was one of the newly great and sought magnificence—and died heavily in debt), all these are well described. We may note the chapter on Hatton's relations with Gascoigne, and two others on his relations with later scholars and writers—mostly minor figures, though Spenser sought his patronage through an introductory sonnet to *The Faerie Queene*; but no closer connexion seems to have existed. Of all the writers who dedicated works to him, in fact, it seems that only Churchyard, Rich and John Dee 'had any close relations with him'.

[4] *Sir Christopher Hatton*, by Eric St. John Brooks. Jonathan Cape. pp. 408. 18*s*.

On 24 August the librarian of Holkham wrote to *T.L.S.* pointing out that some of Hatton's books are still in the library there. There are letters also from Marjorie J. O. Kennedy (5 Oct.) and the author (19 Oct.).

So many hopes clearly centred on Prince Henry and his death in 1612 that it is a pity that so little is really known about him. But this remains so. Since Birch wrote his memoir in 1760 not much has in fact been added. And, one must remember, he was only eighteen when he died. One of the ways on which to approach the life is certainly to collect the poems addressed to him, the references to him in writings, the works dedicated to him, and so on—of which there are an enormous number. Birch had already done something of this. Now Elkin C. Wilson has carried the process through in his study of *Prince Henry and English Literature.*[5] The materials, he says, were intractable. And indeed this was inevitable, as is the fragmentary impression given by the study. There is no centre or focus. No really coherent idea of a personality, of strongly emphasized directions of taste, or of vital relations with men of letters emerges. It is difficult to see how it could. So the book is a collection of material. The fundamental difficulties can be seen easily enough by looking at the tributes to Henry written on his death. In the years 1612–14 more than forty-four such pieces appeared. But, after all, when they have been assembled—and many of them have an exotic interest—how little can be said about them. There is no great poem: and how they repeat themselves and each other!

[5] *Prince Henry and English Literature*, by Elkin Calhoun Wilson. Cornell. Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. viii+187. 18*s.* 6*d.*

# X

# THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE

## (II) THE EARLIER STUART AGE AND THE COMMONWEALTH

By L. C. MARTIN

THE harvest in this field is not quite so bountiful as in 1945. Work on Milton still preponderates. The material relating to him is noticed after the work on other poets and prose-writing has received attention.

The *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* devotes a special issue (Dec.) to 'Baroque Style in Various Arts', and two of the articles call for notice here. René Wellek writes on *The Concept of Baroque in Literary Scholarship*, describing and instancing with great documentary fullness the various senses in which historians and critics in many countries have employed the term. Wölfflin's contrast of Ariosto and Tasso in *Renaissance und Barock* (1888) is the starting-point, but there was little development before 1914 and it was not until the 1920's that the usage became common. Wellek observes two fairly distinct kinds of approach to a definition, some writers describing 'baroque' in terms of style and others preferring to dwell on ideological categories or emotional attitudes. The difficulty is to frame a definition which is neither too wide nor too exclusive, and Wellek thinks that the attempts have not yet quite succeeded. This, however, is not to say that the term is valueless. The concept, vague as it may often be, har stimulated thought about periods and styles and is especially important for the history of English literature, 'since there the very existence of such a style has been obscured by the extension given to the term Elizabethan and by the narrow limits of the one competing term: "metaphysical" '.

Roy Daniells (ibid.) considers *English Baroque and Deliberate Obscurity* with special reference to the 'cult of significant darkness' by such as Donne, Chapman and Reynolds, comparing their

notions or procedure with the analogous phenomena of graphic and plastic design analysed by Wölfflin. It will be seen that this article is related by its theme to Arnold Stein's on Donne noticed below (p. 166).

A substantial collection of seventeenth-century prose and verse,[1] revised and expanded from a volume first published in 1929, is provided by R. P. T. Coffin and A. M. Witherspoon. The net has been cast widely and some of the specimens have not previously been exhibited together. Thus in the prose section, which begins with Nicholas Breton and ends with Gilbert Burnet, room is found, in addition to more familiar material, for passages from Archbishop Laud's *Diary*, Fellтham's *Resolves*, and Selden's *Table Talk*. The verse ranges from Donne to Aphra Behn with a similar inclusiveness. There are separate introductions to the seventeenth century itself, to the prose, and to the verse; and there are sketches of each author's life and achievement. By all means, and not least by their own breezy, figurative style, the editors endeavour to win assent from the 'common reader' to their conviction that the literature of this period has its interest, value, and meaning for modern minds. The scale of the work is such as to afford an unusually profitable sort of initiation.

A selection of pieces by four metaphysical poets[2] is offered by W. C. Scott with a number of illustrations from the *Emblemata Diversorum Principum* of Typotius (1679). This selection was published in 1945 but not obtained for notice in *Y.W.*, xxvi. The editor introduces each writer and also gives a brief general account at the outset and a concluding summary one. He seeks to make good his belief that these poets aimed at and more or less achieved a resolution of the discrepancy between the desired and the attainable. Of the volume as a whole he says, with some justification, that he is 'not attempting in any way to write a scholarly book'; but he makes evident his own keen interest and the emblems give the book a distinctive character.

[1] *Seventeenth-Century Prose and Poetry*, selected and ed. by Robert P. Tristram Coffin and Alexander M. Witherspoon. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. pp. xxi + 807 (prose); viii + 310 (verse). $4.75.

[2] *The Fantasticks: Donne, Herbert, Crashaw, Vaughan*, by W. S. Scott. John Westhouse, 1945. pp. 170. 12*s*. 6*d*.

Donne has been added to the Clarendon English Series[3] and thus for the first time in a volume devoted to him we have a selection which includes both verse and prose. The choice is substantial and representative. It is accompanied by many interesting notes and by the usual assembly of critical witnesses. Walton's shorter *Life* is given in full. In Garrod's own introduction he lightly but probingly seeks to explain why Donne has attracted or repelled his readers.

In *N. & Q.* (16 Nov.) W. Milgate examines the evidence for *The Date of Donne's Birth*, resisting Garrod's arguments in favour of August 1571 (see *Y.W.*, xxv, 135), and preferring some date between 22 January and 12 February 1572.

In *M.L.R.* (Jan.) Evelyn M. Simpson suggests that *The Date of Donne's 'Hymne to God my God, in my sicknesse'* deserves reconsideration. She goes carefully into the arguments of John Sparrow in *M.L.R.* (Oct. 1924; see *Y.W.*, v, 163) for assigning the poem to 1623, and comes to the conclusion that the evidence, both negative and positive, is distinctly more in favour of Walton's original statement that the poem was written on 23 March 1630–1, during Donne's last illness.

Arnold Stein continues his analyses of Donne's style and writes now on *Donne's Obscurity* in *E.L.H.* (June). In a first section he illustrates the poet's habit of stimulating the intelligent reader by offering something not too immediately lucid, and of discouraging the superficial reader by baffling his wits. Reference is made to the traditions of obscurity traceable to the classical satirists, who, for one thing, often wanted to veil their allusions to particular victims. Stein, however, gives a broader setting to his theme by indicating how Elizabethan notions about defensible obscurity were developed towards the close of the century by certain writers for whom it was not enough to avoid a cheap popularity but who wished, with Chapman, in every way to consecrate their strange poems to really 'searching spirits'. 'The feeling against popular art reaches a climax in Donne.'

In *R.E.S.* (July) Joseph Lederer discusses *Donne and the Emblem-*

[3] *John Donne. Poetry and Prose*, ed. by H. W. Garrod. O.U.P. pp. viii + 126. 3*s.* 6*d.*

*atic Practice*, showing how often Donne's imagination was affected by his knowledge of emblematic art—not that direct influence is always at work, though sometimes it is clear enough, but through his, 'participation in the general style-currents of his age'. This is a full and well-informed article, in which one of the most interesting passages has to do with Donne's compass and circle imagery considered in this special connexion.

Under heading *Donne as Navigator* in *T.L.S.* (28 Dec.) Rhodes Dunlap offers an explanation of 'A Valediction: of the Booke', ll. 59–63.

Helen L. Gardner contributes *Notes on Donne's Verse Letters* to *M.L.R.* (July), suggesting explanations for three passages which she thinks have not hitherto been sufficiently or correctly made out.

Don Cameron Allen in *M.L.N.* (Jan.) seeks to throw light on *Donne's Specular Stone* from *Gemmarum et lapidum historia* (1609) by Anselmus Boetius de Boot.

Allen also writes (ibid., April) on *Donne Among the Giants*, considering *the First Anniversary* (ll. 135–44) as a text in the controversy, dating from early Christian times, about the reality of alleged historical giants.

Finally, Allen discusses (ibid., Jan.) *Donne, Butler, and ?*, referring to the anonymous author of *The Surfeit to A.B.C.* (1656), who offers a remark on Donne's style similar to one made by Butler in his *Note-Books*.

G. R. Potter's edition of *A Sermon Preached at Lincoln's Inn by John Donne* was by an oversight included in last year's notices (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 138). This edition is dated 1946.

Mario Praz has now published in separate volumes[4] the two sections of his *Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra, John Donne—Richard Crashaw*[5] (1925); and the study of Donne now contains two introductory chapters, one on *secentismo* in Europe generally, and one on metaphysical poetry as it can be seen to have been shaping itself in England before Donne gave it a more distinct identity.

Richard H. Perkinson discusses *The Epic in Five Acts* in *S. in Ph.*

[4] *La Poesia metafisica inglese del seicento, John Donne*, by Mario Praz. Rome: Edizioni italiane. pp. 175. L.400.

[5] *Richard Crashaw*, by Mario Praz. Brescia: Morcelliana. pp. 201, L.170,

(July). He analyses the various factors which in the Middle Ages and early Renaissance favoured a blurring of the differences between epic and drama, and then examines instances in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of narrative poems, like *Gondibert*, which are disposed into five divisions, whether or not by a conscious approximation to the traditional lay-out of the five-act play. Perkinson also goes into the reasons why this kind of structure for the epic became practically impossible after the first half of the seventeenth century.

Sister Maria Theresa writes in *M.L.N.* (Jan.) to confirm the association of *Sidney Godolphin and 'The Muses Fairest Light'*. She points out that in some copies at least of *Jonsonus Virbius* the name 'Sid: Godolphin' is discernible in the spaces of the wide decorative line beneath the verses.

In *Twentieth Century English* (see above, p. 30) Cleanth Brooks offers an interpretation of Corbet's 'Farewell, rewards and fairies' in support of the proposition that *The New Criticism and Scholarship* can and should co-operate.

Willa M. Evans, having in *P.Q.* (Oct. 1945) discussed the text of *Richard Lovelace's 'Mock-Song'* with reference to a version in John Gamble's collection of manuscript songs now in the New York Public Library, performs a similar service this year in *M.L.Q.* (Sept.) for *The Rose: A Song by Wilson and Lovelace*, of which the musical setting by John Wilson was recently discovered in the same Library, and more recently still in the Bodleian.

A. C. Howell in *E.L.H.* (June) considers *Res et Verba: Words and Things* as this antithesis was used in the seventeenth century to criticize inflated or over-ornamental modes of expression. He shows and illustrates how the distinction was recognized in Latin literature and how, partly under the influence of the scientific spirit, and to the greater encouragement of the 'plain' style, it was often suggested by writers after 1600 that 'words' deserved suspicion unless their connexion with recognizable concepts could be clearly perceived.

In *Isis* (Jan.) Charles F. Mullett gives a summary account of *Thomas Walkington and his 'Optick Glasse'* (1607), indicating how

that treatise, like Burton's larger work, bears witness to the current interest in psychological inquiry. Walkington's contribution is brought into clearer focus by comparison with the related discussions by Timothy Bright and Lemnius.

Under heading *Lady Kent and the Two Sir Edwards*, Don A. Keister gives his reasons for thinking that the Sir Edward Herbert associated with Lady Kent in Selden's *Table-Talk* was probably not, as has been suggested, Lord Herbert of Cherbury.

Jeremy Taylor's preaching style as represented in the Sunday Sermons[6] is patiently examined by Sister M. Salome Antoine with reference to the background of the sermons in Taylor's life, and with classified listing and copious illustration of the 'tropes', the figures of diction, and the figures of thought which he employs. Those who wish to know exactly the number and nature of the tropes, etc., which appear in each sermon will find the information in appendices occupying 116 double-columned pages. Some conclusions are suggested about Taylor's place in the development of prose style in the seventeenth century.

In the fourth edition of J. H. Hanford's *Milton Handbook*[7] 'a necessary compromise has been made between the new and the old in Milton scholarship'. The original statement remains but account is taken in preface, text, footnotes, and bibliography, of the large accretions to knowledge and interpretative criticism recently provided. There is for the first time an Appendix F, on 'Milton in Italy'. Altogether there are twenty-six more pages than in the third edition.

The broader view of Milton's relationships to earlier writers which has recommended itself of late forbids easy conclusions about his indebtedness to any particular 'source'. That it is, however, still possible in some connexions to be reasonably sure that a specific influence was at work, and more so than any other, can be maintained on the evidence of investigations such as Davis P.

[6] *The Rhetoric of Jeremy Taylor's Prose: Ornament of the Sunday Sermons*, by Sister M. Salome Antoine. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Univ. of America Press. pp. xiii+369. $4.00.

[7] *A Milton Handbook*, by James Holly Hanford. New York: F. S. Crofts. pp. xi+465. $2.50.

Harding has carried out.[8] Here the subject of inquiry is the extent to which traces of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* may appear recognizable in Milton's Latin and English poems. Some account is given of the attitude to Ovid represented in the Christian traditions, and of the facilities for the reading of that poet which Milton had at school. Then many instances of apparent reminiscence are cited and carefully weighed, and the conclusion is reached that although Milton was strongly influenced by Ovid in *Comus* and *Paradise Lost* the influence virtually disappears in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, Milton having come to reject the traditional belief that the ancient myths concealed important truths.

To *Essays and Studies* (Vol. xxxi) Ethel Seaton contributes a fresh and stimulating account of the relations between '*Comus*' *and Shakespeare*, and performs a real service in pointing out not only how many passages in the Masque have their antecedence in Shakespeare's plays but how Milton gave his own creative and individual turn to what he consciously or unconsciously remembered. The strongest link is with *Romeo and Juliet*, partly through correspondences of imagery or phrase but not least, as is here interestingly suggested, through the spiritual kinship of Juliet and the Lady. Miss Seaton stresses the normality of both girls and deprecates the view either that the Lady is an abstraction or that Milton's belief in chastity was merely a morbid phase of his development.

To show *The Relationship of* '*Comus*' *to* '*Hero and Leander*' *and* '*Venus and Adonis*' Hermann Schaus in *Studies in English* (Univ. of Texas, 1945–6) adduces a number of parallels in thought and phrasing, some of which may well imply actual reminiscence on Milton's part.

Under heading *Milton, Jonson, and Tiberius* Ralph Nash in *Classical Philology* (July) reverts to the point raised in 1943 (see *Y.W.*, xxiv, 153) about Milton's attribution of a Greek proverb to Tiberius, and remarks that Milton may have taken the proverb from Jonson's *Sejanus* (II, 328–30).

[8] *Milton and the Renaissance Ovid*, by Davis P. Harding. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press (Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit., XXX, No. 4). pp. 105, $1,50 or 2,00.

In *E.L.H.* (June) under heading '*Hail, Wedded Love*' William Haller considers the view of marriage and divorce which Milton arrived at on the basis of Puritan doctrine and of that which he found in Plato and the poets. These had taught him that the office of love begins and ends in the soul. Spenser and the preachers had taught him that the love whose office is in the soul must be sealed in marriage. When therefore the marriage of true minds is not achieved and nothing is left 'but the empty husk of an outside matrimony', Milton thought it incontestable that divorce should be allowed, since otherwise the greatest violence must be done to God's purpose in the creation of human society.

*Milton and Selden on Divorce* is the subject of a lengthy and carefully considered article contributed to *S. in Ph.* (April) by Eivion Owen. It is shown that Milton profoundly respected Selden's learning and wisdom, but was also aware of the great differences between them on matters of fundamental importance. Owen believes that the first edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline* shows no knowledge of Selden's investigations, but that before publishing the second edition Milton became familiar with the *De Jure Naturali.* In that edition he introduces a complimentary reference to Selden, whose practical conclusions are like his own, but makes no use of Selden's material because he could not accept Selden's views on marriage and on Christian liberty in general. *Tetrachordon*, however, betrays some indebtedness to Selden's *Uxor Ebraica* (1646), Milton apparently having had access to the MS. of that work.

Kester Svendsen presents in *S.A.B.* (Oct. 1945) a critical examination of *Milton's Sonnet on the Massacre in Piedmont* with special reference to its structural, rhetorical, and metrical features, and with due attention to finer points of verbal technique.

Using some material which he has published before, John S Diekhoff[9] seeks to justify the ways of Milton to his readers, especially readers of to-day, by answering objections to the thought or argument of *Paradise Lost* and representing it as essentially sound and consistent. Diekhoff's procedure is logical and forthright, and he shows much sympathy with Milton's assumptions,

[9] *Milton's 'Paradise Lost': A Commentary on the Argument*, by John S. Diekhoff. New York: Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. 161. $2.00. 11*s.* 6*d.*

beliefs, and argumentative drift; and after all the efforts to arrive at Milton's 'unconscious' conations it is at least refreshing, though perhaps not always quite satisfying, to be kept on the level of what Milton was intentionally meaning to convey. On that level this book has a great usefulness. There is a full and valuable index.

Leon Howard approaches Milton's 'argument' from another angle. Observing that modern interpreters of Milton have not seldom gone astray by allowing their own mental habits and training to distort his meaning, he maintains that this sort of misunderstanding can only be avoided by taking more account of the logical matrix in which the thought of Milton and other Puritans was formed. This was the Ramean system, which Milton elaborated in his *Artis Logicae* and which necessarily affects the logical procedure of *Paradise Lost*; and thus it is in special senses that Howard writes of '*The Invention' of Milton's 'Great Argument'* in *H.L.Q.* (Feb.). 'When they spoke of the "invention of arguments" the Ramists meant something like the discovery of self-evident truths rather than the fabrication of persuasive discourse', and one of Howard's aims is to show how far this conception may help us to understand Milton's words about justifying the ways of God to men. Various other points and terms of Ramean logic are brought in with a view to clarifying Milton's intention, especially where, as Howard believes, the issue has been clouded by critical considerations quite alien to Milton's intellectual habits.

There is correspondence in *R.E.S.* (Jan.) arising out of B. A. Wright's note (ibid., Jan. 1945) on *Masson's Diagram of Milton's Spaces*. A. J. A. Waldock criticizes Wright's understanding of *Paradise Lost*, I, 73–4 and accuses Milton of 'bungling'; and Wright replies on behalf of Milton's words and of his own interpretation.

Wright also contributes to *R.E.S.* (April) a *Note on 'Paradise Lost', II. 879–83*, with a view to defining the sense of 'Erebus', which is not a synonym for Hell but signifies the 'dark surrounding void of Chaos out of which Hell and the new World of Man were created'.

Further, Wright offers (ibid., July) a *Note on Milton's Use of the Word 'Danger'* in *Comus*, 401 and in *Paradise Lost*, II, 1008, in the obsolete sense 'power to hurt or harm' or simply 'mischief, harm, damage'.

In *E.L.H.* (Dec.) Wm. B. Hunter, Jr., seeks to show that *Eve's Demonic Dream* (*Paradise Lost*, IV) was conceived by Milton in terms of contemporary dream lore. Thus Satan's procedure in the first attack on Eve is in accord with the remark of Glanvill 'that Spirits good or bad can so move the instruments of sense in the brain, as to awake such imaginations, as they have a mind to excite'. Hunter further suggests that in this episode Milton not only availed himself of a good opportunity for dramatic foreshadowing, but may be seen taking sides with contemporary thinkers who employed the doctrines of demonology to combat the materialistic tendencies of the time.

*M.L.N.* (Feb.) contains an article on *Milton and the Sons of God* by Don Cameron Allen, who seeks to explain *Paradise Lost*, XI, 573–87 and *Paradise Regained*, II, 178–81 with reference to Jewish and patristic traditions. Milton himself (though not Satan) accepts the orthodox doctrine that the 'sons of God' (Genesis vi, 2) were the sons of Seth; and Allen thinks that Milton's source for the description in *Paradise Lost* was probably the lore in the *Book of Enoch* as it was set forth by Eutychius, of whose work *Nathm-el-Gauhar* an edition was published in 1658.

Samuel Kliger, writing at some length in *P.M.L.A.* (June) on *The 'Urbs Æterna' in 'Paradise Regained'*, relates the passage on Rome in Book IV to the notion of the eternal city encouraged by the pagan panegyrists and modified by Christian writers into that of the 'urbs sacra', a concept held by St. Augustine in precarious balance against that of the spiritual kingdom by which Rome was to be superseded. It is suggested that Satan's description of Rome's imperial dignity owes most to Claudian; but though Milton employs ideas of both pagan and Christian origin he is independent and uncompromising about any earthly *imperium*, keeping closer than anyone else to the spirit of Daniel ii and iv in writing of the 'stone that shall to pieces dash All monarchies beside throughout the world'.

In a discussion of *Milton on Learning* (*S. in Ph.*, April) G. F. Sensabaugh begins by contrasting Milton's early respect for human inquiry and classical culture with the famous passages in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* which seem to call that respect in

question. Sensabaugh holds that a real change in Milton's views had come about, and tries to explain its nature, finding illumination in the *De Doctrina*, which describes Milton's later attitude. For by this time he had come to think the spiritual regeneration of the individual more important than man's worldly advancement. Education, of which the *De Doctrina* is, among other things, a revised tractate, is now to be directed towards personal salvation through the knowledge of God, without competition from more secular studies and strivings. The position Milton had arrived at was more carefully thought out and more firmly based on Christian dogma than were the views he set forth, for instance, in *Areopagitica*; and neither intellectual curiosity nor classical learning could have the value he once attributed to them. Nevertheless Milton could not destroy all the roots of his own mental training and sympathies and he contrived in various ways to show the effects of classical and Renaissance thought, while claiming that the true light is to be had from the Bible and not otherwise.

*Milton's Materialistic Life Principle*, as discussed by Wm. B. Hunter, Jr., in *J.E.G.P.* (Jan.), is Milton's theory of the soul as described in the *De Doctrina* and as it affects Milton's other writings. Hunter carefully assembles and explains what Milton says about the origin of the soul, its propagation, its connexion with the body, and its return after dissolution to the sun, which in his conception is the great source and focus of light and vital energy for all created things.

In another article (ibid., July) entitled *Milton and Thrice Great Hermes* Hunter shows, by many correspondences, how Milton may have been directly or indirectly indebted for his ideas about the soul and the cosmos to the Hermetic writings.

Further evidence of interest in the *De Doctrina* comes this year from Switzerland, where Albert J. Th. Eisenring[10] has prepared a full and painstaking statement of the contents, chapter by chapter. He also analyses Milton's views on the fundamental doctrines of Christian belief and adds brief summaries of the Anglican and Catholic teaching on each subject, enabling the reader to see pre-

[10] *Milton's 'De Doctrina Christiana', An Historical Introduction and Critical Analysis*, by Albert J. Th. Eisenring. Fribourg: Society of St. Paul. pp. xi+162.

cisely the extent of Milton's heterodoxy. There is a preliminary section on Milton's character as it has been variously delineated since the *De Doctrina* was discovered; and a careful 'history of the text'. Eisenring does not seem to know Maurice Kelley's *This Great Argument* (1941; see *Y.W.*, xxii, 161–2), and in some other respects might usefully have enlarged his bibliography; but the substantial material available to him has well served his purpose, which is different from Kelley's and which is to give the substance of the treatise and then to show, from the Catholic point of view, how far Milton went astray from true Christian beliefs.

*Areopagitica Adapted* in an essay entitled *An Apology for the Liberty of the Press* (1681) by William Denton is the subject of a note by G. F. Sensabaugh in *M.L.N.* (March). Sensabaugh couples Denton's publication with Blount's *A Just Vindication of Learning* (1679), in which *Areopagitica* had been paraphrased. He also examines very fully in *H.L.Q.* (Feb.) the influence of *Milton in the Revolution Settlement* with special reference to the pamphlet *Pro Populo Adversus Tyrannos*, 1689 (see *Y.W.*, xxiii, 164), in which *The Tenure of Kings* was resuscitated as an instrument of Williamite policy. The adaptation there was skilful but the adherence was close, and both from Milton's writings on one side and from the Jacobite reactions to them on the other it would appear that he became a much more important figure in English politics than he had ever been during his lifetime. In this way English constitutional thought has probably been a good deal more indebted to Milton's theories than has commonly been supposed.

Fred Emil Ekfelt writes with some fullness in *P.Q.* (Jan.) on *The Graphic Diction of Milton's English Prose*, giving instances and considering the effect of the homely concrete usages which are more frequently found in Milton's prose than in his verse writings.

In *H.L.Q.* (Feb.) Donald Lemen Clark gives a detailed account of *Milton's Schoolmasters; Alexander Gil and his Son Alexander*, their lives, characters, and writings. Incidentally Clark attributes to the younger Gil the authorship of a satire, 'The Five Senses', which used to be ascribed to Drummond of Hawthornden, and which is here printed in full.

# XI

# THE RESTORATION

By V. DE SOLA PINTO

THE year 1946 has produced a richer crop of Restoration studies than either of its two immediate predecessors. The present chapter begins with a review of an important work on Halifax, and this is followed by notices of a number of studies of Dryden and related topics. The chapter concludes with records of articles and notes on other Restoration authors.

The standard biography of the great Trimmer, George Savile, Marquis of Halifax, is, of course, Miss H. C. Foxcroft's *Life and Works of the First Marquis of Halifax*, published as long ago as 1897. After an interval of nearly half a century, Miss Foxcroft has now published a more concise study of Halifax entitled *A Character of the Trimmer*.[1] The title is not very happily chosen. One of Halifax's own most famous works is *The Character of a Trimmer*, and the similarity of the titles is likely to cause confusion. Moreover, Miss Foxcroft's work is not a 'Character' at all; it is a narrative of Halifax's career interspersed with numerous extracts from his correspondence and brief criticisms of his works, concluding with a few pages in which an attempt is made 'to sum up the character and intellect of the great man whose career we have so far followed'.

Miss Foxcroft is an historian of distinction with a very thorough knowledge of English politics in the Restoration and Revolution periods. She has had the advantage of access to the extant Halifax papers as well as to the Coventry papers at Longleat, and she makes particularly valuable use of Halifax's correspondence with his brother, Henry Savile. Under her competent and unobtrusive guidance, the reader can follow Halifax through the tortuous paths of seventeenth-century politics, from the time of his election to the Convention Parliament of 1659 to his activities as a minister and an opposition leader in the reign of William III. She is especially

[1] *A Character of the Trimmer; Being a Short Life of the First Marquis of Halifax*, by H. C. Foxcroft. C.U.P. pp. x+354. 18*s*.

happy in her handling of his conduct at the time of the Exclusion Bill and the Revolution. It is refreshing to find an historian whose judgment has not been warped by the twentieth-century reaction against the Whig view of history, and to read an account of the politics of this period which neither idealizes Charles II and his brother nor denigrates William III.

Miss Foxcroft is chiefly interested in Halifax as a statesman, and her criticism of his writings is rather superficial. She praises his 'pure, vivid, colloquial style', but makes no attempt to analyse his 'varied vocabulary', 'racy vigour' and 'penetrating but delicate irony'. She compares him with Montaigne and quotes his very interesting appreciation of that author in a letter addressed to Charles Cotton. She prints a letter from Halifax to Henry Savile dated 7/17 July, 1679, in which he laments the recent publication of a 'libel' called *Advice to a Painter*. In a note on this passage, Miss Foxcroft writes, 'This poem is by Marvell and contains satirical allusions to both the Coventrys'. She appears to be confusing *Advice to a Painter*, which contains no allusions to the Coventrys, with Marvell's *Last Instructions to a Painter*, which certainly glances at them both. She also seems to be unaware of the fact that H. M. Margoliouth, in his *Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell* (I, 322), has shown that *Advice to a Painter* is actually by Henry Savile, who implicitly acknowledges his authorship in a reply to the very letter that Miss Foxcroft quotes. There is another curious blunder on p. 293 where reference is made to 'a Mr. Waller' quoted by John Hampden the Younger in his evidence before a committee of the House of Lords in 1689. It is obvious from the notes on the proceedings of this Committee quoted on page 295 that this is Edmund Waller, the poet, who was a relation of Hampden. Nevertheless, Edmund Waller and this 'Mr. Waller' appear in the index as two separate persons.

In spite of some careless proof-reading Miss Foxcroft's book is a valuable work of reference. It is not a 'Character' of the subtle and elusive Trimmer, but a most useful store of information from which one day his 'Character' as a statesman and a writer may be reconstructed.

The most notable contribution to the study of Dryden published during the year is the Selection from his poems edited with an introduction, French translation and notes by Pierre Legouis of

the University of Lyon.[2] The choice of poems is admirable. It includes the whole of *Annus Mirabilis*, *MacFlecknoe*, the two parts of *Absalom and Achitophel*, *The Medal*, *Religio Laici*, the four great odes, the elegy on Oldham, the epistles to Congreve and to John Driden of Chesterton and some shorter pieces. The introduction is a penetrating biographical and critical essay. The critical appreciations of *The Song for Saint Cecilia's Day* and *Alexander's Feast* are particularly valuable, and the answer to the old argument that these two poems are not 'great poetry' is memorable: 'Sans entrer dans une controverse en partie verbale, on peut répondre que Dryden compense ce manque d' élévation par l'absence d'exaltation, d'illusion et de cette grandiose duperie de soi-même si commune dans la poésie lyrique du XIXe siècle.'

Legouis' translation is in lucid French prose (without, as he writes, excluding blank verse 'lorsque par exception il s'offrait de lui-même'). Both the translation and the editor's informative notes will be of great value to French-speaking students of Dryden. They will be equally useful to English and American students of Dryden who can obtain a copy of this edition, a worthy monument of that Anglo-French cultural alliance of which Dryden himself was a pioneer and in some ways a product.

Mary C. Hoefling is the author of a Dissertation with a cumbrous title,[3] published by The Catholic University of America. In her preface Miss Hoefling quotes several critics who have praised Dryden's satiric verse *Characters* but have 'failed to indicate how his best style manifests itself'. Her study aims at exhibiting 'Dryden's style in his "satiric verse *characters*" through tabular data'. Her starting-point is an introductory discussion dealing with the nature of a sentence, which she defines hypothetically as 'the smallest structure of cognitive, volitive, or affective meaning that is psychologically complete in itself for a speaker or listener, or the smallest composite of such structures of meaning'. In the remaining chapters she discriminates between predicative sentences ('structures of cognitive meaning') and non-predicative sentences ('structures of volitive or affective meaning'). She examines eighty-

[2] *Dryden: Poèmes Choisis, Traduction, prèface et notes,* par Pierre Legouis. Paris: Aubier Editions Montaigne. pp. 442.

[3] *A Study of the Structure of Meaning in the Sentences of the Satiric Verse Characters of John Dryden,* by Sister Mary Chrysantha Hoefling. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of America. pp. ix+132.

four *Characters* and provides a series of elaborate statistical tables. Perhaps the most interesting result of her very careful analysis of the elements of Dryden's style is her differentiation between the two 'distinct styles of address' which she finds in the *Characters*. She describes the first as a 'free-running style' in which 'structures of meaning are joined loosely, and, for the most part, composed of attributive elements that drift along without copulas, pronominal subjects, or connectives after an introductory predicative structure'; the other is the 'periodic' style in which 'the structures are carefully wrought, usually predicative throughout, and, at times, enhanced by metaphors and similes'.

Valuable new light is thrown on the background of *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* in an article by George Williamson in *Mod. Phil.* (Aug.) entitled *The Occasion of 'An Essay of Dramatic Poesy'*. This article stresses the occasional character of the Essay, which is commonly connected only with the work of Sir Robert Howard. Williamson, however, draws attention to the interesting remarks on the English drama by Samuel Sorbière in his *Relation d'un voyage en Angleterre* (1664), the storm of indignation aroused by this book and the answer to it by Thomas Sprat in his Observations on *Monsieur Sorbière's Voyage into England* (1665). He quotes and analyses Sorbière's description of the English drama and Sprat's reply to it, and he points out that Howard's Preface to his *Four New Plays* (1665) with its defence of the English drama coming when it did 'must have read largely as another reply to Sorbière'. Dryden in his opening sentence refers to his desire to 'vindicate our English writers from the censure of these who unjustly prefer the French before them' and his Lisideius, the defender of the French theatre, refers to 'an ingenious person of our nation' who had criticized the French for 'not burdening themselves too much with a plot'. This 'ingenious person', hitherto unidentified, is shown by Williamson to be Sprat, as the actual words quoted by Lisideius are from his reply to Sorbière. This article, like that of R. Jack Smith in *R.E.S.*, Jan. 1944 (see *Y.W.*, xxv, 147), shows that a new critical edition of Dryden's prose works is now badly needed.

In a thoughtful, though perhaps rather verbose, article in *Mod. Phil.* (Nov.), Hoyth Trowbridge discusses *The Place of Rules in*

*Dryden's Literary Criticism.* Did Dryden share the neo-classic faith in 'rules', or did he appeal to other criteria? If he did make use of 'rules', what was their derivation and status, and what kind and degree of validity did he suppose them to possess?

In reply to the first question, Trowbridge refers to three theories: Saintsbury's that Dryden simply judged by impressions and 'let the rules take care of themselves', Johnson's that Dryden first taught the English to 'determine upon principle the merit of composition', and Margaret Sherwood's attempt to combine these two opposed opinions by showing that Dryden had no consistent position but 'wavered continually between French rules and English freedom'. Taking the *Defence of An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* as a specimen work but supplementing his argument by reference to other critical essays, Trowbridge shows convincingly that Johnson's view is substantially correct. Dryden definitely opposed Sir Robert Howard's 'antinomian' theory of criticism. He contended that rules for judgment could be grounded on objective principles, though such principles are not dogmatic since they do not claim to be demonstrative and that 'there is a middle ground between individual taste and arbitrary law. Saintsbury's misunderstanding of Dryden is ascribed to 'his failure to transcend the limitation of his own critical position'.

The answer to Trowbridge's second question involves a discussion of Dryden's philosophic position. Since the rules are only probable, Dryden's view cannot be called dogmatic, but on the other hand, he rejected 'anarchic individualism'. Trowbridge points out that there were two types of sceptical philosophy: 'probabilism' descending from Carneades and accepted by Cicero, and the more thoroughgoing scepticism of Pyrrho and Sextus Empiricus. Dryden, according to Trowbridge, is nearer to Cicero's academic probablism than to the scepticism of the Pyrrhonists, but he 'must be dissociated even in some degree from Cicero and the probabilists'. His views are compared with those of Aristotle, Locke and Isaac Watts and the conclusion is that 'whatever the source of Dryden's method of reasoning, it is not sceptical in spirit or intent'.

Hitherto Dryden's translations have hardly attracted the attention that they deserve. Helene M. Hooker's careful examination of *Dryden's 'Georgics' and English Predecessors* in *H.L.Q.* (May) is therefore to be welcomed. She points out that the few English and

American scholars who have concerned themselves with Dryden's Virgil translations have 'generally gone astray because they failed to recognize that the seventeenth-century Virgil translations represent a continuous chain of development in which it is impossible to evaluate the work of any one man without knowing all the others'. Her main contention is that 'Dryden's version is the culmination of the genealogical succession of the seventeenth-century translation of Virgil'. The 'great ancestor' of all the later versions of the *Georgics* is Thomas May's *Virgil's Georgicks Englished* (1628). The descendants of this work are the versions of Ogilby, Cowley, Lauderdale, Knightly Chetwood, Sheffield, Sedley, Addison, Henry Sacheverell, the anonymous translator of 'Amor semper idem' in *Sylvae* and Dryden himself. Each of these translators made use of his predecessors. This was not regarded as plagiarism but as 'the traditional and accepted method or Virgil translation'.

Miss Hooker's article includes an interesting survey of the work of Dryden's seventeenth-century predecessors to whom he was indebted in his translation of the *Georgics*, and an examination of the complex problem of his borrowings. She concludes that 'Dryden takes over few whole lines or couplets verbatim from his predecessors. By far the greatest part of his borrowings are confined to rhyme words and phrases. This fact suggests that Dryden was glad to dispense with the drudgery of rhyming, preferring to spend his talents on the creation of poetry'.

Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis* has usually been studied either (in the words of Van Doren) as 'Dryden's most ambitious official compliment', or, as he himself suggests in his prefatory letter, as an experiment in the short historical epic. Edward N. Hooker in *The Purpose of Dryden's 'Annus Mirabilis'* (*H.L.Q.*, Nov.) shows the poem in a new light as a reply to a series of anonymous pamphlets with similar titles (*Mirabilis Annus*, *Mirabilis Annus Secundus*) which appeared in the years following the Restoration and were obviously propaganda of political and religious groups opposed to the Monarchy. Bishop Parker in his Latin history of the period mentions these pamphlets as examples of seditious libels published by republicans and Dissenters.

The *Mirabilis Annus* tracts were answered by John Spencer in his *Discourse concerning Prodigies* (1663) and passages in Isaac

Barrow's *Sermons* also seem to refer to them. According to Hooker's theory, Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis* was also an answer to them in the light of the great events of 1665–6. He sees in it 'a piece of inspired journalism' in which Dryden 'taking over the *very title* of the seditious tracts, composed a poem to show that the disasters were merely trials (or, if they were allowed to be judgments, then they were judgments upon a people for persisting in their old spirit of rebellion to their rightful sovereign); to show that the disasters were but momentary interruptions in the path of wealth and glory, and that they served to draw the King and his people together in the bonds of mutual suffering and affection'.

Godfrey Davies contributes to the same issue of *H.L.Q.* a study of *The Conclusion of Dryden's 'Absalom and Achitophel'*. According to Spence's *Anecdotes*, Pope (or a certain priest) told Spence that 'King Charles obliged Dryden to put his Oxford speech into verse, and to insert it towards the close of his *Absalom and Achitophel*'. Davies examines the speech of Charles II to which Spence refers and compares it with the speech of King David at the end of Dryden's poem. The only point in common to both speeches is the King's intention to rule according to the laws, but the emphasis is different. Davies argues, however, that the anecdote cannot be entirely ignored. He endeavours to show that Spence's informant 'knew that Dryden had a source but named the wrong one'. The real source of King David's speech was the official manifesto entitled 'His Majesties Declaration to all his Loving Subjects Touching the Causes and Reasons that moved him to Dissolve the Two last Parliaments', published on 8 April 1681. Davies finds a number of parallels between 'The Declaration' and King David's Speech, though he points out that it omits one point on which 'The Declaration' was emphatic—that the King was resolved to have frequent parliaments. He suggests that the King himself may have been 'responsible for this striking omission', since his 'French pension depended on his not listening to Parliament', and 'there was surely no point in reminding people of the promise which had served its turn by quieting the apprehensions of men who feared that the King was going to imitate his father and rule without Parliament'.

Florence R. Scott received the degree of doctor of philosophy in

New York University in May 1943, for a dissertation on *The Life and Works of Sir Robert Howard*, and an abridgment of her dissertation has now been published by the University.[4] The abridgment consists of the complete table of contents, a short summary of the biographical section, an essay on *The Duke of Lerma*, which is apparently the last chapter of the third section dealing with the works. Miss Scott as a result of her researches in the British Museum, the Public Record Office and American libraries, claims to have 'thrown light on Howard's political career, his relations with his contemporaries, and his works—chiefly his plays'. 'The confused records of Howard's four marriages have been straightened out and corrected'. Howard's dispute with Dryden and Shadwell's caricature of him in the *Sullen Lovers* are discussed. His 'highly commonplace' style is considered by Miss Scott as suitable for comedy and she regrets that he turned to write poetic dramas. His interest in the rhymed heroic drama is said to have been aroused by the experiment of his cousin, Lord Orrery (wrongly described as 'The Duke of Orrery'). The dissertation includes an examination of the sources and reception of Howard's four plays. In her study of *The Duke of Lerma*, Miss Scott finds reason to dissent from the high praise given to this play by D. D. Arundell in his *Dryden and Howard, 1664–1668* (1929), though she admits that 'the play has some good situations and considerable vigor of dialogue'.

*Voltaire, Dryden and Heroic Tragedy*[5] by Trustan W. Russell is a book with a rather wider scope than that which is indicated by its title. In his preface, Russell writes that the limits of his study were at first simply an inquiry into the relations of Voltaire with Dryden, but were 'gradually extended as the effect of epic theory upon Voltaire's critical writings became apparent'. Actually the book contains a very full and intelligent examination of some of the main trends in Anglo-French critical opinion concerning epic and tragedy during the century from 1650 to 1750 with special reference to the dramatic theory and practice of Voltaire and the ways in which he was affected by Dryden's poetry and criticism.

[4] *The Life and Works of Sir Robert Howard*, by Florence R. Scott. New York Univ. pp. 21.

[5] *Voltaire, Dryden and Heroic Tragedy*, by Trustan Wheeler Russell. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. 188. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Russell's main contention is that neo-classic conception of the didactic epic as formulated by Rapin, Le Bossu and Dacier not only dominated the minds of aspirants to epic poetry, but also 'determined the whole critical climate' in both countries. In England, this conception affected the theatre in the Restoration period and produced the 'heroic' plays of Dryden and later formal Augustan tragedies such as Addison's *Cato*. In France there was disappointment that the *Siècle de Louis Quatorze* had failed to produce a great epic. When some knowledge of English literature reached France at the turn of the century, it was generally believed both by the French and the English that the English language and English poetry, though unpolished, had an 'epic' strength and energy which the French lacked. Voltaire apparently made a particular study of Dryden when he was in England and was specially attracted by 'the combination of sceptical thought and heroic style' in Dryden's tragedies. In his own dramas he was affected far more strongly by Dryden than by Shakespeare.

This brief outline necessarily does less than justice to the scholarship displayed in this able monograph which is a notable contribution to the study of comparative literature and should be useful to students both of English and of French literature. There are a few queer gallicisms in Russell's style, which suggest that the book may have been translated from a French version.

The amusing squib sometimes called *A Session of the Poets* and sometimes *A Trial of the Poets for the Bays* was printed in two early editions of Rochester's poems and has commonly been accepted as his work, although it was also attributed to Buckingham in his *Miscellaneous Works* of 1704, and was printed anonymously in Dryden's *Miscellany* in 1716. R. G. Ham in a series of studies published in various learned periodicals in America and England between 1925 and 1933, built up an ingenious case for Elkanah Settle as the author of this satire. Ham's theory has been rejected by several other authorities, but his arguments have never been answered. They are analysed and answered in detail by J. H. Wilson in *Rochester's 'A Session of the Poets'* in *R.E.S.* (April). Wilson sees no reason to doubt the truth of Settle's own vehement denial of the authorship of the poem in *A Supplement to the Narrative* (1683). Ham dated the poem in the autumn

of 1677 because Savile in a letter to Rochester, dated 1 November, mentioned a 'libel' by which 'the whole tribe' of poets was 'alarumed'. Wilson believes that the *Session* was written in November or December 1676, as all the references in the satire are to plays, events or situations ante-dating that month. He infers that the 'libel' of Savile's letter must be another satire. The *Session* was mentioned in a play produced in August or September 1677, so could hardly have 'alarumed' the poets two months later. Wilson also supports his argument by an imposing array of internal evidence from the *Session* itself. He concludes that it was very probably 'the joint product of a group of Court Wits, meeting at Rochester's country retreat, Woodstock', and that 'all the available evidence points clearly towards him as at least the major hand in its composition'. He suggests, therefore, that 'until further evidence (or better arguments) appear', 'the poem be allowed to rest quietly in the Rochester canon'.

Rodney M. Baine has performed a very useful service by his acute examination of the problem of the authorship of the obscene farce called *Sodom* in his *Rochester or Fishbourne: A Question of Authorship* (*R.E.S.*, July). The ascription of this work to Rochester is one of the traditions which helped in the building up of the character of the satanic Restoration poet-aristocrat of eighteenth and nineteenth-century legend. Several recent writers, including J. C. Ghosh in his edition of Otway (1922), and the present writer in his *Rochester* (1935) have expressed strong doubts with regard to Rochester's supposed responsibility for this crude production. Baine makes a thorough analysis of the early allusions to the farce and shows that there is no real evidence that its authorship was ever ascribed to Rochester before 1689 and that the Rochester tradition was disseminated by certain booksellers in that year. Anthony Wood writing in 1691 or 1692 was 'more than sceptical', and in 1698, Charles Gildon, who certainly had access to reliable information, definitely attributed it to 'one Mr. *Fishbourn*, an Inns of Court Gentleman'. J. H. Prinz and Montague Summers both assumed that this 'Mr. Fishbourn' was John Fishbourne, who matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1664, but is not known to have written a line of verse.

Montague Summers, arguing in favour of Rochester's authorship in his *Playhouse of Pepys*, makes the incorrect statement that

Gildon attributed the farce to *John* Fishbourne, and also apparently confuses John with his younger brother Christopher. Baine shows that Christopher Fishbourne served as an ensign in Flanders in 1678–9. Now the *Sodom* farce is full of military allusions; moreover a phrase used by Oldham concerning its author is meaningless if applied to Rochester, but comprehensible if it alludes to someone who served in the campaign of 1678–9. Christopher also published several poems, including an *Ode for St. Cecilia's Day*, performed in November 1683. Baine has found some indecent verses attributed to 'Fisborne' (probably Christopher) in a manuscript book in Harvard Library. Thus there seems to be an imposing weight of evidence in favour of the theory that the author of *Sodom* was Christopher Fishbourne, nephew of Sir Christopher Wren and younger son of Richard Fishbourne of New Windsor, Berks.

*The Change of Crownes*, a comedy by the Hon. Edward Howard, was performed at the Theatre Royal on 15 April 1667, when it was seen by Pepys, who also records that, though the play 'took very much', one of the parts in it gave offence to the King. Lacy, the actor who played the obnoxious part, was arrested and the company forbidden to act for a time. *The Change of Crownes* was never printed, and has generally been regarded as one of the lost plays of the Restoration theatre. There has now been discovered in the possession of Mr. R. A. Austen-Leigh a prompt copy of it with the title but without Howard's name. F. S. Boas describes this manuscript in an article entitled *A Lost Restoration Play Restored* (*T.L.S.*, 28 Sept.). This article gives an outline of the plot with a number of quotations, showing that the play, though it reaches no great height of poetic style, is an effective dramatic structure with lively and well-written dialogue in competent blank verse. The prompt copy preserves the names of various actors besides that of Lacy and there are also interesting stage directions. Most of the offending scenes in which Asinello (Lacy) appears are enclosed in black lines, which, Boas conjectures, 'must have been inserted after the performance of them had proved so disastrous'.

'Ned' Howard was a favourite butt of the Restoration Wits, and subsequent critics have usually accepted their estimate of his writings. Boas suggests that the recovery of *The Change of*

*Crownes* will go far to redeem his reputation from 'the ridicule of him by some of his contemporaries'.

Godfrey Davies contributed a note on *The Date of 'Britannia and Rawleigh'*, to *H.L.Q.* (May). G. A. Aitken thought the satire was 'written at the end of 1673 or early in 1674'. H. M. Margoliouth commented 'Date not before 17 December 1674, when Henriette de Quéroualle, young sister of the Duchess of Portsmouth, married Philip Herbert, seventh Earl of Pembroke'. He suggested 'the early part of 1675' as a possible date, but added 'it may be later'. Pierre Legouis assigned the satire to 'début de 1675?' After a careful examination of various allusions to contemporary persons and events in the poem, Davies concludes that it was composed early in 1674. It is true that the Earl of Pembroke married Henriette de Quéroualle in December 1674. Margoliouth believed that there was a reference to this marriage in the poem (l. 169), and, if he was right, it could not have been written before that date. Davies, however, is probably justified in his contention that the line which Margoliouth cited as a reference to the marriage is only an allusion to Pembroke as a debauched young man who associated with the 'Carwells'. The other evidence which he cites is convincing: 'A careful examination of all the points raised shows that while some might be assigned to other times, there is no one time will fit them all except early in 1674.' His final argument is based on the conclusion of the poem. Rawleigh urges Britannia to make one more effort to reclaim Charles II. She refuses because the Stuart cannot be divided from the Tyrant. When would a well-informed satirist be likely to determine that the King was incapable of reformation? Davies gives weighty reasons for supposing that the answer might well be early in February 1674.

The taking of the oaths to William and Mary in August 1690, by Dr. William Sherlock (afterwards Dean of St. Paul's), who had hitherto been a non-juror, was an event which aroused much interest and controversy. It produced one of the most vigorous crops of pamphlets of that great age of pamphleteering. These pamphlets are examined by Charles F. Mullett in *Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688* (*H.L.Q.*, Nov.). Mullett has produced a workmanlike survey and he summarizes the contents of the chief contributions to the controversy in a lively style. It is a pity that he

does not give much actual quotation from these inaccessible works, some of which have a certain literary value. For instance a specimen of the lively tract called *A Dialogue between Dr. Sherlock, the King of France and the Grand Turk* would have been a welcome supplement to the brief summary of the contents of the pamphlet, and an extract from *The Kitchen-Maid's Answer to the London Prentice's Word to the Wavering Levite* would have thrown light on the journalistic methods of Williamite England. In a footnote, Mullett quotes several amusing contemporary ballads on the controversy, but his extracts are tantalizingly short and he gives no references. The article is valuable for the clues which it gives to English public opinion on such subjects as divine right, passive obedience and non-resistance in the reign of John Locke and William III.

George Stepney, the subject of one of Johnson's shortest Lives, is perhaps the least interesting of the poets who profited by the patronage of the Earl of Dorset in the reign of William III. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr., has published in *H.L.Q.* (Nov.) a carefully documented study of this diplomat, minor versifier and friend of Prior and the Montagues under the title of *George Stepney: My Lord Dorsets Boy*. This is the most detailed life of Stepney that has hitherto appeared. Swedenberg makes good use of the Stepney papers in the Public Record Office, Kemble's *State Papers and Correspondence*, the Historical MSS. Commission's publications and other hitherto untapped sources of information. He quotes interesting letters from Stepney to Leibniz and to Prior and he prints for the first time a poem by Stepney on *The Taking of Namur* by William III from B.M. Add MSS. 28897. No extravagant claims are made on behalf of Stepney's verse, but it is argued that 'as a friend of the witty and great and as a spectator and actor in the pageant of affairs, he is not an uninteresting figure'.

The part played by Dr. William King in the Phalaris controversy and his subsequent attacks on Richard Bentley is the subject of *The Phalaris Controversy: King versus Bentley* by Colin J. Horne in *R.E.S.* (Oct.). Horne considers that justice has not hitherto been done to this aspect of King's work and his article contains a review of King's relations with Bentley from the time when he witnessed his encounter with the Hon. Charles Boyle in

Thomas Bennett's shop in 1694. He analyses the method of parody used in pp. 184–201 of the rejoinder of the Christ Church Wits to Bentley, commonly called *Boyle on Bentley* (1698), and has no doubt that Pope was right in his attribution to King of this passage, 'the manner and the method' of which he declares to be 'exactly those of King' as they appear in another parody by him published in the same year. A satirical index appeared in the second edition of *Boyle on Bentley*. This was also attributed by Pope to King, and Horne has no doubt that it is his work. He draws attention to the probability that this was the first use of an index for satirical purposes in an English book. King's *Dialogues of the Dead* (1699) with their attack on the 'Snarling Critick' Bentivoglio are also noted by Horne as the first English attempt to use this form in the satiric manner of Lucian.

After briefly noticing King's *Remarks on 'The Tale of a Tub'* (1704) and his attitude towards Swift's belated intervention in the Bentley-Boyle controversy, Horne turns to the quarrel between Bentley and the Fellows of Trinity and King's satiric attacks on him in his *Some Account of Horace* (which Horne considers must have been written after December 1711, the date of publication of Bentley's Horace) and the amusing *Odes of Horace in English and Latin* (with the famous *Notes upon Notes*). The conclusion of the article is a well-balanced summary of the view of Bentley's scholarship and of the new science taken by men of letters like King, Pope and a large section of University men, who saw in the activities of the Royal Society and the scientific scholarship of Bentley a 'challenge to established authority in literary studies'.

The date of Congreve's *The Old Bachelor* is the subject of a note by R. G. Howarth in *P.M.L.A.* (June) entitled *Congreve's First Play: Addendum*. Howarth's note is a reply to a statement by John C. Hodges in an article in *P.M.L.A.* (Dec. 1943) that 'the date and place of Congreve's brilliant first comedy have never been examined carefully'. He added in a footnote a reference to the 'interesting note by R. G. Howarth in *T.L.S.* (13 June 1936)'. As the writer of the note in question (see *Y.W.*, 1936, 197), Howarth claims to 'have examined in it, carefully, though with unavoidable incompleteness, the date and circumstances of composition'. Howarth repeats the contention of his former note that the true date of the first composition of the play was 1689 and

denies that there is 'any tendency to question the earlier date'. He believes that Congreve 'met Southerne and so Dryden much earlier than was supposed' and that 'he was far longer re-shaping and re-polishing his comedy, at Dryden's direction, than we imagine'.

He adds a hitherto unnoticed reference to the place of composition in *The Maclise Gallery of Illustrious Literary Characters* by W. Bates (1883): 'Two miles further up the river (Dove) a grotto is preserved in which Congreve wrote his first drama'. In far-off Sydney, Howarth may care to know that the grotto and inscription were seen by the present writer two years ago in the grounds of Ilam Hall, Derbyshire, and were then in good condition.

A short check-list of works attributed to Edward (Ned) Ward (1667–1713) was contributed to *N. & Q.* (6 April) by Claude E. Jones of the University of California. Jones states that he is compiling an 'extensive bibliography of Ward's writings'.

J. L. Weir communicated to *N. & Q.* (2 Nov.) the text of a short letter of King James II, dated 26 April 1685. The letter, which is in Weir's possession, is addressed to a Colonel Douglas and 'does not appear to have been printed elsewhere'.

# XII

# THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

By EDITH J. MORLEY

THOUGH in this section there is no outstanding publication to be noticed this year, it is pleasant to see the large number of works that have appeared in spite of the difficulties that still have to be overcome by all concerned. And there is much of value to record in both individual studies and more general criticism. We begin as usual with texts, which are less numerous than of late, and proceed to commentaries.

'The verses[1] here published for the first time are the earliest known writings of Daniel Defoe. The text is printed from a note-book written in his hand, signed with his name and his initials, and dated by him 1681.' This note-book, now in the Huntington Library, contains 195 pages, most of them covered by Defoe's transcripts of sermons preached by a Mr. John Collins during that year: the seven verse-meditations on the last twenty-three pages are of Defoe's own composition, and are about eight years earlier in date than anything hitherto known as of his authorship. The *Meditacons* are printed 'without modernization or correction' exactly as written down by Defoe, and in a brief Introduction, the editor, G. H. Healey, gives the history of the MS. note-book. The verses provide an interesting glimpse of the writer's state of mind at the period when he had recently given up the idea of becoming a minister. They seem to prove that he is troubled by religious doubts, though

*Conscience y^e^ Garrison Maintaines*

and

*The Soul to its full Freedom is restord*
*And Willingly Obeys her rightfull Lord.*

The second volume of *The Percy Letters*[2] (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 159–

[1] *The Meditations of Daniel Defoe*, ed. George Harris Healey. Massachusetts: Cummington Press. pp. x+26. $7.50.

[2] *The Percy Letters. The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Richard Farmer*, ed. Cleanth Brooks. Louisiana State Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xviii+218. 18*s*.

60), *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Richard Farmer*, edited by Cleanth Brooks, is in one respect disappointing, in that it contains only five letters by Farmer among the fifty-five printed. Apparently Percy did not keep Farmer's letters and we have therefore to content ourselves with but one side of the correspondence. This covers the years 1762 to 1778, 'the period of Percy's most intense literary activity', and is almost entirely concerned with the problems and projects that occupied him, though it also contains many references to encounters with Johnson, Garrick, Thomas Warton, Hurd and other notable people. We do not hear why the correspondence came to an untimely end nor whether the friendship between Percy and Farmer ended in the quarrel hinted at by Joseph Cradock. These matters are fully discussed in the editor's Introduction, and his notes supply a running commentary on the text. The volume is full of interest and throws much light on the work of the literary and antiquarian explorers of the eighteenth century.

According to the blurb, *Before the Romantics*[3] is an 'exploration of Dryden, Pope, and the other poets and prose writers of the Enlightenment. It ranges from Samuel Butler to Dr. Johnson and Fuseli' and goes 'not only to poets and men of letters, but to scientists, architects, painters, gardeners, theologians, mystics and philosophers' in the effort to show that 'the period is not the desert of dry thought, political controversy and empty love songs it is too often held to be'. Grigson made his anthology 'to show something of the variety and vigour of a hundred and fifty years of thinking, theorizing, and writing' and he has succeeded in his endeavour to prove—if proof is still necessary—that 'rules and regulations failed . . . to flatten out all of what we call imagination'. His selection contains much that is unfamiliar to the general reader and even the initiated will find a good deal that is fresh. Further, the very personal and independent views expressed in the notes will afford entertainment as well as information to all.

There is every reason to be grateful to Richard Schlatter for his scholarly edition of *The History of the Kingdom of Basaruch*[4] and

[3] *Before the Romantics: An Anthology of the Enlightenment*, chosen by Geoffrey Grigson. Routledge. pp. xii+350. 10*s.* 6*d.*

[4] *The History of the Kingdom of Basaruch and Three Unpublished Letters*, by Joseph Morgan, ed. Richard Schlatter. Harvard U.P. and O.U.P. pp. 172. $4 or 22*s.* 6*d.*

his conclusive attribution of its authorship to Joseph Morgan, a New Jersey Congregational minister and theologian. The work is an allegory in the tradition of Bunyan, and a lively and readable defence of Calvinistic doctrine as interpreted by American Puritanism. Morgan is much more tolerant than most of the believers, and his allegory makes their grim creed at least credible to the modern reader. This is due in part to the excellence of his style and his mastery of the allegoric form, which enable him to sustain interest in an almost entirely doctrinal exposition with little narrative background. As Schlatter says: 'the symbols hold together and make a good story by themselves while at the same time they fit neatly at all points the things symbolized . . . the author manages to describe the Calvinist theology accurately in the guise of the history of a mythical kingdom, and yet that history itself makes a logical and dramatic story independently of the theology it symbolizes.'

To students of literature, Morgan's work is of primary importance in the evolution of symbolism and as the earliest example of what deserves to be called the American novel. It is an historical document of first-rate interest.

The collection of Beattie papers which belongs to the University of Aberdeen, contains *inter alia* the diary[5] of the poet's visit to London in 1773, the object of which was to secure a pension. This diary is now for the first time printed and fully annotated by R. S. Walker, who includes also an extract from Beattie's Day-Book recording his expenditure for the year in question, a map of London at the time of his visit, a map of the road to London, various other portraits and contemporary illustrations, together with facsimile reproductions of letters to and from Beattie and of pages from the Day-Book. The editor's Introduction gives an account of Beattie's life and of the *Essay on Truth*, in his own day reckoned higher than the *Minstrel*, by which he is now chiefly remembered.

It is true that Beattie was no Boswell, but he came into personal touch with many of the same people as the greater diarist as well as with the ministers, the Court and the king and queen themselves. His experiences, impressions and the progress of his mission are

[5] *James Beattie's London Diary*, ed. Ralph S. Walker. Aberdeen Univ. Press. pp. 146. 12*s.* 6*d.*

described with obvious sincerity and we derive new insight into the social life of the period from his account—the more so that he was writing for himself and without any thought of a wider audience. Nor do we like him less for his naïve enjoyment and recording of all the compliments he received, e.g. from Mr. Burke who 'spoke of the style of the *Essay on Truth* in the highest terms of approbation, and gave it such preference . . . as must have flattered the most exorbitant vanity. Johnson has often spoken of it in the same terms'. Reynolds, too, insisted on painting his portrait in the allegorical picture (reproduced) of 'The Triumph of Truth', while the King informed him that he 'never stole a book but one, and that was yours. I stole it from the Queen.' The method of securing a pension also reveals with fresh vividness the evils of dependence on literary patronage. It is not merely for such particular aspects but also for the general view of contemporary life and conditions that the modern reader is indebted to the writer and his editor.

This selection of Crabbe's *Poems*[6] comprises *The Village, Book 1*, *The Parish Register: Baptisms*, and ten complete sections from *The Borough*, including *Peter Grimes*. Philip Henderson provides an Introduction which contains a brief biography and criticism of the poet and there are also twenty-eight notes and a frontispiece reproducing Chantrey's drawing of Crabbe. The volume is confined to Crabbe's earlier and most characteristic verse: it presents 'a pretty complete picture of Georgian and Regency rural and provincial society such as we get nowhere else. . . . Crabbe . . . gives us the actual Suffolk landscape in a series of pictures that have the detailed precision and sombre colouring of the Dutch genre painters'. This quotation may serve to show that Henderson, in his criticism as well as in his selections, is able to present a fair sample of Crabbe's quality. The little volume forms an excellent introduction to both the poet and his poems.

*Poems of Robert Burns*[7] (selected) in Penguin Books contains a summary life of the poet, a list of common Scottish words, English

[6] *Poems, by George Crabbe*, selected by Philip Henderson. Lawson and Dunn. pp. xxii+134. 6*s*. 6*d*.

[7] *Poems of Robert Burns*, selected by Henry W. Meikle and William Beattie. Penguin Books. pp. xiv+191. 1*s*.

renderings of less common ones where they occur and reprints of poems and songs which cover some 115 pp. and form a representative selection from all sources. Finally there is an index of titles and first lines to complete an admirable pocket-edition.

Fuller note has been made above (p. 188) of J. Horne's account of *The Phalars Controversy: King versus Bentley* in which he shows that behind all the personal attacks on Bentley 'was the resentment of conservative taste at the successful re-statements of inductive scholarship. To this extent the men of letters like King and Pope, and a large section of the University men, were defending themselves against a new scholarship that owed something of its inspiration to science'.

In his lecture to a Dutch audience on *Daniel Defoe*,[8] Bonamy Dobrée naturally does not attempt to deal with every aspect of that elusive, multifarious and attractive writer. What he attempts, however, he successfully achieves. No one can read his account without a fresh realization of Defoe's genius, which 'never fails to produce delighted surprise'. 'His writing remains fresh, his pictures amazingly vivid, his touch on so many sides of human emotion so beautifully sure.' This final summing-up is amply illustrated by the points previously made in the lecture.

The gradual development of periodical literature at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries coincides with the abolition of the censorship of the press and with the decline of literary patronage. The journalist with his living to make had 'to cater to the whims and prejudices of his readers, to keep them supplied with the current political gossip, or to divert them with the novel and salacious'. 'For something well over a decade Ward was certainly among the leaders of the new movement', but 'limited in his capacities and talent, he turned to [his] only available source of material—his own contemporary world'. No other

[8] *Daniel Defoe*, by Bonamy Dobrée. Allard Pierson Stichting, No. 20. Univ. of Amsterdam. Groningen: J. B. Wolters. pp. 24.

writer of his day (1667–1731) has presented an equally vivid and all-embracing picture of the contemporary scene: the streets and taverns and coffee-houses of London, the men and women who loitered in them, their tales and gossip and political factions come to life again in his pages. In his *Ned Ward of Grubstreet*,[9] H. W. Troyer for the first time makes a detailed study of his subject and it is soon obvious to the reader that his work is accomplished with zest as well as competence. He has enjoyed his excursion into eighteenth-century London, with the result that he helps us to enjoy it too, even when it transports us into strange and not always very reputable company—on the whole perhaps more congenial when met in Troyer's pages than in the coarser portrayal of Ward himself.

The Appendices, which cover over fifty pages, give a bibliography of Ward's writings and also the doubtful attributions to him. There are notes to each chapter, and an adequate index.

In *The Meaning of Matthew Prior's 'Alma'* (*E.L.H.*, Dec.), Monroe K. Spears sets out to controvert Johnson's criticism that it 'seems never to have had a plan'. Spears attempts to show on the contrary 'that the plan is an expression of Pyrrhonism, and that the poem of which it is the core is a significant and characteristic application of this philosophy to contemporary thought'. 'It is also an epitome of Prior's version of the sceptical philosophy.'

In *P.M.L.A.* (March), Wallace Cable Brown discusses *Gay's Mastery of the Heroic Couplet*, and maintains that his achievements in that form 'are greater than has been generally recognized'. To prove his point Brown makes a detailed examination of Gay's poems in heroic couplets.

Of the *Four Essays on 'Gulliver's Travels'*[10] by the late Arthur E. Case, the most important is that on 'Personal and Political Satire'. This supplements Firth's lecture (see *Y.W.*, i, 3) on *The Political Significance of 'Gulliver's Travels'* by showing that Swift's satire is more far-reaching than has been hitherto recognized. The allegory

[9] *Ned Ward of Grubstreet: A Study of Sub-Literary London in the Eigtheenth Century*, by Howard William Troyer. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xii+290. $ 3.50 and 20*s*.

[10] *Four Essays on 'Gulliver's Travels'*, by Arthur E Case. Princeton Univ. Press and O.U.P. 1945. pp. 134. $2 or 11*s*. 6*d*.

symbolizes more than Irish affairs and the battle over Wood's half-pence, while Munodi stands for Oxford, not for Viscount Midleton. Case proves his claim in detail, incidentally succeeding in his contention that 'the third voyage is much more unified in purpose than has commonly been supposed'. Its purpose 'is not . . . to attack the new science, but to attack learned folly . . . and especially innovations and innovators in general' with special reference to the Whig ministry and its 'experimentation in the field of government'. The paper on 'The Significance of "Gulliver's Travels" ' amplifies the argument by its analysis *inter alia* of Swift's motives in writing and its exposition of the unity of design in the work as a whole. Like most competent commentators on Swift, Case concludes by an emphatic denial of the common assertion that he was a misanthrope.

The essay on 'The Text of "Gulliver's Travels" ' is an attempt to show the unreliability of Faulkner's edition of 1735. In this Case differs from other authorities, notably Hubbard (*Bibliography of Gulliver's Travels*, 1922) and Harold Williams, both of whom have shown reason for their preference for Faulkner's variants. 'The Geography and Chronology of "Gulliver's Travels" ' are subjected to minute investigation in the remaining paper.

The Alexander Lectures of Herbert Davis on *Stella, A Gentlewoman of the Eighteenth Century*[11] were published in 1942 but unfortunately have only now been available for notice in *Y.W.* They are too important to be passed over even at this late date. The theme of the lectures is best stated in the Introduction which did not originally form part of them when delivered at the University of Toronto. Davis writes: 'In the process of making literature out of his experience of friendship with Esther Johnson . . . Swift does more than set before us an individual person who lived a very private life among a small circle of friends in Dublin during the first quarter of the eighteenth century; for he is working at the same time at a larger subject in which he was always intensely interested, a study of the English gentlewoman, and her place in an enlightened society.' Thus the title of the lectures is 'symbolic' rather than descriptive: Davis is attempting to continue the study of C. S. Lewis in his *Allegory of Love*. He is dealing with 'the

[11] *Stella, A Gentlewoman of the Eighteenth Century*, by Herbert Davis. New York: Macmillan. 1942, pp. xiv + 104. 7*s*. 6*d*.

development of the romantic conception of woman' from the Elizabethan Age to the time of Swift. The resulting lectures are fascinating in their breadth and depth of treatment. It is good to be lifted out of the region of surmise and gossip about Stella and to be shown how 'to isolate and scrutinize certain qualities in Swift's mind and art', and his 'mingling of satire and laughter and tenderness'.

Churchill's *P.E.N. Book*[12] on Swift as the champion of human liberty is slight in bulk and in content, the writer being very emphatic in the statement of opinions that are commonly accepted by competent critics of the present day. It is difficult to know whom he has in mind when he attacks 'those who assert that Swift was indifferent to liberty and conscience, and just wrote to order or from injured vanity', or who nowadays is supposed to take seriously the ironical suggestion of the *Modest Proposal.* But at any rate Churchill makes it clear that he thoroughly enjoys his opportunity to air his views not only on Swift but on the 'more vulgar mind of Thackeray' and on some of his fellow 'literary journalists' who also make no claim to profound critical insight or historical knowledge. It will doubtless be a relief to know that he agrees 'with the world and Mr. A. L. Rowse in placing Gulliver first, rather than with Mr. Quintana, who prefers the *Tale of a Tub*'.

H. L. Lorimer writes on *Homer and Pope* (*T.L.S.*, 9 March and 4 May).

Charlotte E. Crawford answers her question *What was Pope's Debt to Edward Young?* (*E.L.H.*, Sept.) by a comparison between the seven satires of *The Universal Passion* and Pope's 'grave epistles'. She substantiates the existence of a marked resemblance, especially in their 'characteristical satire', and believes Pope to have been indebted to Young.

T. C. Duncan Eaves (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.) discusses the history and authenticity of *Joseph Highmore's Portrait of the Reverend Edward Young* which he believes to be the 'one indisputable likeness' that exists of the poet.

In the *U.T.Q.*, Vol. xv, No. 2 W. L. MacDonald writes an article entitled *A French Life of Pope*, in which he describes the

[12] *He Served Human Liberty: An Essay on the Genius of Jonathan Swift*, by R. C. Churchill. Allen and Unwin. pp. 56. 2*s.* 6*d.*

biography of 215 pages prefixed to the 1763 edition of the *Oeuvres diverses de Pope, traduites de l'anglois*. It is, he claims, an admirable, critical life of Pope, and the first in date upon which dependence can be placed.

*The 'Spectator' Tradition and the Development of the Familiar Essay* is the subject of a paper by Melvin R. Watson in *E.L.H.* (Sept.). In it he claims that 'the ulterior purpose of the eighteenth-century essay', that of reforming society, was 'at variance with the spirit of the familiar essay' and that its audience was 'limited to a class', whereas 'the familiar essay was universal in its appeal'. From this premise, Watson proceeds to show that by 1820 'the tradition had been completely transformed into a new creation which had few resemblances to the old'.

*Satire and Comedy in the Works of Henry Fielding* are examined in detail by W. R. Irwin (*E.L.H.*, Sept.) who considers that Fielding's 'early satires, except for *Tom Thumb*, are now largely forgotten or deprecated', because they occur chiefly in the dramatic essays of his youth. Irwin is at pains to show that 'during a dozen years' of miscellaneous satiric writing, Fielding was in fact developing the theory of 'comedy operating in the novels' later on. 'There is a constancy of artistic spirit and intention throughout, which can be seen by comparing his literary satire with his narrative comedy.'

Nettie S. Tillett (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.) in an article entitled *Is Coleridge Indebted to Fielding?* makes the interesting suggestion that Coleridge's views upon the supernatural and the familiar quotation concerning 'the willing suspension of disbelief for the moment' may ultimately have been influenced by and be reminiscent of similar passages in Fielding. She cites in illustration the Introduction to Book VIII of *Tom Jones* which she compares with Chapters 14 and 22 of *Biographia Literaria*, and concludes that it is 'a not unreasonable assumption' that 'there is a link between Fielding's "wonderful long chapter" and Coleridge's well-known passages'.

*The Death of Walpole: Henry Fielding and a Fogotten Cause Célèbre* by R. C. Jarvis (*M.L.R.*, April) ascribes to Fielding a

pamphlet entitled *The Charge to the Jury on the Sum of Evidence on the Trial of A.B.C.D. and E.F. all M.D. for the Death of one Robert at Orfud* which was sold at Sotheby's on 15 February 1926 and dates from the year of Robert Walpole's death, 1745—a period in which it has been commonly held that Fielding had withdrawn from political journalism and wrote nothing. *The Charge to the Jury* appeared in July, and is full of the writer's characteristic irony. Jarvis claims that the 'touchstone of his style' proves it without doubt to be Fielding's work.

In *M.L.R.* (Jan.) R. T. Williams points out in a note that the opening of Coleridge's *Inside the Coach* (1791) is a burlesque of the first lines of Dyer's *Grongar Hill.*

In a note in *M.L.R.* (Oct.) entitled *Alas, Poor Eliza,* Rufus D. S. Putney shows reason to believe that Sterne's epitaph ('Columns and Labour'd urns but vainly shew', etc.) and the accompanying letter dated by his daughter 9 April 1767, referred to Mrs. James and not to Eliza Draper, and that there is therefore no reason to place them a month earlier as has been done by Curtis in his edition of Sterne's correspondence. In *T.L.S.* (9 March) Putney corrects P. Quennell's account of *Sterne's Eliza.*

Robert B. Heilman (*R.E.S.*, July) in a note on *Falstaff and Smollett's Micklewhimmen* holds that Smollett's character in *Humphry Clinker* 'borrows heavily from the treatment of Falstaff in *1 Henry IV*, II, iv'. Heilman points out, in confirmation of his opinion, that not only is Smollett indebted to Shakespeare in this instance, but that there are twelve other references to him in this novel alone.

The three essays entitled *Johnson Agonistes,*[13] *Boswell's Boswell* and *Johnson's 'Irene'* now appearing under the imprint of Cambridge, have all previously been published by the University of California Press (1944) but were not then sent to *Y.W.* for notice. The volume is to be welcomed by English readers as a contribution to the understanding of the mind and character of the two men whose names are inseparably linked in literary history. Bronson contrives to be fresh and independent in his approach to Johnson without any attempt to be 'original' at the expense of

[13] *Johnson Agonistes and Other Essays,* by B. H. Bronson. C.U.P. pp. 156. 8*s.* 6*d.*

either his subject or of other critics. Consequently his conclusions are of interest, especially on such subjects as Johnson's 'conservatism' and 'pessimism'. It is illuminating to be reminded by definite illustrations that 'it is of the essence of Johnson's nature that his very acceptances should be strenuous, hard won and with difficulty held'. For him it is literally true that 'to strive with difficulties and to conquer them is the highest human felicity'; above all else he is a born fighter, characterized till the very end by the dynamic quality of his personality and outlook.

As a result of his detailed study of the *Private Papers*, Bronson elaborates his belief in Boswell's 'strenuous and lifelong effort to know himself, and honestly to acknowledge in writing whatever self-scrutiny revealed': hence the 'unparalleled reality, the unrivalled veracity of that record' in the *Journals*, the *Tour* and the *Life of Johnson*.

The third essay, on *Johnson's 'Irene'*, is a detailed study of the origins, first draft and worth of the play which earlier critics, e.g. Leslie Stephen, dismiss as almost unreadable. Bronson agrees that its 'most abiding interest' lies in its 'reflection of Johnson's personality and view of life', and makes the interesting suggestion that in the character of Irene's confidante, who 'dominates the play' Johnson depicts his ideal woman, and probably makes his 'marriage offering' to his newly-wedded wife. In his amusing imitation of one of Johnson's own 'short strictures', Bronson finally summarizes his verdict that 'this tragedy is one of the works upon which our author has apparently laboured; but as success in works of invention is not always proportionate to labour, it is not finished at last with the happy force of some other of his pieces wherein he seems to have produced without labour, what no labour can improve'.

In Part X of his *Johnsonian Gleanings*,[14] A. L. Reade summarizes, condenses and recasts the facts collected in his earlier publications, producing a concise and attractive narrative of Johnson's early life up to 1740. Reade's work, a labour of love begun some forty years ago, contains the results of investigation and research not previously available, and this volume which presents the consoli-

[14] *Johnsonian Gleanings, Part X. Johnson's Early Life: The Final Narrative*, by Aleyn Lyell Reade. The Author, Treleaven House, Blundellsands. pp.xii + 224. 26*s*.; subscribers 21*s*.

dated material in 'a succinct and readable' form will be appreciated by all Johnsonians. No one else has equal right to deal with the evidence, in large part first collected by Reade himself: few could have presented it so well as he has done.

Outstanding among Reade's discoveries in the 'Early Life' are such things as the length of Johnson's stay at Oxford, details of his courtship and marriage and of his various attempts at schoolmastering. In Part XI we are promised a 'consolidated index of names to the whole series' in order to 'obviate the heartbreaking necessity of looking through eleven separate indexes for any desired name'. This is typical also of Reade's ambition in this volume to make 'the mass of information' he has accumulated more easily accessible to his readers.

In his Robert Spence Watson Memorial Lecture, C. C. Abbott selected as his subject *Boswell*.[15] His main thesis concerns *My Journal*, 'kept with varying fullness over a period of thirty-three years' and discovered, after a 'fantastic' history, partly in Malahide Castle in 1927 and 1930 and partly by Abbott himself, with the willing co-operation of Lord Clinton, at Fettercairn House. The detailed story is told elsewhere (see *Y.W.*, xvii, 207–8). In this lecture, Abbott deals mainly with Boswell's genius and with his character as revealed in the *Journal*, which is summed up as 'a passionate pursuit of life, an attempt to catch the moment as it flies, on the wing, and rescue it from oblivion's poppy'. 'The claim he made for his *Life* of Johnson—"the whole exhibiting a view of literature and literary men in Great Britain, for near half a century"—is fairly met, and his *Journal*, with its multitude of men and women, has an even wider range.'

The lecture merits the attention even of those who have long recognized Boswell's integrity as a writer and his power to give 'an honest picture of human nature',—and not least of 'the clash of appetite and aspiration in himself'.

*Mrs. Piozzi's Omissions from Johnson's Letters to Thrales* by R. W. Chapman (*R.E.S.*, Jan.) is an examination of all the available evidence on the subject. Chapman's conclusion is that Mrs.

[15] *Boswell*, by Claude Colleer Abbott. Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, pp. 24. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Piozzi was not guilty of tampering with Johnson's letters but that 'she seems to have been, at the worst, indifferent honest'.

*T.L.S.* (2 March). Chapman dates some letters of *Johnson and Boswell* in 1784. On 14 September he has a note on *Boswell's Editors*. *N.& Q.* (23 Feb.) has a note by him on Mrs. Thrale's use of the title of '*Doctor*' *Johnson*.

W. K. Winsatt has an account of *Johnson and Scots* in *T.L.S.* (9 March).

To *N. & Q.* (7 Sept.) Claude E. Jones contributes two hitherto unpublished letters to *Herbert Croft* from *Johnson and Mrs Montagu*.

*Samuel Johnson and the First Roller Spinning Machine* (*M.L.R.*, Jan.) by John J. Brown links him with the inventions of Lewis Paul and suggests that he helped in their development. Brown gives documentary proof by reference to Johnson's correspondence with Paul and also bases his conjecture on the fact that he was in the district when the invention was being perfected. His lifelong sympathy for inventors is well known. In the same periodical (Oct.) J. de L. Mann continues the discussion and points out that the two documents cited by Brown 'only show that he was intimate with Paul' and 'probably interested in the machine'. There is nothing to indicate that Johnson 'ever took an active part in developing the invention', and Brown's conjectures are 'at variance with the rest of the evidence' on the subject.

*The Hooded Hawk*[16] shows Wyndham Lewis as an enthusiastic admirer of Boswell, and one who is well versed in all the most recent discoveries and criticism concerning his protagonist. The material is used to produce a biography in the approved modern style, and if this result reads rather like fiction than sober criticism, this is probably the impression which the writer intended to convey. At any rate his conclusions are based upon solid foundations of fact, and we need not quarrel with his successful endeavour to portray Boswell more nearly in his true colours than he is commonly presented to the ordinary reader. Scholars may sometimes differ from Lewis and desire to add to or subtract from his statements or speculations. But like other people, they must share the

[16] *The Hooded Hawk or the Case of Mr. Boswell*, by D. B. Wyndham Lewis. Eyre and Spottiswoode, pp. 281. 12*s.* 6*d.*

obvious enjoyment of the writer in his task. Of him, as of Boswell, it is true that 'his intentions are so manifestly good that only the most rancid censor could pass them over'.

In answer to the claims made for *Ursa Major*[17] on its paper cover suffice it to say that the book will emphatically not be 'acceptable to all true Johnsonians' and that it is in no degree 'a work of scholarship'. It is true that Vulliamy has read widely in his period and author, but he shows himself to be undiscriminating and uncritical in the deductions he draws and obsessed by prejudices which stultify his powers of judgment. Thus he can find nothing to praise in Boswell but 'a somewhat unusual facility in writing' while Mrs. Thrale can be defended only by 'a hypothesis of mental and emotional instability'. Again, 'it is doubtful whether many people could now read [Johnson's] poems for pleasure, or, indeed, read them at all', while in *The Lives of the Poets*, 'the style of Johnson is to be seen at his best and his opinions at their worst'. 'Those who turn to the *Lives of the Poets* are well advised if they read only the biographies, which are often so admirable, and leave the critical parts alone.'

Vulliamy holds that his opinions are those which are 'legitimately deducible from the evidence'. He must not complain if to others they appear to be perverse and wrong-headed.

Edward D. Seebor and Henry H. Remak have a joint note in *M.L.R.* (Jan.) on *The First French Translation of 'The Deserted Village'* which they ascribe to Charles-Michel Campion, 1734–84, of Orleans and Marseilles. They possess the MS. in question which they consider 'an interesting and skilful example of eighteenth-century translation, and a piece that reveals distinctive and significant qualities of the age', though Goldsmith's charm of language and rhythm suffer.

*M.L.N.* (Feb.) has a paper by John P. Emery on *Murphy's authorship of the notes of Smart's 'Hilliad'* and a note by Ralph M. Williams on *John Dyer's degree from Cambridge*.

In *S in Ph.* (Jan.) Edward H. Weatherly examines Churchill's *Literary Indebtedness to Pope*, showing by a detailed study 'how often he followed in Pope's footsteps' in spite of his 'outspoken

[17] *Ursa Major, A Study of Dr. Johnson and his Friends*, by C. E. Vulliamy. Michael Joseph. pp. 340. 15*s*.

preference for Dryden and his frequent slighting references to Pope'. Weatherly is led to the conclusion that perhaps the work of Pope was 'the most important single literary influence on Churchill's poetic career'.

*T.L.S.* (22 June) contains notes by Alan Herrick on *Eighteenth-Century Verse.*

R. W. Ketton-Cremer's life of *Horace Walpole*[18] was first published in 1940, but, as it did not then come to the *Y.W.* for notice, must now be welcomed in its second edition. For the writer shows himself to be a judicious and understanding biographer, who deals with Walpole's many-sided interests and activities with sympathy, knowledge and urbanity. The first paragraph of the Preface sounds the keynote to the volume: 'Horace Walpole deliberately set himself to chronicle the social and political history of his age. . . . When painting for future centuries an elaborate and splendid panorama of his own, he did not neglect to place on he canvas an elaborately finished self-portrait.' Later the author states his intention 'to show Walpole as a kindlier, wiser, more consistent and more straightforward man than our forebears would allow him to be and . . . to give full value to the extent and variety of his achievement'. This promise is fulfilled. The author uses some fresh evidence and makes good use of all available material, old and new; his facts are well-documented and the authorities cited. But it is rather by his judicious employment of his material and his balanced point of view than by his discoveries that Ketton-Cremer's biography ranks as an original contribution to our knowledge of Walpole's life and to the estimate of his worth.

The accounts given of Walpole's quarrel with Gray and the consequent estrangement between them and of Chatterton's fruitless application to Walpole, with the unhappy controversy that resulted, are two outstanding examples of Ketton-Cremer's treatment of his subject. The book at long last presents Walpole in his right position as man, politician, antiquary and historian.

*Lady Luxborough Goes to Bath*[19] is an attempt 'to revive the details of the everyday life of a "lady of quality" in the most popular

[18] *Horace Walpole*, by R. W. Ketton-Cremer. Faber. pp. 334. 21*s.*

[19] *Lady Luxborough Goes to Bath*, by Marjorie Williams. Blackwell, pp. 67. 12*s.* 6*d.*

of English spas' in the year 1752. It is obvious, even without the acknowledgments, that the writer, Marjorie Williams, has based her account on fact and that her every detail, whetherof topography or description of the daily routine, is authentic. But the picture is sketched with the lightest of touches and there is no parade of the learning which forms its background. Though only a scholar could have written such a book, it is one to be read and appreciated by everyone with a taste for social history. The illustrations and end-papers are as attractive as the text of the book, of which they form an integral part.

Ilse Dusoir Lind's doctoral thesis on *Richard Jago*[20] has only just arrived in time for notice this year. It is a further study of a member of Shenstone's Warwickshire circle and is written with the enjoyment which the coterie seems to inspire in those who devote themselves to this little band of minor eighteenth-century men of letters. Miss Lind's essay has the notes and bibliography (but not the index) required for its purpose, but it does not suffer from its academic presentation. She has succeeded in giving life and interest to her theme and in rendering it a pleasant task to make Jago's acquaintance and to share Shenstone's liking for him. Without placing his success as a poet too high, she estimates Jago's achievement in *Edge-Hill* justly and relates it to the age in which it was written. 'To claim more for him than that he fulfilled his own modest aim with moderate success is unwarranted', and 'one last view of him is that of a self-possessed old man, puttering contentedly in his garden'. She makes her point that 'for anyone who would understand eighteenth-century localism there is something to be gained from a close examination of *Edge-Hill*' and its author.

T. G. Snoddy[21] in his scholarly work claims that Michael Bruce was one of the young poets who, like Chatterton and Fergusson, died ere he had attained the eminence to which his gifts entitled him but whose actual achievement is full of promise. Most of Snoddy's book is concerned with the authorship of the *Ode to the Cuckoo*, to which John Logan, Bruce's fellow-student and first

[20] *Richard Jago: A Study in Eighteenth Century Localism*, by Ilse Dusoir Lind. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania. 1945. pp. viii+118.

[21] *Michael Bruce, Shepherd Poet of the Lomond Braes, 1746–1767*, by T. G. Snoddy. Blackwood. pp. x+ 224. 10*s*. 6*d*.

editor laid claim. There is little if any doubt that Bruce was the writer and Snoddy's review of the evidence is convincing. So too is his account of the whole relationship between the two men and the attribution of the scriptural paraphrases also published among Logan's poems.

It is unfortunate that after comparative neglect since Foot's biography in 1811, two full-dress studies of *Arthur Murphy*[22] should have appeared in the same year by two American scholars, and the more surprising that one of them, Dunbar, several times refers to the other's 'unpublished thesis' with which apparently he was well acquainted. Knowledge of work-in-progress should have prevented an overlap which must be annoying to both. We had occasion to note similar inadvertence when Shenstone's *Letters* found two editors in the same year. In fact Murphy and his work required examination in the light of modern scholarship; his two critics do not reveal that he deserved so much time and attention as have now been bestowed upon him. Both treat their subject with judgment and in fullest detail, devoting their main attention to his dramatic work. Both are on the whole commendably restrained and judicious in their estimate of his achievement, though Emery does not succeed in his attempt to place Murphy's comedies in the same rank as those of Goldsmith and Sheridan. We think Dunbar is nearer the mark when he concludes that they 'are among the very best of the period'. At any rate Murphy avoided the pitfalls of sentimentalism and of licentiousness: he used his talent to produce genuine comedies of manners, with 'dialogue . . . easy and natural . . . plots neatly constructed . . . situations effective . . . wit amusing . . . characters well drawn'. Dunbar interprets the material he has collected with sound understanding of its bearing. Emery writes with greater ease and in that respect perhaps his book is more likely to attract readers. But both authors succeed in the task they have undertaken and give a well-substantiated estimate of a half-forgotten dramatist of considerable historic if not intrinsic importance.

[22] *The Dramatic Career of Arthur Murphy*, by Howard Hunter Dunbar. New York: M.L.A.A. and O.U.P. pp. x+340. 21*s*.

*Arthur Murphy: An Eminent English Dramatist of the Eighteenth Century*, by John Pike Emery. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press and O.U.P. pp. x+224. 20*s*.

The current number of the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*[23] is dedicated to the memory of Sir William Jones (1746–94) in celebration of the bi-centenary of his birth. It contains various articles dealing with all aspects of his work as Orientalist, jurist, man-of-letters and poet. Those which chiefly concern the *Y.W.* are by A. J. Arberry, on *New Light on Sir William Jones*, and on *Orient Pearls at Random Strung*; by V. de Sola Pinto on *Sir William Jones and English Literature* and by L. F. Powell on *Sir William Jones and the Club*. So, at long last, justice is done to the many-sided work and influence of the scholar and poet who has hitherto been so undeservedly neglected.

A. J. Arberry combats the accusation of Jones's revolutionary sympathies and successfully maintains that he 'took his stand first and last on the Constitution', objecting only to the 'unconstitutional enlargement of the powers of the Crown' which resulted in the war with America. *Orient Pearls at Random Strung*, Arberry's second essay, is a detailed account of *Shīrāzi Turk* and of Jones's rendering of it into *A Persian Song*.

V. de Sola Pinto points out in his essay that except 'for an occasional short poem in an anthology' no poetical or critical work of Jones has been reprinted since Chalmers included him among *The English Poets* in 1810. At that date Jones could scarcely have been omitted from such a collection since his writings were widely read and popular in the early part of the nineteenth century. His importance lay as much in his indication of 'new types of imagery and subject matter' as in the intrinsic worth of his verse, and we have his own statement to prove that he knew very well what he intended to do for English poetry. He set out to introduce 'the principal writings of the Asiatics' so as to 'open for speculation a new and ample field', to provide 'a new set of images and similitudes and a number of excellent models' which 'future scholars might explain and future poets imitate'. Pinto examines Jones's literary work in detail and estimates his nine *Hymns* on Hindu mythology as his most considerable achievement in poetry. His influence on other writers and particularly on Shelley is judged as considerable and the essay concludes with the following summary: 'Jones deserves to be recognized as an English poet in his own right; he was also a scholar, who, like Sir James Frazer in our time, had

[23] *The Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (Univ. of London), Vol xi, Part 4. Luzac and Co. pp. 669-912. 15*s*.

the power of kindling the imagination of some of the most significant writers of his age.'

In *Sir William Jones and the Club*, L. F. Powell first of all points out that, in spite of its exclusiveness, the Club elected Jones a member in 1773 when he was only twenty-six years of age, and when Johnson, Reynolds and Burke, its founders, were still active participants in its doings. After being called to the Bar in 1774, Jones became too immersed in business to attend the meetings regularly, but by 1780 he was sufficiently popular to be elected president of the Club. He became friendly though not intimate with Johnson, and, in spite of strongly divergent political opinions, the two men respected and admired one another. Jones described Johnson as 'one of the most sagacious men in this age', while Johnson thought Jones 'as splendid a literary character as any to be named' and 'the most enlightened of the sons of men'.

A. J. Arberry's monograph on *Asiatic Jones, Pioneer of Indian Studies*[24] is a readable and enthusiastic tribute to the many-sided work and achievement of the great man who was in so many respects far in advance of his own age. It is as philologist and man-of-letters that he chiefly concerns readers of *Y.W.*, but for them as for others his achievement cannot be confined to any one aspect of his work. A perusal of Arberry's brief account of it leaves the reader convinced of the justice of the estimate of Dr. Parr: 'It is happy for us that this man was born'—not merely because of his multifarious learning but because he was, as Johnson called him, 'the most enlightened of the sons of men', ripe in wisdom as well as in knowledge.

One error in Arberry's account should be noted. It was not Jones, but Johnson in the Preface to the *Dictionary* who wrote that 'Words are the daughters of earth, things are the sons of heaven' (p. 33). If Jones uses the phrase, it must be as a quotation.

In an article in *R.E.S.* (April) on *Percy's Hau Kiou Chouaan*, T. C. Fan shows that 'there can be no doubt' that it is a version of an authentic Chinese original and not an ingenious fake. 'The Chinese original, a quaint work of popular fiction, is still available, though seldom read'. Percy 'was more scrupulous and less dogmatic than most of his contemporaries, though somewhat un-

[24] *Asiatic Jones. The Life and Influence of Sir William Jones (1746-94)*, by A. J. Arberry. Pub. for the British Council by Longmans, Green. pp. 40.

critical and by no means always judicious' in the use of his materials, and 'he must be remembered as the first man, so far as we know, who introduced the Chinese novel into Europe'.

In *R.E.S.* (Oct.) Fan in an essay entitled *Sir William Jones's Chinese Studies* continues his investigations into Oriental influences on English scholarship, and concludes that Jones was 'a worthy precursor' of the 'British sinologues of the nineteenth century'.

George Woodcock's biographical study of *William Godwin*[25] claims to be the first detailed modern account of the life, work and influence of the remarkable man whose significance it would be difficult to over-estimate, not only on his own generation but on all subsequent upholders of libertarian social philosophy and individual freedom.

Woodcock's championship is whole-hearted and certainly makes Godwin personally much more likeable than he often appears in contemporary descriptions. But while it is well to have a right estimate of his character and achievement, this should not be obtained by glossing over those traits and beliefs which made him difficult to associate with in daily life. To take only one example. We may understand and even sympathize with Godwin's lack of 'a sense of *meum* and *tuum*', but that ought not to lead to unjust accusations of meanness (p. 202) against Crabb Robinson who, as late as 1822, subscribed thirty pounds to the fund collected for his relief, and that without any hope of its repayment. In the world as it is, where Godwin's ideas of political justice are not accepted, the basis of social intercourse rests on the commonly accepted conception of honesty. Similarly with other ideas of morality. Dissenters must conform to ordinary standards of conduct until they succeed in converting the majority to their own opinions. 'Things as they are' cannot safely be ignored by individuals—as Godwin himself, and his chief disciple, Shelley, discovered to their cost.

Students will be grateful for the detailed analysis of Godwin's works provided by Woodcock, and particularly for the very full account of *Political Justice*.

[25] *William Godwin: a Biographical Study*, by George Woodcock, *with a Foreword* by Herbert Read. Porcupine Press. pp. x+266. 12*s*. 6*d*.

W. E. Woodward's *Tom Paine, America's Godfather*[26] is an attempt to counteract the abuse which, the author says, has been showered upon Paine for 'about a hundred and fifty years' in the country to which he devoted his best efforts. In England in recent times this criticism does not apply; we may recall for example the notable pamphlet by Kingsley Martin (see *Y.W.*, vi, 259) which is not mentioned in Woodward's brief bibliography. But, as would be expected from the writer of the work under discussion, his estimate is formed after fresh and detailed research into all the facts he has been able to disentangle or discover. Consequently we may accept as final the picture presented of 'Tom Paine and his place in American history'. 'The truth is that Paine was a saint in the cause of reason and freedom, and unless he is so considered the record of his life is just a tangle of unrelated impulses', while *The Rights of Man* 'set forth the fundamental ideas on which the American republic was founded'. 'Whatever he wrote was so simple, and yet so convincing, that his enemies felt instinctively there could be no answer except by abuse and intimidation.' Paine died in 1809, but his work for human freedom and 'the brotherhood of mankind' lives on. There is no longer any excuse for enmity or recrimination through the ignorance which can be enlightened by recourse to Woodward's statement of facts.

W. P. Witcutt attempts in his psychological study of *Blake*[27] to interpret the *Prophetic Books* by means of the doctrines of Jung. The theory of the collective sub-conscious is now generally accepted by psychologists of every school and there is no need therefore to cavil at Witcutt's statement that 'There is in the unconscious mind a substratum of images which are fundamentally the same for all men, no matter of what period or race'. This assumption accounts for the wide, well-nigh universal diffusion of certain myths and legends which has so often proved a stumbling-block to students of anthropology and primitive religions. Even so, we cannot agree that Blake's symbolism is sufficiently interpreted by this theory. Blake borrowed freely from every writer on mythology, religion and similar subjects, ancient or modern, with

[26] *Tom Paine: America's Godfather, 1731-1809*, by W. E. Woodward Secker and Warburg. pp. 360. 18*s*.

[27] *Blake: a Psychological Study*, by W. P. Witcutt. Hollis and Carter. pp. 128. 8*s*. 6*d*.

whom he came in contact. His inventions and borrowings have to be tracked down if we are to understand his allusions, and the relative importance of these must be estimated as well as the weight to be attached to the collective sub-conscious and its influence.

While therefore Witcutt does not convince this writer that his elucidation of Blake's mythology is complete or final, he appears to suggest fresh lines of approach, and much that he says is of interest. We could wish that he had provided a brief bibliography and an index and that he were less sure that he had completely solved his riddle, while the work of most other interpreters could be safely ignored. There is no reference to most recent studies of Blake's symbolism in general and of the *Prophetic Books* in particular.

*Tracks in the Snow* [28] by Ruthven Todd consists of four essays, the first of which is a consideration 'of the manner in which the work of the scientists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries impacted upon those who followed them and whose interests were more purely aesthetic'. The writer himself says that he gives 'almost enough quotations to make a small anthology' and this is so much the case as to render his paper disjointed. But it nevertheless repays the reader by giving him insight into a neglected aspect of intellectual development. In 'William Blake and the Mythologists' the writer examines some of Blake's less-known sources and their influence, tracing his borrowings e.g. from 'the works of the Druidical writers, particularly those published about the end of the eighteenth century'. Todd succeeds in proving his contention 'that the realization of the part they played in the creation of Blake's universe makes it easier for us to approach and understand his essentially simple message, of the existence of the Everlasting Gospel'. In 'The Reputation and Prejudices of Henry Fuseli', Todd presents a lively and unusual portrait of that unconventional and extravagant artist, while 'The Imagination of John Martin' is a defence of that 'mad' painter who has recently come once more into favour.

*Tracks in the Snow* establishes the writer as an antiquarian with wide and unusual interests which will appeal to the like-minded and make his work attractive even to the more pedestrian student.

[28] *Tracks in the Snow: Studies in English Science and Art*, by Ruthven Todd. Grey Walls Press. pp. x+134. 12*s*. 6*d*.

The Faber Gallery volume of Blake[29] consists of ten plates beautifully reproduced in colour from the Tate Gallery collection, including four of the colour-prints presented in 1939 by Mr. W. Graham Robertson. The book is remarkably cheap in price and satisfactory in content, in spite of the difficulties of present-day publication. In addition to the plates, there is an Introduction in which Geoffrey Keynes succeeds, in a few pages, in saying something fresh and suggestive about Blake as a painter and designer, while his notes on the various reproductions describe them severally and give an account of their history. Connoisseurs as well as novices will have reason to be grateful for this admirable volume.

In *George Colman the Younger*[30] we have the first full biography of a man who as playwright, producer and finally censor, dominated the English theatre after his own father's death and Sheridan's retirement. This extract from the advertisement justifies the painstaking work of Jeremy Bagster-Collins, who has examined everything which pertains to his subject. The resultant estimate explains why he is first in the field. Colman's plays do not merit survival or revival. They may indeed be the most notable comedies of a period when the public asked for nothing but 'escape' from reality. But that does not signify that they are anything but bad in themselves, sentimental and extravagant in plot, absurd in characterization—yet a fair index to the story of the English theatre at the time of their appearance.

The book lacks an index and even a list of chapter headings to make reference easier. It is in other respects a scholarly production.

*Dr. Johnson and Company*[31] by Robert Lynd is a reprint in the *Penguin Books* of a volume that first appeared in 1927 and was noticed in *Y.W.*, viii, 269.

*English Letters of the Eighteenth Century*[32] ed. by James Aitken also reprints in *Pelican Books* a 'haphazard' selection from the correspondence of some of the chief letter-writers from Pope to

[29] *Blake, with an Introduction and Notes*, by Geoffrey Keynes. Faber. pp. 24. 6*s*.

[30] *George Colman the Younger, 1762-1836*, by Jeremy F. Bagster-Collins. New York: King's Crown Press and O.U.P. pp. viii+368. $3 or 20*s*.

[31] *Dr. Johnson and Company*, by Robert Lynd. Penguin Books. pp. 128. 1*s*.

[32] *English Letters of the Eighteenth Cenury*, ed. by James Aitken. Pelican Books. pp. 185. 1*s*.

Byron inclusive. Each writer is introduced by a brief note, and the editor has produced an attractive volume which should stimulate its readers to further study.

The principal articles in the current *Burns Chronicle*[33] are by J. C. Ewing and Andrew M'Callum on *The Falling-out at Woodley Park of Burns and Maria Riddell*, by William W. Smith on *Burns and the Scottish Flora* and by J. Minto Robertson on *Burns and Byron—A Comparison.*

In *The King of Brentford*[34] Robert Henrey re-tells in a semi-fictitious fashion the history of the Middlesex town beloved of George II, because its dirt reminded him of his native Hanover, and the one-time home of Horace Walpole and Pope, among other notables of their day who disported themselves on the banks of the Thames. The book is fully illustrated, with reproductions, among others, of several eighteenth-century prints, and though it makes no claim to scholarship, it is nevertheless the product of research and merits the attention of students as well as of the general reader.

Four of the eleven chapters in the late John Laird's *Philosophical Incursions into English Literature*[35] are concerned with eighteenth-century topics, namely, those on 'Robinson Crusoe's Philosophy', 'Pope's Essay on Man', 'Concerning Dr. Isaac Watts', and 'Shandean Philosophy'. Laird deals solely with the philosophical aspect of his subject-matter and makes no claim to be anything but 'an amateur' critic of literature, but his readers will soon discover that he has much of interest to say to them. The treatment of 'Robinson Crusoe', light-hearted as it is, is also altogether fresh, for while the 'moral' intention of the story-teller is obvious, the tale has not been previously described as 'a thoroughly philosophical romance', 'ethico-theological *pur sang*', 'a *tractatus theologico-politicus*'. It is less unexpected to find Pope's *Essay on Man* carefully examined and compared with Bolingbroke's philosophical tenets. The resulting conclusions however differ considerably from ordinary

[33] *Burns Chronicle and Club Directory.* Second Series, Vol. xxi. Burns Federation: Kilmarnock. pp. 130. 2*s* 6*d.* and 4*s.*

[34] *The King of Brentford,* by Robert Henrey. Peter Davies. pp. 176. 12*s.* 6*d.*

[35] See above, Chap. I, p. 13.

generalizations about their influence on the poet. We learn much 'Concerning Dr. Isaac Watts' and his philosophical writings which is usually overlooked by those who know him only as a hymn-writer. The 'Shandean Philosophy' sometimes turns out to be more closely allied to that of Locke than we should have expected; the philosophy of Sterne's sermons was however not so strong as their benevolence and his design in the *Sentimental Journey* was, as he described it, 'to teach us to love the world and our fellow-creatures better than we do'.

*From Classic to Romantic* [36] consists of the six Lowell Lectures delivered by W. J. Bate in 1945. 'They treat a few aspects of . . . the crucial transition which took place during the eighteenth century in European conceptions of the character, justification, and aim of art.' Bate claims that England 'perhaps more than any other single country' was responsible for this alteration of ideas, commonly, but loosely and inadequately, signified by the terms classic and romantic. 'The purpose of these lectures is to sketch some of the more significant outlines of this evolution' to describe the 'premises which underlay conceptions of taste or aesthetic judgment in English classicism and romanticism, and to connect the supplanting of the one by the other with the broader shift in European thought which it reflects'. The titles of the lectures must serve to indicate the line of the argument, viz. (1) The Classic and Neo-Classic Premises; (2) Neo-Classic Developments and Reactions; (3) Johnson and Reynolds: the Premise of General Nature; (4) The Growth of Individualism: the Premise of the Association of Ideas; (5) The Growth of Individualism: the Premise of Feeling; (6) The English Romantic Compromise.

Having shown the gradual movement away from the conviction that the essential nature of man is rational, Bate traces the growth of the belief that it consists 'either of a conglomeration of instincts, habits and feelings, or else . . . of an ego which creates and projects its own world, and which has little real hope of knowing anything else'. Finally 'the empirical but compromising good sense which traditionally characterizes British thought at its happiest, and . . . a stubborn refusal to accept for long any systematization', to-

[36] *From Classic to Romantic. Premises of Taste in Eighteenth-Century England*, by Walter Jackson Bate. Harvard Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. x + 198. $3 or 16*s*.

gether with a moderation which shows itself in 'an enviable capacity to reconcile apparently inconsistent elements' help leading English critics to avoid the 'excesses of both emotionalism and subjectivism'. It will be gathered that the lectures stimulate thought and interest.

*Le Romantisme Anglais*[37] is a notable attempt to present the various aspects of the so-called romantic movement in English literature by a series of critical essays together with translations from some of the principal writers of verse and prose. The volume is edited by Robert Kanters who writes the Introduction. Paul van Tieghem contributes an essay on *La place du romantisme anglais dans le romantisme européen*; Louis Cazamian writes on *Le symbolisme dans le romantisme anglais*. Next come papers on *Quelques Précurseurs*, *Burns* by Pierre Messiaen, *Chatterton* by Léon Lemonnier, and *Blake* by Raymond Las Vergnas. The main part of the book is naturally concerned with writers who belong to the nineteenth century, and the admirable translations are confined to their works.

But as van Tieghem recognizes 'les poètes préromantiques anglais et quelques prosateurs avaient préparé les lecteurs à une littérature plus personelle, plus libre, plus directe, plus colorée quelquefois'. The essays dealing with them justify this opinion and are valuable contributions to an outstanding effort to introduce English writers to French readers.

*The Wind that Shakes the Barley:*[38] *A Novel of the Life and Loves of Robert Burns* by James Barke is the first part of a projected trilogy to be entitled *Immortal Memory*. It is a novel, not a biography, but it is based on historical facts, and claims that it presents these accurately, except where minor deviations are necessary 'in order to achieve a profounder spiritual and artistic truth'.

In his essay (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.) on *The Associationist Criticism of Francis Hutcheson and David Hume*, Martin Kallich shows that 'the psychological critical theory of these two writers . . . will no

[37] *Les Lettres. Cahier Special* 5.6. *Le Romantisme Anglais. Études et Traductions*. Tome II. Paris: Librairie des Lettres. pp. 240. Fr. 150.

[38] *The Wind that Shakes the Barley*, by James Barke. Collins. pp. 384. 9*s*. 6*d*.

doubt suggest the real complexity of eighteenth-century critical theory to those readers who are accustomed to think of it in terms of simple and rigid formulas and of unsystematic provisions for such irrational exceptions as grace and sublimity'. Hutcheson accounts for the 'diversity of experience and its effects upon neo-classic taste by the new theory of association'. Hume, however, 'believes that principles of art must be founded on principles of human nature, or, to be more precise, that generally accepted neo-classic doctrines must be interpreted according to . . . the operations of the mind known as the association of ideas'.

In *M.L.N.* (April), A. Aronson in *The Anatomy of Taste*, discusses the meaning of Taste in eighteenth-century criticism.

In *N. & Q.* (1 June) F. T. Wood writes on *A Census of Extant Collections of English Provincial Playbills of the Eighteenth Century.* Rees and Cooper supplement his note on 29 June.

A. R. Humphreys divides into two parts his account of *The Rights of Woman in the Age of Reason* (*M.L.R.*, July), the first dealing with John Dunton to Catherine Macaulay, the second with Mary Wollstonecraft. The evidence is carefully selected and examined but the writer naturally cannot find much that is very new to say on a subject which has been pretty thoroughly explored already.

# XIII

# THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

## I

By DOROTHY MARGARET STUART

ONCE again the English Romantics have filled a large place in the literary work of 1946. Shelley and Keats have received more attention than the rest, but the publication of the third volume of the *Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*,[1] edited by the late Ernest de Selincourt and by Helen Darbishire, ranks as one of the major events of the period under review. When he died de Selincourt left the 'copy' for the last three volumes of this edition substantially ready for the press, with injunctions that the final revision should be undertaken by Miss Darbishire, who has admirably carried out this work..

The content of Volume III is rich, including the bulk of Wordsworth's sonnets; *Memorials* of various tours; *The White Doe* and other narrative poems; and an appendix with sonnets not included in the 1849–50 edition, some of them hitherto unpublished.

In the preface to her book (Yale Studies in English Series, Vol. 102), *Wordsworth's Reading in Roman Prose*[2] Jane Worthington states that her thesis is 'not merely that Wordsworth read some Roman prose, but that he read widely, sometimes even intensively, and that his reading had an appreciable effect upon his thought and work'. That he was profoundly influenced by the Roman Stoics she is able to demonstrate in her last chapter, thus establishing the connexion between the stoicism so often discerned by modern critics in his poetry and the classical philosophy from which it was derived. The first and second chapters deal with the stimulus given to Wordsworth's Roman studies by his association with the French Revolution and with the traces of Roman political theory

[1] *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. from the manuscripts by E. de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire. Vol. III. O.U.P. pp. vi+620. 25*s*.

[2] *Wordsworth's Reading in Roman Prose*, by Jane Worthington. O.U.P. pp. 84. 16*s*. 6*d*.

in the poet's own mind and work. The whole book is elaborately documented, and would make a good starting-point for further Wordsworthian exploration along similar lines.

In *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.) (Univ. of Illinois) Francis Christensen wrote on *Creative Sensibility in Wordsworth* in order to show how Wordsworth 'could place the stress he does on sensation as the source and occasion of knowledge . . . and yet at the same time hold a view of the mind or imagination as creative'. Wordsworth, according to Christensen, conceived of the senses as themselves creative: and his term for their function is 'creative sensibility'. Examples are given from the *Prelude*, the *Excursion* and the *Recluse*, and there are cross-references to S. T. Coleridge, Hartley Coleridge, and others: but it is possible to feel a little doubt as to whether this industrious commentator has rightly apprehended the exact meaning attached by Wordsworth to the word 'sensibility'.

*Southey's Revision of his 'Life of Wesley'* was the subject of a note by Raymond D. Havens (*R.E.S.*, April), giving an analysis of the notes added by Southey to a copy of the second edition (1820) now in the Library of the Johns Hopkins University.

For the subject of his Warton Lecture Basil Willey chose *Coleridge on Imagination and Fancy*,[3] considering what Coleridge meant by his celebrated distinction between Imagination and Fancy; why he thought it so important; and finally, how far it retains any importance to-day. The Imagination, Willey says, 'is the mind in its highest state of creative interest and alertness'; Fancy, in spite of Coleridge's statement that it is 'no other than a mode of Memory', is 'on a higher level than mere perception or mere memory; but it is below Imagination in that, instead of making all things new, it merely constructs patterns out of *ready-made* materials; . . . it juxtaposes images but does not fuse them into unity'. The importance of this distinction in Coleridge's eyes was that it marked 'a vital stage in his life-and-death struggle against the mechanical materialism of the eighteenth century'. Rejecting the verdict of some critics that the Fancy-Imagination distinction is 'useless', Willey reaches the conclusion that it points 'not only

[3] *Coleridge on Imagination and Fancy*, by Basil Willey. O.U.P. for British Academy. pp. 15. 2*s*.

to an observable difference between kinds of poetry but to a profound distinction in our ways of responding to experience': and that we can still use Coleridge's theory to distinguish between those contemporary poets who are successfully subduing a world far colder and more hostile than the world he knew and those who are 'merely using bygone modes to produce what is superficially or academically pleasing'.

Howard H. Creed also considers a critical theory of Coleridge's, in *Coleridge on 'Taste'* (*E.L.H.*, June). According to this theory the aesthetic reaction registers likes and dislikes instinctively. Taste is a 'faculty', and, although amenable to improvement, it must be trusted if the logical process that follows is to be of any worth. Creed offers an elaborate study of the poet's aesthetic principles, showing him to have resolved in the true Kantian manner 'the troublesome antinomy of taste'. Though Coleridge set out to teach the general public he seems to have resigned himself to 'accepting as a fact that only poets will profit in any great degree from his teaching'. His final definition of taste is that it is 'the conscious fusion of a knowing subject and a knowable object': and, in Creed's view, 'the philosophical background for the definition . . . is not romantic nonsense but a valid preliminary to a theory of the nature of poetry'.

Early in his article on *Coleridge's Sir Leoline* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) Nathan C. Starr reminds us that in *The Road to Tryermaine* Nethercot gives Hutchinson's *History of the County of Cumberland* as the source whence Coleridge derived the name of Christabel's father. Hutchinson got the story in which that name occurs from Camden's *Britannia* (1695 edition): it is a story of reconciliation, the scene set in the valley of the Severn at a place visited by Southey, Coleridge and the Misses Fricker during the summer of 1795—that summer which saw a quarrel flare up between the poets, only to be followed by appeasement and a renewal of friendship. Starr suggests that 'a triple tie links real experience, the work of art, and the literary source'; he also shows that Leoline figures elsewhere in Camden, and appears in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*.

Nettie S. Tillett's question *Is Coleridge indebted to Fielding?* (*S.*

*in Ph.*, Oct.) and her answer in the affirmative have been noted above (Ch. XII, p. 119).

*Coleridge and Priestley* provided the subject for two letters in *T.L.S.* (5 and 26 Jan.). In the first J. C. Maxwell discussed Coleridge's use of Joseph Priestley's 'picture' of the flames of two candles in the *Optics*: in the second Ethel Seaton suggested that the words 'Picture of Hymen' in Coleridge's note on that passage may be traced to Chapman's continuation of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, Sestiad V.

Byron continued to be the object of considerable study, and one 1945 volume hitherto overlooked may be recorded here. This is Paul G. Trueblood's elaborate study of *Don Juan* entitled *The Flowering of Byron's Genius*.[4] A fuller knowledge of English history in the Regency period would have enabled this diligent commentator to produce an acceptable companion to Byronic studies. As things are, he provides a guide whose leadership must be watched and questioned at almost every turn, as, for example, in an extraordinary passage on the Prince Regent (p. 119).

More important is Salvador de Madariaga's Byron Foundation Lecture—*Don Juan as a European Figure*.[5] The fascinating libertine of Spanish legend, ballad and drama is here ranked with Don Quixote, Hamlet and Faust in a constellation formed by 'the four highest stars in our European firmament'. His literary history is traced, his kinship with Faust defined, Molière and Mozart make fleeting appearances; and finally we reach the brief but arresting passages where Byron's Don Juan stands in the centre of the scene. Here we find the enunciation of a truth which eluded Trueblood: 'one must believe in order to blaspheme: and Byron's blasphemies against England, her ways and her gods, were but revelations of his deep Englishry'. But Madariaga accepts this final avatar of his hero with reserve; Byron's Spanish was lamentable; 'no one but an idle Englishman would think of turning Don Juan into a tourist'; and we learn that the Don, though he finds himself 'wafted about the world in the most exhilarating rhythm and impertinent

[4] *The Flowering of Byron's Genius*, by Paul G. Trueblood. Stanford Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. 183. 14*s.*

[5] *Don Juan as a European Figure*, by S. de Madariaga. Univ. of Nottingham. pp. 22. 1*s.* 6*d.*

style that could be dreamt of', does not thus gain anything in symbolic value or vigour as one of 'the four major characters of the European Olympus'.

Next in importance among the Byroniana of the year was an article by C. Keith on *Byron's Letters* (*Q.Q.*, winter). 'When, in 1816', writes Keith, 'England booted Byron out she little thought it was to be the making of him—as a letter-writer no less than as a poet.' To his mother and his wife his letters were singularly (though perhaps comprehensibly) uninspiring; and it took three years on the Continent to make him capable of writing love-letters such as those to the Countess Guiccioli; but his best letters, it is truly said, were written to men. 'Byron the plain man, Byron the reveller, Byron the athlete' appear vividly in his later epistles, 'but far and away outweighing all three, Byron the reader and the literary critic'. There follows a survey of the poet's reading and of his reactions to what he read; and finally he is praised for his easy, colloquial style, for 'up and down the ladder of humanity, more familiarly than any other great poet, Byron moves'.

Hoxie N. Fairchild, in a letter headed *Byron and Monk Lewis* (*T.L.S.*, 11 May), suggests that Monk Lewis's Farewell to Spain (in a poem called *The Exiles* inserted in the second volume of *The Monk*) may have given Byron the idea not only for the melancholy part of Canto II, stanzas 18–20, but also for the sea-sickness of the hero.

To *N.& Q.* (29 June) D. B. Gregor contributed *An Unpublished Letter from the Countess Guiccioli referring to Byron.* This letter was addressed to Dr. Vaccà of Pisa, whom it requested to send a prescription to relieve external pain on milord's skin. The date is 17 August (no year) and Gregor links it up with Byron's own letter to Tom Moore (27 Aug. 1822) describing severe blistering of his skin after a long swim under the noonday sun, but not mentioning the fact that during this swim the body of Shelley was being cremated on the beach at Viareggio. D. Caclamanos followed (10 Aug.) with a note, *Byron and the Countess Guiccioli*, reminding readers that the lady's second husband, the Marquis de Boissy, was quite proud of his wife's connexion with the poet.

In *Plagiarism or Parallelism?* (*N. & Q.*, 27 July) D. B. Gregor pointed out a similarity between passages in Byron's *Manfred* and Vincenzo Monti's poem *À don Sigismondo Chigi.* The quest of analogies was continued (28 Dec.) by T. O. Mabbott in a note *Chatterton and Byron: a Reminiscence?* He suggests that in the opening couplet of Byron's *Monody on Sheridan* there may be an echo of Chatterton's *Naiva and Mored*, ll. 43–4.

In *Quarterly Rev.* (April) Robert Sencourt wrote upon *Byron and Shelley at the Lake of Geneva.* This essay shows the two poets on the shore of the Lake in 1816, with Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, Clare Clairmont and Dr. Polidori among the figures in the landscape. As the result of their intercourse at Geneva Sencourt considers that the genius of all three—Byron, Shelley and Mary—gained 'an access of fervour and vigour' reflected in their writings at the time.

Shelley continued in 1946 to attract more attention than any other English poet of the period. Edmund Blunden's long, vivid and close-packed biography[6] was the outstanding event in this field. It makes good the assurance that 'it is Shelley in his own age and under its influence who is here depicted': and there is probably nothing omitted of any significance or moment—unless it be the memorable prediction of Caroline, Princess of Wales, in 1811, that 'if he (Shelley) be not clapped up in Bedlam or hanged he will certainly prove one of the sweetest singers on the tuneful margin of the Cherwell'.

This book produced a great deal of critical comment and appreciation and was the subject of an article, *The Man Shelley* (*T.L.S.*, 4 May). Dalway Turnbull reverting (11 May) to this article, under the heading *English Elegies*, put forward a plea that Swinburne's *Ave Atque Vale* should have been numbered with *Lycidas*, *Thyrsis* and Cowley's *On Mr. William Harvey* among our 'grand elegies'. Commenting on the same article J. McNully wrote (*T.L.S.*, 25 May) to point out that in *The Boat on the Serchio* as well as in *Adonais* Shelley forgot to be an atheist.

Of *The Shelley Legend*, by Robert M. Smith (in collaboration with Martha M. Schlegel, T. W. Ehrsam and L. A. Waters), no

[6] *Shelley*, by Edmund Blunden. Collins. pp. 320. 12*s.* 6*d.*

copy was received for notice in *Y.W.*, but its repercussions vibrate through the Shelley criticism of the year. This 'meandering miscellany', 'this thoroughly unreliable book' (*T.L.S.*, 26 Oct.) set out to prove that Shelley's widow and his daughter-in-law had used material which they knew to be spurious in order to whiten his memory and blacken the memories of Harriet Westbrook and others.

Writing on *The Shelley Legend* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) Frederick L. Jones declared 'all this is old in Shelley scholarship'—the defence of Harriet, the abuse of Mary and Lady Shelley, the acceptance of the Hoppner story. He examines the book systematically, and concludes that 'the only contentions of any importance are not true'. Moreover, the authors are guilty of so many inaccuracies that a reader must be chary of accepting any of their facts or statements without checking them by reliable sources of information. Smith, it is pointed out, 'is not only snatching at straws: he is making straws'. After demolishing in turn the six major propositions laid down in *The Shelley Legend*, Jones declares that no single forgery is established that was not hitherto identified.

Writing in *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.) on *A New Shelley Legend*, Kenneth N. Cameron stresses the danger that this portrait may be accepted as faithful by popular reviewers. 'Of the essential Shelley', he says, 'we find nothing in *The Shelley Legend*.' Rossetti once remarked, apropos of Hogg's *Life of Shelley*, that he 'hated a man who wrote by nudges and winks'. 'He should have lived', comments Cameron, 'to read *The Shelley Legend*.'

Newman I. White, in '*The Shelley Legend*' *Examined* (*S. in Ph.*, July), provides a complete vindication of Shelley and an equally complete refutation of the charges brought against him. He also demonstrates the absurdity of the suggestion that Mary Shelley was in league with the forger, Major Byron, and reaffirms his belief that the most important of Byron's forgeries are almost certainly copies of genuine originals. He adds that he has considered the book 'with a seriousness unmerited either by its intrinsic absurdity or by the manners of its authors'.

Paton G. Gates had an article *In Defence of Leigh Hunt* in *T.L.S.* (12 Oct.) championing Hunt against the authors of *The Shelley Legend* and refuting the strictures there made upon his conduct in relation to Byron and Shelley.

Discussing *The Inconsistency of Shelley's 'Alastor'* (*E.L.H.*, Dec.) Frederick L. Jones asks, 'Why was Shelley inconsistent, and why did he defend himself in an even more inconsistent Preface?' This double inconsistency is stated to have been the result of Shelley's failure to combine ideas derived from Wordsworth and ideas derived from Sir William Drummond's *Academical Questions*. His philosophy was in a state of rapid transition at the time that he was writing *Alastor*: 'before he finished the poem his thought had changed' and before he wrote the preface it had changed again, mainly however as 'a development of the implications in the last lines of the poem'.

In *'Hellas' and 'Charles the First'* (*S in Ph.*, July) Raymond D. Havens points out that 'uncertainty as to the future' is quite as marked in the two semi-choruses which precede the great final chorus of *Hellas* as it is in the fourth and final stanzas of that chorus. 'Melancholy or realism conquered', he says, 'and the chanter of millenniums turned again from Europe and the disappointing present to unknown lands and distant times, to the ultimate triumph of good in remote, kingless continents.' The penultimate scene of *Charles the First* is shown to contain passages surprisingly akin to these two semi-choruses, and other affinities are noted between the two dramas: 'in each he turns from airy fancy to realism . . . in other words, he was growing up'.

A letter from Henry Tyler on *'Thrillers' at Eton* (*T.L.S.*, 28 Dec.) dealt mainly with Shelley's 'horrid' novel, *Zastrozzi* (composed while he was at Eton) and cited a relevant footnote from G. H. Sumner's *Life of Charles Richard Sumner, Bishop of Winchester* (1876). The Bishop, who entered Eton two years before Shelley and left in the same year (1810) wrote when an Etonian 'a tale of a very sensational character' entitled *The White Nun or the Black Dog of Dromore*. No reasons are given for thinking that the two youthful romanticists ever read each other's 'thrillers'.

Kenneth N. Cameron provided (*N. & Q.*, 23 Feb.) an important correction to *Shelley at Oxford* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi,195), of which the editor, Walter S. Scott, printed as an original new prose work by Shelley a translation of Aristotle's *Ethics*, Book 8.

In a note on *The Witch of Atlas* (*N. & Q.*, 23 Feb.) S.B.P. offered new interpretations of the poem, and suggested that stanzas xxxi ff. refer to the invention of the steamboat. In 1819–20 the poet was interested in such a boat, to be built by Henry Reveley, Maria Gisborne's son by her first marriage. E.B. writing under the same heading (23 March) remarked that the recognition of Lucretius as the Old Master whom Shelley honours in so many stanzas of *The Witch of Atlas* reminded him of the quotations from *De Natura Rerum* in *Queen Mab*, and also of Shelley's tribute to the Roman poet in the Preface to *The Revolt of Islam*.

L. Verkoren contributed to *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.) *A Note on Shelley's Sonnet 'Lift not the painted veil'* and made the point that when Shelley was writing *Prometheus Unbound* in 1818 he was still haunted by the image of the painted veil used in this sonnet a year before. It is associated—quite correctly—with the 'dome of many-coloured glass' in *Adonais*.

G. M. Hort, in *First Born of Ariel* (*Contemporary*, June), studied in sympathetic detail Shelley's daughter by Harriet Westbrook the charming Ianthe, wife of E. J. Esdaile, Squire of Cothlestone in Somerset. Edmund Blunden gave (*T.L.S.*, 13 July) further information about Harriet (Westbrook) Shelley, drawn from the registers of St. George's, Hanover Square.

In a letter, *Shelley and Keats* (*T.L.S.*, 29 June), L. C. Thompson referred to the late A. C. Bradley's opinion that there were similarities between Keats's *Endymion* and Shelley's *Alastor*, and indicated more than a dozen affinities between *Alastor* and the *Ode to the Nightingale*. 'If', he says, 'the publication of Keats's *Ode* had preceded the composing of *Alastor* it is difficult to imagine Shelley's publishing *Alastor*—he had a fastidious taste in these matters. . . . When the extent of Keats's debt to Shelley for poetic material is realized it is easier to see why he avoided Shelley and did not wish to be considered one of his pupils.'

The other side of the medal is revealed in a note on *'The Witch of Atlas' and 'Endymion'* by S.B.P. (*N. & Q.*, 23 March). Reverting to J. Livingstone Lowe's article (*P.M.L.A.*, March 1940), he quotes Lowe's opinion that *The Witch of Atlas* is 'a striking, almost start-

ling example of the impregnation of one poem by another'—namely, by *Endymion*.

Robert R. Kubach gives evidence in support of an affirmative answer to his own question. *Was Keats the 'Sensitive Plant'?* (*N. & Q.*, 9 Feb.); but an editorial footnote supports an allegorical interpretation.

*The Noble Savage in Mary Shelley's 'Frankenstein'* is discussed by Milton Millhauser (*N. & Q.*, 15 June). For the most part, he points out, the story of the monster is that of an adult in the state of nature: 'his mixture of innocence with ignorance in the earlier part was the very synthesis represented by the Noble Savage or Natural Man of late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century philosophy'. Though the first lurid vision is relentlessly pursued to its end, 'the familiar lineaments of the Noble Savage . . . did come for a little while to be visible in Frankenstein's impious creation'. On 27 July F. H. Amphlett-Micklewright commented that Mary Shelley illustrated 'the extent to which the matter-of-fact utilitarianism of Godwin and an occult philosophy could become wedded in one mind'.

Though no book was devoted to Keats in 1946, he was the subject of much comment in periodicals. Katharine M. R. Kenyon in a letter, *Keats and Ourselves* (*T.L.S.*, 26 Jan.) put forward a plea that when we look for a philosophy of life in Keats's *Odes* we should recollect that they were written before he was twenty-four and look also at his letters, in which 'we can trace his growth and distinguish between ideas he was discarding and those he was dwelling with, between experiences that pleased and stimulated and those that hurt.' This letter was the outcome of the leader under the same title (*T.L.S.*, 10 Nov. 1945): Anna J. Mill (2 Feb.) queried the leader-writer's pronouncement on the great *Odes* (see *Y.W.*, xxvi, 191).

A more formidable piece of analytical criticism appeared in Richard H. Fogle's *Empathic Imagery in Keats and Shelley* (*P.M.L.A.*, March). Empathy is defined as the involuntary projection of oneself into an object: its nature is like that of an iceberg, 'with the greater part of it hidden below the surface'; the term itself is Titchener's English equivalent of Lötze's *Einfühlung*. Cole-

ridge, it seems 'anticipated with remarkable exactness the observations of later psychologists'. When empathy is in action 'our contemplation of the object gives rise to an adjustment of motor and kinesthetic sensations'; and to judge from the scientific explanations here elaborated the physiological results of empathy are almost as important as the psychological—and even more peculiar. After a long preamble Fogle proceeds to apply the theory of 'poetic empathy' to the poems of Keats and Shelley, distinguishing between 'sympathy', which feels *parallel* with an object and 'empathy' which both feels and thinks *in* it. Keats is shown, by extracts from his letters, to have been consciously and intensely empathic; his poems are, however, objective; only twice does he describe the effects of the process—in *The Eve of St. Agnes*, ll. 14–18, and in *Lamia*, ll. 245–8, ll. 259–60, ll. 299–301. Shelley is the poet of sympathy: 'he projects himself into the object intellectually and emotionally, not physically'. Only into *The Cenci* does empathy 'enter prominently'; Shelley was incapable as a rule of eliciting 'the strong physical response' essential to authentic *Einfühlung*.

In *The Meaning of Keats's 'Eve of St. Mark'* (*E.L.H.*, March) Walter E. Houghton expresses the view that scholarship has tended either to distract attention from this poem or to distort its meaning. It is too often read 'in the light of an unwritten and quite hypothetical story linking up the old legend with Keats's sentiments to Fanny Brawne at the time'. The various MS. versions are carefully analysed, and a précis of the poem itself is given. Keats here 'managed to fasten his imagination upon a unifying principle—the romantic contrast of the familiar and the strange. He gave it embodiment in the figure of a modern girl in an English town reading medieval legends . . . and he cut under the surface to suggest the human tragedy implicit in the situation'.

C. B. Young initiated (*T.L.S.*, 6 April) a correspondence on *Keats's 'Eve of St. Agnes' and 'Cymbeline'*. Echoes of the play are indicated in the poem; and the question is asked whether 'so many verbal coincidences in 300 lines of Keats and 50 lines of Shakespeare' can be pure accident. De Selincourt's curious error in stating that 'tinct is a word found only in Spenser' is also corrected by a reference to Imogen's eyelids. A. H. T. Dudley followed

(4 May) with a reminder that, though missed by de Selincourt, the affinities between *The Eve of St. Agnes* and *Cymbeline* had been noted by C. L. Finney in his book, *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry* (Harvard, 1936).

In *Keats's Forerunners* (1 June) Margaret E. O'Brien pointed out that in his article on Keats in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1882) Swinburne had remarked upon the *Eve of St. Agnes—Cymbeline* affinities, even though laying more stress on Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* as a possible source of certain images and phrases. Curiously enough, R. K. Gordon in *Notes on Keats's 'Eve of St. Agnes'* (*M.L.R.*, Oct.) omits *Cymbeline* from the list of works likely to have influenced Keats, though Spenser, Shakespeare (chiefly *Romeo and Juliet*) and Scott (*The Lay of the Last Minstrel*) all figure in the *Notes*.

The quest for origins was pursued by Louis Bonnerot of Caen University, in a letter, *Keats and Wordsworth* (*T.L.S.*, 9 Feb.). He discerns analogies between the reflections of Wordsworth's Solitary in *The Excursion*, Book V, ll. 394–410, and Keats's Sonnet beginning, 'Four seasons fill the measure of the year'. This Sonnet was written in 1818, at a time when Wordsworth's influence was particularly strong.

In *Swift and Keats* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) H. E. Briggs sought to explain several hitherto obscure references in Keats's letters, and thus to clarify a much-debated passage in *I Stood Tip Toe upon a Little Hill. Gulliver's Travels*, Chapter 8, is suggested as a possible source of Keats's 'Homer stepping at the trumpet call', and other Swiftian echoes are identified in the letters and poems.

*U.T.Q.* (July) contained an article on *The Character and Poetry of Keats* written in 1893 by the Canadian poet, John Lampman and now published with a prefatory note by E. K. Brown.

A paper by Hyder E. Rollins on *Keats's Elgin Marble Sonnets* in *Studies in Honour of A. H. R. Fairchild* deals specially with the authorship of the review in *The Champion*, 9 March 1817, of Keats's *Poems*, which ended with a tribute to two sonnets not included in the volume, but printed on the same date, signed J. K. in Hunt's *Examiner*. The sonnets 'an seeing the Elgin Marbles' and 'To Haydon' were composed after a visit to the British Museum on 1 or 2 March by Keats, Haydon and Reynolds, and were written

by Keats on page 121 of a copy of the *Poems* presented by him to Reynolds. On grounds that seem conclusive Rollins supports the view that Reynolds, not Haydon, was the reviewer, and that an early letter of Keats thanking Reynolds, dated only 'Sunday evening', was written on 9 March 1817.

H. W. Arundell contributed a note (*N. & Q.*, 10 Aug.) on *Pride and Prejudice*, continuing the discussion of the probable origin of the title and citing an even earlier example than any previously suggested: i.e. the *Epistles* of Bishop Joseph Hall, 1610. He did not, however, establish that these *Epistles* had been read by Miss Austen.

There was a marked decline in Walter Scott studies during 1946. E. H. Holthouse pointed out (*T.L.S.*, 25 May) a curious error in John Buchan's *Life* apropos of *Scott's First Love*. Scott is quoted on page 55 as saying that after Williamina Belches' rejection of his suit his heart was 'handsomely pierced' by Charlotte Carpenter; his *Journal*, 18 December 1825, shows that the verb should have been 'pieced'.

A. Lytton Sells contributed to *D.U.J.* (June) a paper on *The Return of Cleveland* in *'The Pirate.'* He establishes undeniable though hardly startling affinities between Scott's hero, Basil Mertonn, and the hero of l'Abbé Prévost's novel, *Le philosophe anglais, ou l'histoire de M. Cleveland, fils naturel de Cromwell.*

E. A. Greening-Lamborn, discussing *Sir Walter's Heraldry* (*N. & Q.*, 18 May and 1 June) showed that in spite of Scott's lively interest in the herald's craft, his knowledge of it was 'always superficial and often inaccurate'.

H.G.L.K. writing (*N. & Q.* 1 June) on *Scott Prototypes* identified Wandering Willie of *Redgauntlet* with a blind harper who perished in a landslide in 1816. James C. Corson followed (29 June) with further details, and was able to give the harper's name. It was William Up Pritchard, and he came from Carmarthenshire.

A. Aspinall showed in a note on *Walter Scott's Baronetcy* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.) that the suggestion that the author of *Waverley* should be made a baronet did not come from the Prince Regent,

who proved unresponsive when this was proposed in February 1818 by William Adam, Lord Chief Commissioner of the Scottish Jury Court, formerly Solicitor-General and Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales. Correspondence discovered by Aspinall in the P.R.O. proves that the idea originated with Adam, but was put into operation only through the active mediation of Lords Sidmouth and Liverpool.

Continuing his publication of *The Letters of J. G. Lockhart to John Wilson Croker* from the originals in the William L. Clements Library, Alan L. Strout gave a number of letters of a very unequal degree of interest (*N. & Q.*, 9 and 23 March, 20 April, 4 and 18 May, 1 and 15 June). These reveal, as he says, 'a life now comparatively uneventful, clouded by ill-health and by anxiety about his wayward son, Walter'. French politics loom large. From the literary point of view perhaps the most interesting letters are those published on 20 April and 4 May. They deal in part with Croker's review of Macaulay's *History*, and indicate Lockhart's acute perception of the political bias and sectarian prejudice colouring much of that work. Among the letters in the 15 June instalment are some containing comments on Southey's *Life* by his son.

Two admirable editions of W. S. Landor have appeared: one of *The Shorter Poems*,[7] selected and edited by J. B. Sidgwick; and one of both poetry and prose edited by Sir E. K. Chambers,[8] and containing also Swinburne's poem and the relevant essays by E. de Selincourt, Walter Raleigh and Oliver Elton.

A review of the new two-volume Everyman edition of the *Letters of Charles Lamb* (*T.L.S.*, 15 June) drew forth a letter (31 August) from Edith C. Johnson on *Lamb and Manning*. She considered that the writer of the article was inclined to undervalue Thomas Manning, and put forward reasons for holding him in higher estimation than he is wont to enjoy.

Samuel McKechnie contributed to *N. & Q.* (2, 16 and 30 Nov., 14 and 28 Dec.) five of the proposed nine instalments of a detailed study of *Charles Lamb of the India House*—a study of interest to all lovers of Elia. In *An Elian Annotation* (*N. & Q.*, 14 Dec.) John M.

[7] *The Shorter Poems of Walter Savage Landor*, ed. by J. B. Sidgwick. C.U.P. pp. 91. 6*s*.

[8] *Landor; Poetry and Prose*, ed. by E. K. Chambers. O.U.P. pp. xx+185. 5*s*.

Turnbull identified 'mild, childlike, pastoral M—' of the *South Sea House* essay.

Hazlitt's visits to Northcote—the foundation of the well-known *Conversations*—were the subject of an article in *T.L.S.* (19 Oct.) under the heading *The Devil's Visits*. The old academician was to Hazlitt, remarks the writer, 'the spokesman of a shimmering host of inarticulate shades'.

W. J. Sykes in an article on *Hazlitt's Place in Literature* (*Q.Q.*, spring) endorsed Saintsbury's opinion that Hazlitt was 'the greatest critic that England had yet produced', and added a survey of his work, with well-chosen illustrative extracts.

*Carlyle and Irving* engaged the attention of Thomas A. Kirby (*E.L.H.*, March). Reading the 220 pages of Carlyle's *Reminiscences* 'one becomes aware that as Carlyle matured his attitude to his old friend Edward Irving changed considerably', and the 'total adulation' of the Kirkaldy-Edinburgh period was gradually tempered by a more detached and critical point of view. An unpublished letter in the possession of Kirby shows that *circa* 1822 Irving was Carlyle's earnest admirer and friend; it is to his credit that he remained, as Carlyle here witnesses, 'very kind and loving' towards him to the end of his life. The progressive decline in the enthusiasm felt by the sage for the preacher is well illustrated in this article. The introduction to Jane Welsh is mentioned as one of the debts owed by the younger to the older man; but there is no hint as to the possible influence on Carlyle's attitude of his knowledge of his Jeanie's early infatuation for Irving.

*M.L.Q.* (Sept.) contained an article by Maxwell H. Goldberg on *Carlyle, Pictet and Jeffrey*. This is a study of the circumstances which persuaded Carlyle, in January 1820, to disregard the advice of Edward Irving and undertake (as his first contribution to the *Edinburgh Review*) his 'ill-fated critique' of Marc Auguste Pictet's technical treatise setting forth 'a mechanical theory of gravitation'. The *Edinburgh Review* notice of Pictet's *Voyage de Trois Mois* is attributed to Jeffrey; it may have given Carlyle a precedent for regarding Pictet as 'fat quarry for a critical huntsman'. After he left his MS. at Jeffrey's house with his own hand it vanished and has never been traced.

Jeffrey appears again (*M.L.Q.*, Dec.) in an article by J. Raymond Derby: *The Paradox of Francis Jeffrey: Reason versus Sensibility*. It shows the conflict which raged, from his Oxford days until the end of his life, between Jeffrey's 'dogmatic acceptance and enforcement of rules' and his less known, less frequently revealed romantic and emotional tendencies. As Weisinger points out, 'he excoriated emotional excess in others, yet in his private life, especially in his later years, he was given to emotional orgies'—as witness his unrestrained weeping over the death of Little Nell.

In a letter on *Charles Dickens and Richard Bentley* (*T.L.S.*, 5 Jan.) Mrs. H. H. Bentley took Dame Una Pope-Hennessy to task for the treatment she had meted out to Richard Bentley in her life of Dickens. Dame Una replied (12 Jan.) defending herself. J. Carter (2 March) and Mr. H. H. Bentley (23 March) intervened. David A. Randall, in an article under the same heading (12 Oct.) recorded the existence of upwards of a hundred unpublished letters from Dickens to Bentley and claimed that they went far to negative Dame Una's dismissal of the publisher as 'purblind and mean of soul'. Dame Una retorted (2 Nov.) with *another* unpublished letter supporting her opinion.

Christof Wegelin, writing in *M.L.Q.* (March) on *Dickens and Irving: the Problem of Influence*, referred back to Ernest Boll's article on the same subject (*M.L.Q.*, Dec. 1944) and sought to reassess the value of the evidence there presented and thereby to correct his estimate of Irving's influence on the English novelist. He suspects Dickens of 'amiable hyperbole' in the letter quoted by Boll as evidence of the 'enormous contribution' made by Irving to the literary development of Dickens, and cites similar passages from letters to Landor and Mrs. Watson. Most English readers will feel that Wegelin has done well to modify the results of Boll's fervour: 'fervour spent in a good cause', though 'its excess teaches the commanding need, in author and reader alike, of vigilant scepticism in dealing with problems of sources and influence'.

*Owen Meredith: a Critical Life of Robert, First Earl of Lytton* by Amelia Brooks Harlan was not made available for notice in *Y.W.* It inspired an article, *John Forster's Poet* (*T.L.S.*, 3 Aug.) which in its turn produced a letter on *Dickens and Owen Meredith* from Frederick Page. This reopened the question of Dickens's

editorial handling of Lytton's story, *The Disappearance of John Ackland* (cf. *N. & Q.*, 4 March and 8 April 1944). Page repudiates the theory that Dickens may have stolen Lytton's idea and adapted it to his own purposes in *Edwin Drood.*

Dickens's relations with an even more distinguished contributor were dealt with by Annette B. Hopkins in an article on *Dickens and Mrs. Gaskell* (*H.L.Q.*, Aug.). She shows how his opinion of Mrs. Gaskell altered, and how his admiration became tinged with sometimes unreasonable exasperation. On her side the lady never learned to shape herself to his requirements, and finally transferred her favour to the newly-established *Cornhill.*

In *C.L.S.* (xxiii–xxiv) John Hennig proffered *A Note on Dickens and Goethe.* He detected an analogy between Goethe's poem *Die Wandelnde Glocke* and a passage in *Barnaby Rudge*, Chapter LV; but it is startling to find the glaring eyes and convulsed limbs attributed to Willett the innkeeper instead of to Rudge the murderer, when the alarm-bell peals through the night.

Though many people may agree with Malcolm Elwin's letter, *Thackeray* (*T.L.S.*, 10 Aug.), approving the action of the novelist's descendants in authorizing Gordon N. Ray to publish his letters in full—a step almost forced upon them by the appearance of publications *not* so authorized—there may be others to whom it will seem an ironical circumstance that these monumental, complicated, richly-illustrated and copiously indexed Books of Revelation[9] should have been devoted to the life and correspondence of a man who expressly vetoed any full-scale biography of himself. Ironical undoubtedly, but beyond question justifiable. Thackeray's personality, his career, his friendships and his feuds, his work and his play, have all been exploited, commented and enlarged upon, speculated about and juggled with, until his gigantic figure, physical and moral, has become not only blurred but distorted. No future writer will have any excuse for portraying anybody but the man himself. Seldom has any life been so floodlit at every stage, from every angle. These letters and papers do not only increase our knowledge of Thackeray as a novelist, a satirist and an artist;

[9] *The Letters and Private Papers of W. M. Thackeray*, ed. by Gordon N. Ray. O.U.P. Vol. I, pp. clxxiii+522; Vol. II, viii+847; Vol. III, viii+695; Vol. IV, x+586. 126*s.*

nor do they only introduce to us at close range the people who counted for most in a career which was fortunate mainly in patches. They open a window upon a wide 'field full of folk', they illuminate the background and the dramatis personae of the long novel in which he himself is the central (and not the least heroic) personage.

The editing and the production merit high praise. It is a pleasure to handle books so well printed on such admirable paper, with reproductions of maps, sketches, portraits and original MSS. G. N. Ray has brought to his task—as every good editor should—great enthusiasm for his subject and extensive knowledge of it in each of its many aspects. His 'Memoranda Concerning Certain Persons who Figure in Thackeray's Correspondence' will be as entertaining to the casual reader as they are valuable to the student of the Titmarsh circle, though he has been perhaps unduly harsh in his comments upon Mr. Brookfield. Tennyson's sonnet might in justice have been quoted, even if not in full. 'Our kindlier, trustier Jaques'—that was no small praise from a man like Tennyson.

The first two volumes were reviewed in *T.L.S.* (29 June) under the heading, *The Making of a Novelist*. B. Ifor Evans wrote on *Thackeray in his Letters* in the *Contemporary* (Nov.).

Vera Wheatley in a letter, *Thackeray* (*T.L.S.*, 7 Sept.), rebuked Elwin for describing as 'inadequate' Lady Ritchie's Introductions to her father's works in the Biographical Edition, and expressed scepticism as to the reliability of the anecdote relating how Thackeray had forced a young man to go down on his knees in front of 13 Young Street, Kensington, because *Vanity Fair* had been written in that house. Ernest Carr, supporting this view (21 Sept.) gave a more credible (and creditable) version of the incident on the authority of the *Life* written by F. T. Marzials and Herman Merivale in 1891.

Thackeray's visits to Goethe at Weimar provided material for a letter, *Thackeray and Goethe* (*T.L.S.*, 6 July), from H. Sochaczewer, suggesting that it must have been the German poet's daughter-in-law, Ottilie, to whom the English novelist referred as a great bore. A letter followed on *Thackeray's Visits to Goethe* (*T.L.S.*, 13 July). The writer, Walter A. Phillips, could remember Ottilie von Goethe, who told him that the youthful Thackeray used often to come to

tea with her. He concludes, 'Thackeray's whole picture of Weimar (Pumpernickel) does little credit to one who received so much hospitality and kindness there'. Desmond MacCarthy, in a note on *Thackeray at Weimar* (*T.L.S.*, 20 July) defending W.M.T. from the charge of ingratitude, pointed out that, though 'to listen to a *précieuse* from a bygone age must be a thrilling pleasure', to listen to her 'in her heyday might well be a different sensation'.

In a note on *Thackeray and Sir Martin Archer-Shee* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) Harold H. Scudder suggested that Sir Martin was the original of Mr. Smee in *Vanity Fair*, and of Andrew Smee, Esq., R.A., in *The Newcomes*, as also of Claude A. Carmine in the *Fitz-Boodle Papers*. Thackeray's dislike of Archer-Shee may very well have been part of his peculiar *fronde* against the Irish: and Scudder shows that he could be very rude to the inoffensive painter under his actual name in *Fraser's Magazine* and elsewhere.

*Rachel Esmond and the Dilemma of Victorian Womanhood* provided material for a piquant study by Howard O. Brogan (*E.L.H.*, Sept.). He traces the highly comprehensible disgust of the Victorians at what George Eliot described as the 'uncomfortable plot' of *Esmond*, and suggests that it was this provoking, possessive woman's fanatical devotion as wife and mother which atoned in Thackeray's eyes for all the faults he could not but perceive in her character.

*Tennyson: An Introduction and a Selection* by W. H. Auden was not made available for notice in *Y.W.* Three *Tennyson Queries* appeared in *N. & Q.* (6 April): two were answered by L. R. M. Strachan (4 May). He was able to show (1) that the person to whom the poem *To —— after reading a 'Life and Letters'* was addressed was the poet's brother, Charles Tennyson Turner—the allusion being to Lord Houghton's *Life of Keats*: and (2) that 'the Dead Prophet' was, according to the second Lord Tennyson's *Life* of his father, no prophet in particular.

The centenary of the marriage of Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett was marked by a special article, *Poets of Love: The Two Brownings* (*T.L.S.*, 14 Sept.).

C. A. Alington in a letter, *Browning and Beauty* (*T.L.S.*, 13 April),

dismissed as nonsense the suggestion in *Matthew Arnold To-day* (*T.L.S.*, 6 April) that Browning 'hated beauty'. In *One Word More* he was obviously and not unsuccessfully aiming at the very quality he has been supposed to have despised.

Richard Curle, writing on *The Brownings* (*T.L.S.*, 2 Nov.), had some new theories to offer upon the genesis of the *Sonnets from the Portuguese*. On 16 November appeared an appreciative letter from Hannah D. French, research librarian at Wellesley College, Massachussets, where the originals of the Browning love-letters are preserved. Dallas Kenmare in a letter on *Haydon's Tragedy* (*T.L.S.*, 6 July) quoted some passages from Elizabeth Barrett's letter to Robert Browning after the suicide of Benjamin Robert Haydon.

*P.M.L.A.* (Sept.) contained a vivid article on *Robert Browning and his Son* by Gertrude Reese. It embodies four hitherto unpublished letters from Benjamin Jowett to the anxious poet-parent before, during and after 'Pen's' brief Oxford days, and takes us through his uneventful life, from the early stage of ringlets, plumed hats and frilly trousers to the final vision of 'a red-cheeked man, somewhat plump, somewhat bald, and usually dressed in black-and-white checks'. Full prominence is given to his artistic attainments and his devotion to the memory of his parents.

Though received too late to be noticed in *Y.W.*, XXVI, the valuable book[10] of essays in commemoration of the first centenary of Newman's conversion should not remain unrecorded. All the essays are interesting, but from the literary standpoint the most noteworthy is Geoffrey Tillotson's study of *Newman's 'Essay on Poetry'*. The closing essay, *On Reading Newman* by Henry Tristram, would be helpful to any student wishing either to acquire or to extend familiarity with the writings of the Cardinal.

Two letters headed *Newman decides* in, *T.L.S.*, (5 and 19 Jan.), the first from L. E. Elliott Binns, the second from S. L. Ollard, reverted to that unlucky and often misquoted passage in the Life of St. Neot written by Newman in collaboration with Dalgains but usually attributed to J. A. Froude. Ollard gives the correct wording: 'and this is all that is known and more than all—yet nothing to what the angels know—of the life of this servant of God' (see *Y.W.*, xxv, 204).

[10] *John Henry Newman; Centenary Essays.* Burns, Oates. pp. 241. 10*s* 6*d.*

The writer of an article, *Matthew Arnold To-day* (*T.L.S.*, 6 April) considered that Arnold's prophecy that 'he would have his day' has now been made good. Of Arnold's want of productivity it is pointed out that many explanations have been essayed. 'The psychology of frustration has been idly called in to interpret the failure of the lily to grow in bulk like a tree,' and 'some have put the blame on Dr. Arnold, as if that mighty Rustum of the Public Schools had slain a poetic Sohrab by too much moralizing'.

Arnold's knowledge—or, alternatively, ignorance—of botany and ornithology was the subject of comment. Eric Parker, in a letter on *Matthew Arnold* (*T.L.S.*, 27 April), disagreed with the writer of the article noted above that it was 'an error in observation' on Arnold's part to write of 'the cuckoo's parting cry' in the month of June. On 11 May two other correspondents, C. H. Steel and Ella M. Horsey, continued to discuss the poet, the cuckoo, and the 'parting cry'.

Robert Eisler (*T.L.S.*, 4 May) appends a note to the alteration of the pale blue to the pale pink convolvulus in *The Scholar Gypsy*. He says that he himself has gathered *ippomoea purpura* near the monument erected by Sir Arthur Evans to the scholar gypsy, but it is a garden flower; 'pink flowering bindweed' is the common variety. Hugh Macdonald closed the correspondence (18 May) with a further aspersion upon Arnold's botany, and remarks incidentally that Wordsworth 'never quite tidied up his botany' despite his frequent revisions of his own work.

J. D. Jump, with reference to M. M. Bevington's book on *The Saturday Review* (1941), contributed an article to *R.E.S.* (Oct.) on *Matthew Arnold and the 'Saturday Review'*. He deals with that part of the book touching upon Arnold's battle with the editor, John Douglas Cook, over British Philistinism. Cook's gradual change of attitude towards Arnold during the last two years of his editorship is illustrated by extracts from *S.R.* reviews of *Culture and Anarchy* (1868) and *Friendship's Garland* (1871).

*S. in Ph.* (Jan.) contained an article by William D. Templeman on *Arnold's 'Literary Influence of Academies'. Macaulay, and Espinasse*. It is largely a discussion of the question as to what led Arnold to describe Macaulay's nephew, G. O. Trevelyan as 'very clever' in an article on *The Literary Influence of Academies* appear-

ing in *Cornhill*, August, 1864. The answer is found in *Macmillan's Magazine*, May 1864, in a series of articles, *Letters from a Competition Wallah*. The name of G. O. Trevelyan was not given, but Arnold must have known when he wrote his own *Cornhill* article that the writer of these letters was Macaulay's 'very clever nephew'. The later part of Templeman's paper deals with the possibility that Arnold may have derived some material from an article entitled *Concerning the Organization of Literature* (*Macmillan's Magazine*, March 1864) and written by Francis Espinasse, 'a Scotsman who spent many years of literary work in London, Manchester, and other parts of England'.

Coleman O. Parsons wrote (*N. & Q.* 24 Aug.) on *Harrison Ainsworth's Use of John Elwes in 'The Miser's Daughter'* and elicited further notes on the same subject from F. H. Amphlett Micklewright (8 Sept.).

*Background Material for the Study of 'Silas Marner'* was provided by Parsons (*N. & Q.*, 28 Dec.), who makes several interesting suggestions.

Particulars about the originals of Inspector Bucket in *Bleak House* and Inspector Cuff in *The Moonstone* were given in *A Victorian Classic* by G. F. McCleary (*The Fortnightly*, Aug.). *The Moonstone* is the classic.

In spite of its slightly flippant title, Naomi Royde-Smith's study of Mrs. Sherwood[11] is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of that remarkable woman and of her works. To many readers much of the material here gathered will be entirely new, and most of it can hardly fail to be entertaining.

The fiftieth anniversary of the death of William Morris was marked by an article, *The Utopia of William Morris* (*T.L.S.*, 5 Oct.).

Augusto Guidi, the author of a study in Italian of Coventry Patmore,[12] specialized in German and Scandinavian languages

[11] *The State of Mind of Mrs. Sherwood: A Study*, by Naomi Royde-Smith. Macmillan. pp. xviii+205. 7*s.* 6*d.*

[12] *Coventry Patmore*, di Augusto Guidi. Marcelliana, Brescia. pp. 181. Lire 150.

and literature before devoting himself almost entirely to English. From 1938 to 1942 he occupied the chair of English language and literature in the University of Pisa. His book on Patmore explores every branch of the poet's spiritual and intellectual life with understanding and sympathy. He rejects the view that Catholicism was in Patmore's very blood and that he had a natural impulse towards Rome; he does not attach much importance to the circumstance that the second Mrs. Patmore was a Catholic. In his opinion the conversion was a voluntary act long in contemplation. His critical assessment of Patmore's verse is close, judicious and well informed, and his sympathy with his subject is such that he can even forgive him for expressing a preference for St. Paul's in London over St. Peter's in Rome.

Though Enid Starkie makes only a brief and bare allusion to *Ave atque Vale* in her introduction to Geoffrey Wager's very free and loose English versions of selected poems by Baudelaire,[13] many English readers will be interested in the book mainly for Swinburne's sake, and for that reason it is noted here.

*Stevenson's Interest in Tableaux* was the subject of a note by Coleman O. Parsons (*N. & Q.*, 6 April). By the term tableau he means 'a striking interpretative array of persons and objects', and he is correct in saying that a Stevenson story 'is often a series of tableaux linked by narration'. He gives an interesting example of how R.L.S. utilized his personal memories of a tragic scene at North Berwick when writing the early part of *St. Ives*.

Parsons also wrote (*S. in Ph.*, July) on *Stevenson's Use of Witchcraft in 'Thrawn Janet'*, tracing for the first time the influence exercised upon Stevenson by his study of the Scottish literature of witchcraft, and the way in which his weirdest story was shaped and coloured by that study.

*English Treatment of the Classical-Romantic Problem* was discussed by Herbert Weisinger (*M.L.Q.*, Dec.). He points out that the classical-romantic debate introduced yet another confusion into an already complicated and perplexing riddle. The Romantics

[13] *Charles Baudelaire.* Selected poems, with translations by Geoffrey Wagner and an Introduction by Enid Starkie. The Falcon Press. pp. 131 7*s.* 6*d.*

tended to deprive the Middle Ages of their historical separateness from the ancient and modern eras, and to fuse them with the modern world in opposition to the ancient world: 'thus only two historical periods are left, the classical and the Romantic'. Corroborative passages are cited from Coleridge, *Shakespearean Criticism* and *Table Talk*, Hazlitt, Scott and de Quincey.

The inclusion of a little anthology of *English Letters of the Nineteenth Century*[14] in the Pelican Books is to be welcomed. Literary men are well represented, and the editor, James Aitken, has spread his net as wide as his page limit would permit.

Histories of periodicals often provide lively reading, and this holds good of Isabelle W. Entrikin's dissertation on *Sarah Josepha Hale and Godey's 'Lady's Book'*.[15] This redoubtable woman, editing two widely-circulated American magazines over a period of nearly fifty years, herself wrote a large proportion of the stories, essays, articles and poems needed to fill their columns. As a reviewer she had sufficient acumen to praise Edgar Allan Poe, Carlyle and Dickens, but as time passed the space allotted by her to literary criticism became smaller and smaller, owing to the encroachments of more popular material such as fashion and fiction.

[14] *English Letters of the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by James Aitken. A Pelican Book. pp. 188. 1*s*.

[15] *Sarah Josepha Hale and Godey's 'Lady's Book'*, by Isabella Webbe Entrikin. Univ. of Pennsylvania. pp. v+157.

# XIV

# THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

## II

By H. V. Routh

As is usual when beginning the survey of a period, the writer looks around for some author who might serve as an introduction. On this occasion the reader may be satisfied with *The Journals of C. K. Newcomb.*[1] Chronologically he belongs to the nineteenth century (*b.* 1820, *d.* 1894), and was much admired by Emerson who openly spoke of his genius; all through his life he was the centre of a small circle of associates who were inexhaustibly interested in his personality and points of view; and since manhood he has enjoyed a certain literary and external reputation through allusions in quite important books.

Nevertheless he belongs to the twentieth century in the sense that he is an anticipation. He kept a diary in which the ideas of our own time are beginning to simmer. Being an invalid, he dreams of action, of having a definite object in life, and in his case, as in that of Barbellion, the only possible object was self-expression—the creation of his own portrait in a spiritual autobiography. Some of his ideas are well in advance of mid-nineteenth-century America. His ethics, and indeed his morals are based on the characters of Shakespeare as the standards of good and evil. Like W. E. Henley and Stevenson he has almost a passion for the kind of energy we now call vitalism. Some of his best entries record his cult of nature which might be described as a blend of impressionalism and expressionalism, with phrases and metaphors often rising to genuine poetry in prose. The selecting and editing of this human document are commendably thorough. The introductions are so good that they almost relieve one of studying the text.

Should the reader prefer a more factual introduction he has only to turn to Allerdyce Nicoll's *A History of Late Nineteenth*

[1] *The Journals of C. K. Newcomb*, ed. by J. K. Johnson. *Brown Univ. Studies*, Vol. X. pp. vi+299. $4.

*Century Drama, 1850–1900*[2], which shows us how the theatre grew into the kind of entertainment we enjoy to-day. Needless to add that the review is admirably documented, is scholarly but not pedantic, in fact hardly academic. Nicoll has worked into his story a surprising amount of information about actor-managers, the growth of London (in 1801 there were only 865,000 citizens), the development of urban and suburban transit, the multiplication of theatres. In 1851, the year of the Great Exhibition, there were less than twenty playhouses. In 1899 there were sixty-one theatres. The influence and example of the Continent are, of course, discussed. That was to be expected. But we are pleasantly surprised by the interesting specimens of home criticism and comment which he has collected. Even the interest of the Queen is not forgotten. Stageland and its multitudinous environment come to life in his lucid and quietly written pages.

His period extends, roughly, from Robertson to Wilde, and Shaw in his first phase; and he is, perhaps, most illuminating on H. A. Jones and Pinero; and William Archer revives as an unmistakably substantial ghost. But amongst these and many other influential and brilliant personalities, we feel undoubtedly the pressure of a tendency which came to light as early as 1770, was enforced by Robertson and consummated in our own time—the tradition of a qualified realism, modified by experiments in stage technique, and tempered by the individuality and sentiment of the dramatist. 'Realism in the picture-frame stage, with the banishment of antiquated conventions, triumphed'—and yet left a void. Hence the struggling survival of poetic drama.

The outlines of this study in development contain little that is unexpected or even new. The originality appears in the mass of well-arranged details, and the casual comments; for instance, that H. A. Jones awakened tastes and desires which were later to be satisfied by Galsworthy and Maugham. On the other hand some may think that he hardly does justice to Wilde and Shaw.

Considering the many social, financial, administrative and cultural influences which combined to shape the theatre, it is disappointing to find that he overlooks one of the most important elements. He remembers that Robertson relied on 'the sense of spiritual reality to be conveyed by means of his actors', yet Nicoll

[2] *A History of Late Nineteenth Century Drama*, 1850-1900, by Allardyce Nicoll. Vol. I. pp. xii + 228. 15*s*. Vol. II. pp. 772. 25*s*. C.U.P.

tells us nothing more about the succession of artists who did so much to make the drama live and often brought to light the spirit and significance of plays which the literary critic considers worthless; for instance *The Bells* (Irving), *The Vandyke* (Tree). After all, the drama is an art which lives on the stage in collaboration with the cast. This omission is all the more regrettable since our historian is sufficiently thorough and theatrically-minded to fill over 700 pages with a hand-list of plays.

Since Wilde figures in *Late Nineteenth Century Drama*, this is, perhaps, the place to record another biography on that apparently inexhaustible subject. Pearson[3] casts many sidelights on some other personalities of the so-called naughty 'nineties, notably on eminent actors and actresses, sometimes with their photographs. He also gives us a few notions concerning the diplomatic arts by which a fashionable author ought nowadays to push his interests. In that respect *The Life* might almost be considered to be the publicist's *Vade Mecum*. Otherwise he throws no new light on Wilde's ideas, influence, literary style, or importance as a play writer. His entertaining pages are a repository of his hero's epigrams and idiosyncrasies, and should be studied as a striking example of that comparatively new literary type, the novelized biography. Incidentally he presents Wilde as a personality brimming over with kindness and human nature, a boy who never grew up.

The author of *Dorian Gray* and *Lady Windermere's Fan* seems never to have died, but we must not therefore overlook his predecessors who seem now to be coming back to life. Amongst them Richard Jefferies[4] seems to be one of the most promising and his memory has just been honoured by *A Tribute* which admirably illustrates the inner meaning of his short life. Looker's notes on his sense of outward things, his genius for contemplation and his acquiescence in beauty, are illuminating. 'Get out of tune with nature, you cannot understand anything. Get in tune and you understand everything.' So wrote Jefferies in his *Private Notebooks*, and his aphorisms collected under 'Thoughts that Breathe and Words that Burn' will come as an inspiration to many who have

[3] *The Life of Oscar Wilde*, by Hesketh Pearson. Methuen. pp. vii+389. 16*s*.

[4] *The Worthing Cavalcade; Richard Jefferies. A Tribute by Various Writers*, ed. by S. J. Looker. Aldridge Bros. pp. 156.

half-forgotten this never popular author. Out of a hundred or more *obiter dicta* one might quote 'science is like a proverb—half true'; 'people change very much more rapidly than their rulers'; 'anything is picturesque that is characteristic'; 'the hours when the mind is absorbed by beauty are the only hours when we really live'. Clifford Bax has contributed a short essay on that unfortunately entitled autobiography *The Story of My Heart*, which is a glimpse into mysticism freed from sentiment and inspired by experience.

If the first part of *A Tribute* gives some idea of a mind ever in quest of spiritual sensibility and integration, the latter part evokes the atmosphere and scenery—the environment—in which the prose-poet's soul fulfilled itself. The localities are not only described; there are over fifty illustrations, so the reader can see as well as read.

Jefferies calls to mind Henry James whose characters, though curiously engaging, are too like their creator to come within the range of normal experience. They may live similar lives to ours, but yet they leave us outside their spiritual orbit. The author keeps us at arm's-length, and we require a password in order to win his intimacy. That is what F. O. Matthiessen[5] offers us.

According to William James (the pragmatist) his brother drifted from 'the vital facts of human character'. According to Matthiessen he tried hard to capture 'the vital facts', in their 'emotional capacity', but could not or would not penetrate to the 'stream of consciousness' (William's expression). He could realize their significance only as avowed thoughts. That is why the novelist is elusive. Consciousness for him was not a stream but a structure, organized out of episodes. So he never found his basis till he learnt something of dramatic technique in his otherwise disastrous excursion into drama.

To give a clue to his genius, Matthiessen analyses *The Ambassadors*, *The Wings of a Dove*, *The Golden Bowl*; showing in each case how the plot was elaborated out of the originating idea and fulfilled itself through a minute and carefully balanced process of architecture; but the climax of his essay is reached in Chapter VI, 'The Religion of Consciousness'. James, like his father—and many others—suffered from moments of spiritual exhaustion, when the

[5] *Henry James: The Major Phase*, by F. O. Matthiessen. O.U.P. pp. xvi+190. 9*s.* 6*d.*

vulgarity of modern life, or even the horror of evil, seemed to overwhelm his powers, especially the power to create. He revived his inward energy by turning it outwards, cultivating a sense of other people in their mysterious and impulsive personal relationships, not a sense of society; and further onwards even to 'a complete cultivating double awareness of the past and of himself watching it'. So he succeeded in effacing 'the pit of insecurity beneath the surface of life'. Thus his novels are profoundly ethical and, with their spiritual implications, are more difficult to read. In considering this his 'total view of the world', he frequently reminds Matthiessen of T. S. Eliot whom he may much have influenced. The concluding chapter, picturesquely entitled 'The Painter's Sponge and Varnish Bottle', draws attention to the novelist's revisions and emendations—a fascinating study of his technique and phraseology.

If James was somewhat a mystic using the methods from which we expect realism, W. B. Yeats[6] had something akin to his genius. Such is the upshot of P. Ure's inquiry into the myth as handled by the Irish poet, though he does not mention James. He begins by explaining that the word myth need not necessarily imply a religious allegory, nor on the other hand mere fiction. It springs from a principle of growth thanks to which the human being stretches feelers into the dark and lays hold of figures and symbols through which to express his hopes and desires. This source of inspiration (whether drawn from folklore, legendary epic or the individual's imagination) is particularly necessary to the poet whose concern is 'the flowering of our inwardness' (Rilke), provided that his material retains the semblance of symbolic if not actual truth; and such is the right approach to Yeats. Ure traces the stages by which his poet learnt to blend his experience with his imagination; to look *within* in order to see the vision *outside*; and how be became conscious of the power which grew and matured with years. The critic's manner and method are a trifle laboured, but any student of Yeats will find his essay worth reading.

The same is true of another and otherwise very different volume of criticism by R. Hamilton on one of our most straightforward

[6] *Towards a Myth: Studies in the Poetry of W. B. Yeats*, by P. Ure. Univ. Press of Liverpool and Hodder and Stoughton. pp. 123. 8*s*. 6*d*.

authors, W. H. Hudson.[7] He gives us the story of his life, written with insight and sympathy; and more important, a satisfying idea of his books, illustrated by excerpts and quotations which almost amount to an anthology. In fact, one is half afraid that the reader may be so convinced by the exposition, that he will feel no urge to pass on to the originals. If he does feel that urge, he will learn much by comparing his own impressions with those of the critic. Is there a strain of artificiality in all Hudson's romances (not least in *Green Mansions*)? Is *The Book of a Naturalist* his most characteristic production? Are *The Shepherd's Life* and *Far Away and Long Ago* the most aesthetically satisfying? We all agree that his essays contain his best and most essential work because they are the simplest and most direct. But was there any need to make so many excursions and comparisons?

Hamilton has certainly produced a thoughtful and spirited book. He has his heart in his subject; he is himself a lover and observer of nature; and is a humanist with an aptitude for philosophy. Moreover he is a discerning critic and perceives his hero's limitations. Unhappily he seems to be always searching among his other interests, in order to illuminate his subject often where no illumination is needed. Consequently he is inclined to render his theme dark with excessive light.

It may seem ungracious, but one is tempted to make a similar reservation with regard to Joan Bennett's essay on Virginia Woolf.[8] This novelist has been much discussed during the last few years, and her most recent critic has no unexpected sidelights or headlights to offer. Her aim is to vindicate or rather revindicate. She recognizes that Virginia is difficult, because we cannot readily enter into the peculiar spirit of her inventiveness, cannot quite catch her sense of life. So Mrs. Bennett employs a method which can best be described as architectural. She constructs a scaffolding, piece by piece, supplying the materials out of the novelist's own work. At least half her book is made up of representative excerpts which, with the help of explanations, the student can read or reread in their full meaning and context. So we come to appreciate

[7] *W. H. Hudson; The Vision of Earth*, by R. Hamilton. Dent. pp. xi+147. 10*s*. 6*d*.

[8] *Virginia Woolf; Her Art as a Novelist*, by Joan Bennett. C.U.P. 1945. pp. viii+ 131. 6*s*.

the fluidity rather than the fixity of personality; and learn to expect 'inlets' into consciousness and into mutual understandings, rather than dramatic events. The import grows on us through insight, and we do not feel the need of psychological pronouncements. Philosophy, says Mrs. Bennett, 'is consumed in her novels'.

On the other hand we become aware of the tension between love and hatred of life, between action and contemplation. Like Virginia Woolf herself, we get near to wisdom through sympathy and inter-personal experience. This interpretation is not new; but is well worth renewing. But Mrs. Bennett's exposition seems to be rather too intellectualized; she demands, perhaps, more of her readers than is necessary; and some of them will be left wondering whether Virginia Woolf's characters are worth so much trouble.

A change is certainly creeping over the art of criticism. The influence of science (notably psycho-analysis) has often been noticed, and now we begin to feel the touch of philosophy, metaphysics and pneumatology. An example comes to hand in the remarkable *La Vocation de Katherine Mansfield*.[9] This study concludes with a quotation from J. Rivière Massis's *Jugements*. 'There is the quality of *naïveté* in every writer who is not a Christian. He has always the air of someone kept in the dark about something, but quite unaware of it. There is a certain gesture of the spirit which he cannot think of making. There is a depth which he does not touch.' These words may be taken as an all-but embracing assessment of Katharine and of her generation. They all missed something: the confidence in Divine Love, 'the unique reality, that which is the source of all others'. Yet her life and work bear witness to an intuitive yearning towards this, the supreme ideal, which she never quite reached. Hence the title of Odette Lenoël's book; for *Vocation* means a call and an election, most often by God.

Bearing in mind this doctrine, two thoughtful and deeply religious writers set themselves to tell us how the novelist tried to complete and realize her soul, groping after what Gabriel Marcel terms 'le chemin perdu de l'unité intérieur'. We are reminded of her lonely childhood; how she strove to envisage the world through her hopes and aspirations. Then followed disillusionment. In her

[9] *La Vocation de Katherine Mansfield*, by Odette Lenoël. Paris: Editions Albin Michel. pp. 252. frs. 105.

own phrase she felt 'the snail under the leaf, even under the flower'. So she turned to realism, vainly hoping to resist the meanness and ugliness of life by giving it expression in art. 'Render me', she prayed, 'clear as crystal so that thy light may shine through me.' The important events of her life in London—the hasty imprudent marriage, the meeting with Murry, the death of her dearly loved brother—are discussed with delicacy and insight as powerful influences in the history of her soul. Towards the end of the 1914–18 war her health failed and she attained to a finer appreciation of joy, beauty and goodness, through their gradual loss.

However, the 1946 work on the twentieth century is not so tendentious, nor gives so much food for thought—sometimes too much. Among the exceptions we have the portrait of Caradoc Evans,[10] the Welsh Board-school boy who knew no English till he left school, began life as a draper's assistant, then wrote for the London papers (notably *T.P.'s Weekly*) and created an outlet for his exuberant personality by characterizing and caricaturing Welshmen, especially his neighbours, and the peasantry, and played the part of a true educator by encouraging village theatricals. After his death his presence and peculiarities have been revived for us by Oliver Sandys, herself a competent novelist of the popular type. It is an original book, a portrait, not a biography, as inconsequential and spontaneous as life itself, intimate but unsentimental, a type of its own—Boswellism and Bohemia combined.

We have a very different biography in Lady Tweedsmuir's survey of her husband, John Buchan.[11] It is an anthology of his most striking thoughts, the views and impressions gathered from life and literature, which found their ordered place in the corpus of his literary work. The reader will be surprised at the sheer volume and varied range of his writings, produced by the public man of business and politics; and will appreciate that he lived with the zest and spirit of a man of action, whether reading history, exploring wild nature, deer-stalking, or writing novels of adventure. To judge

[10] *Caradoc Evans*, by Oliver Sandys. Hurst and Blackett. pp. 167. 16s.

[11] *The Clearing House; A Selection from the Writings of John Buchan*, arranged by Lady Tweedsmuir. Hodder and Stoughton. pp. xiii+233. 12*s.* 6*d.*

by *The Clearing House* he was essentially an amateur really in quest of experience which he could not make fully his own unless it found its way into a book.

When we turn to poetry very few volumes seem to be available for notice. The most important is the *édition définitive* of Rupert Brooke.[12] The 82 poems of the original two volumes (1911 and 1915) have been increased to 120, mostly juvenilia, for the sake of completeness. The Introduction, all too short, gives some idea of the poet's own literary taste; how he first loved Swinburne and then fell in love with Yeats. It is interesting to learn that during his twenties, literary influences gave way to 'the Fabian brand of Socialism which he had adopted as an undergraduate at Cambridge'; and that his 'later poems' were inspired by the heights and depths of his emotional crises, of which most of his friends knew nothing.

A selection from the poetry of Ronald Bottrall[13] has also appeared. Miss Sitwell, in her preface, dwells on his increasing promise of maturity, and claims that his technique is 'completely at one with the vision of the poem. It is fluid when it should be fluid, hard when it should be hard; it is malleable and the rhythms change without a jolt.' She also speaks of 'the same lovely and piercing visual sense'. The lover of poetry, however, must be left to judge for himself.

If the student requires an acid commentary on the conflicting views and interests represented in this survey he might turn to Connolly's *Condemned Playground.*[14] As Martin Cooper puts it: 'They are *par excellence* the voice of the opposition; but they have a certain antiseptic quality and act as an effective antidote to our national drug of complacency.' We certainly meet more than enough to challenge our judgments and perhaps irritate us into revising them. For instance, we are invited to agree that A. E.

[12] *The Poetical Works of Rupert Brooke*, ed. by G. Keynes. Faber and Faber. pp. 208. 8*s.* 6*d.*

[13] *Selected Poems by Ronald Bottrall*, with a Preface by Edith Sitwell. Nicholson and Watson. pp. x+64. 4*s.* 6*d.*

[14] *The Condemned Playground; Essays 1927-44*, by Cyril Connolly. Routledge. 1945. pp. viii+287. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Housman's poems 'deserve to be set to music by English composers and will then live as long as the B.B.C.'; that the English poet who most resembles Rimbaud is Blake; that the defects of English novels are (1) the thinness of material, (2) poverty of style, (3) lack of power; and that in all these qualities the Americans are our superiors. France is Connolly's spiritual home because intellect and intelligence have always had free play (except for Proust) and he particularly admires E. M. Forster and Somerset Maugham because they still retain the Gallic freedom and artistic power.

These and many other such assertions, propounded with an aggressive self-confidence, are helpful if only the offended reader will exercise his own critical faculty and make sure that Connolly is not right. Besides his whole attitude represents the mental background to the revolt of the 'thirties and the post-war irritability. Moreover his style sparkles with colloquial wit and his racy Bohemian mannerisms now and then emit striking felicities of thought.

Is there a ready answer to this Nihilism? Connolly himself supplies one while quoting an observation made by Gide on French literature in 1940. 'Would it not be wiser to realize that every advanced literature, whatever its character, tends to exhaust what produces it? This flower of civilization develops and opens at the expense of the plant, which surrenders and sacrifices itself to the flower.'

By FREDERICK S. BOAS

Somewhat in contrast with the books noticed in the above section the relevant articles in periodicals deal chiefly with American or Irish writers. But first place may be given to J. O. Bailey's paper on *Hardy's 'Mephistophelian Visitants'* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) which appears to be the only one concerned with the Wessex novelist.

Bailey points out that Hardy's plots often introduce an outsider or invader who projects a disturbing force into the story. In reference to one of them, Diggory Venn, the reddleman, in *The Return of the Native*, Hardy uses the term 'Mephistophelian visitant.' Bailey would apply the term to a series of invaders in the novels, 'three of them dressed in red and all presented in a background of suggestions that they are preternatural'.

The first is Elizabeth Endorfield in *Under the Greenwood Tree*, whose name suggests the Witch of Endor, and whose red cloak is a Satanic emblem. In *Far from the Madding Crowd* Sergeant Troy is also distinguished by his scarlet coat, and is addressed by Boldwood, from whom he has lured Bathsheba, as devil and juggler of Satan. In *The Return of the Native* Diggory Venn is not temporarily overlaid with red but permeated by it, and 'Satanic symbolism is constantly suggested by both the way he appeared abruptly in lurid lights and the way he affected the feelings of others'. He is Hardy's prime Mephistophelian visitant.

Bailey deals in similar fashion with William Dare in *A Laodicean*, with Richard Newson and Donald Farfrae in *The Mayor of Casterbridge* and Dr. Fitzpiers in *The Woodlanders*. Thereafter the Mephistophelian visitant disappears from the novels, but in *The Dynasts* three of the spirits, the Sinister, the Ironic, and of Rumour, which invade the human drama, represent various of his aspects. Bailey finally discusses some of the sources which may have helped to inspire Hardy's conception.

William T. Goring in *A Note on 'My Lady' of 'Modern Love'* (*M.L.Q.*, Sept.) shows that if 'My Lady' in the poem is the golden-haired Janet Duff Gordon, she was a child when Meredith and his wife, 'Madam' of the poem, settled at Weybridge after their marriage. Almost a generation therefore separated 'My Lady' and 'Madam', and the dramatic meeting between them in *Modern Love* could not have taken place. It was not till after the failure of his marriage that Meredith in 1859 renewed acquaintance with Janet, then grown up, and became passionately fond of her. He then wove the two separate episodes into a single tragic sequence.

In the same number of *M.L.Q.* H. T. Webster in a series of parallels traces *Possible Influence of George Gissing's 'Workers in the Dawn' on Maugham's 'Of Human Bondage'*.

In *The Road to Concord* (*Princeton Univ. Library Chronicle*, April) Carlos Baker describes, with a facsimile, a rediscovered letter of Emerson concerning Walt Whitman, and discusses its significance in their relations. When Emerson received in 1855 the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* he wrote an enthusiastic letter about it to Whitman, which the poet printed as an advertisement in the second

edition. Emerson did not object, but when Whitman visited Boston in February 1860 Emerson in vain urged him to cut out some of the outspoken poems on sex which were likely to interfere with the sale of the book.

With the outbreak of the Civil War Whitman undertook service among the wounded in New York and Washington. From the latter he wrote on 29 December 1862 to Emerson saying that he needed to get employment and have an income. He asked Emerson to send him letters directed to S. P. Chase, the Secretary of the Treasury, and W. H. Seward, and a note of introduction to Senator Charles Sumner. Emerson on 10 January 1863 wrote to Chase on behalf of Whitman a letter which has escaped the notice of Walt's biographers, though it was printed in the Washington *Daily News* of 9 May 1931. It has now been rediscovered in the U.S.A. Treasury Archives and is reprinted by Baker. In it Emerson speaks of Whitman 'as a man of strong original genius, combining, with marked eccentricities, great powers and valuable traits of character. . . . If his writings are in certain points open to criticism, they show extraordinary power and are more deeply American than those of any other poet.'

The terms of this letter show, as Baker rightly claims, that fundamentally Emerson retained the generous admiration of Whitman's work that he had expressed in 1855, though he felt bound to make some qualifications. It is from this personal point of view that the letter is important for it failed in its immediate purpose. Chase considered *Leaves of Grass* 'a very bad book' and would not appoint its author to a post. How under other auspices Whitman entered the government service on 1 January 1865 and continued in various posts till 30 June 1874 has been described by Dixon Wecter (see *Y.W.*, xxiv, 212).

Baker's article closes with an account of Whitman's criticism of Emerson's 'bloodless intellectuality' in 1880; the burying of the hatchet at a Sunday dinner at Emerson's house on 18 September 1881; and after his death seven months later Walt's declaration that his last word about Emerson will be 'loyal, loyal'.

Florence M. Chase in *A Note on Whitman's Mockingbird* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) points out that the poem *Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking* (1860) describes a pair of mocking birds that are similar to one in an ornithological book, *Birds of Long Island* (1844).

Miss Chase quotes a number of parallels between the poem and the book which she thinks that Whitman may well have read and mingled with his boyhood memories of days on Long Island.

The biographical importance hitherto unrecognized of other correspondence is stressed by Harrison Hayford in *The Significance of Melville's 'Agatha' Letters* (*E.L.H.*, Dec.). Between 13 August and probably late in November 1852 Herman Melville sent three letters to Hawthorne. In the first two he suggested that Hawthorne should make a romance out of the records of a legal case in which a sailor had deserted his wife, Agatha, and committed bigamy; in the third, after Hawthorne had 'expressed uncertainty' about undertaking this, and urged Melville to write the story himself, the latter declared he had decided to do so.

'Agatha' eventually was not written or at any rate not published, but from the hints that Melville gives Hayford concludes that the heroine would not, like Ahab or Pierre, have pitted herself against evil but would have patiently submitted to it. Moreover the letters to Hawthorne, together with a letter to Richard Bentley, the publisher, disprove the theory that in writing *Pierre*, published in August 1852, Melville intended this to be his last word, and only took up his pen again later because no other means of making a living was left to him.

From a further letter by the novelist's mother William H. Gilman throws light on *Melville's Liverpool Trip* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.). This trip which forms the substance of his novel, *Redburn*, had been assigned by his biographers to 1837. But his mother's letter, in the New York Public Library, dated 1 June 1839, and addressed to Herman's elder brother, proves that the voyage took place in the summer of that year. Gilman further shows that the *St. Lawrence* must have been the ship on which Melville sailed, and which in the novel is called *The Highlander*. He appears in the list of the crew with 'Herman' mis-read as 'Norman', and other members of the *St. Lawrence* crew tally significantly with some of those on *The Highlander*.

In *The Neuroticism of William Dean Howells* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) Edwin H. Cady aims at accounting for the failure of Howells to carry adequately into practice in his novels his theories of realism. He 'never truly faced the violent and sordid facts of reality'. The

reason, in Cady's view, is to be found in the hypochondria from which Howells suffered in an acute form from his earliest years. One phase of this, after he had been bitten by a dog, was a terror of hydrophobia. And when he was given a chance of journalistic achievement by a first-class post on the Cincinnati *Gazette* he became a victim to his nervous morbidity, and threw up the post after a night's experience as a reporter in the police station. Even after his appointment as U.S. consul at Venice and his happy marriage, he could not shake off the effect of these early experiences, and could glance 'only obliquely and hurriedly at the sordid truths which as a realist and a socialist he was bound to admit and try to ameliorate'.

In an article with the somewhat enigmatic title *The Spoils of Henry James* (*P.M.L.A.*, March) Adeline R. Tintner discusses the varying significance of the part played by works of art in James's novels. Whatever the changes be at different times, yet as Miss Tintner sums it up, 'the overall meaning is that the work of art embodies or incorporates civilization as it was available to James. It acts as protagonist in the total drama. For James's œuvre is the record of an attempt to balance the material aspect of civilization, art, . . . with its spiritual aspect, life.'

In a note *On Poe's 'Valley of Unrest'* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.), which in its earliest version (1831) he terms 'the valley Nis', T. F. Bledsoe suggests that 'Nis' is a confused word. It continues the sound and sense of *Dis*, a Roman underworld god; *dis*, the prefix denoting reversal or privation; and *nil*, nothing.

In *Yeats's Debt to Ronsard on a 'Carpe Diem' Theme* (*C.L.S.*, xix, 4–7) William F. Mackey compares and contrasts the Irish poet's lyric beginning 'When you are old and gray and full of sleep' with the Frenchman's sonnet beginning, 'Quand vous serez bien vieille au soir à la chandelle'. In a letter to his father Yeats praised Villon and Ronsard for their power of dramatic lyrical expression, and Mackey finds in the latter's sonnet the source of Yeats's poem. In theme, imagery and aesthetic pattern they are alike. But the spirit of Yeats's poem is different from Ronsard's and 'comes from the mysticism of his temperament and the symbolism and simplicity of his art'.

A. Norman Jeffares discusses *The Byzantine Poems of W. B. Yeats* (*R.E.S.*, Jan.) 'Sailing to Byzantium' (1926) exists in MS. drafts as well as in the printed form, and from a comparison of these Jeffares traces 'the process by which an autobiographical record of a mood was altered into this complex symbolic poem'. For 'Byzantium' (1930) he indicates the sources upon which Yeats chiefly drew.

In *Two Songs of Yeats's* (*M.L.N.*, June) Russell K. Alspach first traces the three different versions through which 'Red Hauraban's Song About Ireland' passed successively in the *National Observer*, 4 August 1894, *The Sweet Rose* (1897) and *A Broad Sheet* (1903), before it appeared, with its final title, in *The Poetical Works* (1906). Alspach also finds a source of 'The Song of Wandering Aengus' (1899) in a Greek folk-song, 'The Three Fishes', published in Lucy Garnett's *Greek Folk Poesy*, which Yeats had reviewed.

David H. Greene is anxious to have *An Adequate Text of J. M. Synge* (*M.L.N.*, Nov.). He points out that none of the editions of his collected works, the Dublin (1910), the Boston (1911), the London (1929–34), the Randon House (1935), is complete. The London edition prints for the first time passages from Synge's notebooks and the revised version of Act III of *The Well of the Saints*, but it omits the two essays, 'An Autumn Night in the Hills' and 'Under Ether'. The Randon House edition includes these but it omits six other essays and five translated poems and prints the unrevised version of Act III of *The Well of the Saints*.

Charles E. Mounts in a note on *Housman's Twisting of Scripture* (*M.L.N.*, March) points to Isaiah lv, 1–3, 'Ho everyone that thirsteth', as the inspiration of No. 22 in Housman's *More Poems*,

> *Ho everyone that thirsteth,*
> *And hath the price to give*, etc.

Mounts comments that Housman has 'seized upon an indealistic outcry of the Hebrew prophet as the spring-board for a *carpe diem* justification of an illicit amour', thus exemplifying the bitterness of his mood.

Lee E. Holt, in an article on *E. M. Forster and Samuel Butler* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) claims that Forster should be placed second only

to Shaw among Butler's disciples. In a B.B.C. 1944 series on 'Books that have influenced me' Forster chose as his subject *Erewhon*, and declared that Butler provided the food for which he was waiting. But it is chiefly with passages in *Alps and Sanctuaries* and with *The Way of All Flesh* that Holt finds contacts and parallels in Forster's novels. He illustrates his thesis in turn from *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, *The Longest Journey*, *A Room with a View*, *Howards End* and *A Passage to India*. He finds that both Butler and Forster believe that the English way of life needs an infusion of more of the Italian spirit; that both wage war against intellectual and emotional narrowness, are intensely interested in the conflict of ideas and philosophies, and make effective use of musical analogies. Holt's article deepens the regret that Forster did not write the critical study of Butler which he seems to have planned.

In the same number of *P.M.L.A.* John H. Roberts writes on '*Vision and Design*' in Virginia Woolf. The title of the article is derived from Roger Fry's collection of essays, *Vision and Design* (1920), and Roberts aims at showing that the novelist was greatly influenced by the theories of the artist, with whom in their long association she is known to have discussed the methods of the arts. According to Fry the basic reaction to works of art is 'a reaction to a relation and not to sensations or objects or persons or events'. Thus with Clarissa and Septimus in Mrs. Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway*, 'their reality consists not of themselves as persons, but of their relationship to each other as forms'. Roberts illustrates this in detail from the novel, and finds in it the same 'continuous plastic rhythm penetrating through a whole composition' which charmed Fry in the paintings of Cézanne. Similarly in Mrs. Woolf's next novel, *The Lighthouse*, as Roberts analyses its characters and situations, 'our attention is focused on the problem of relationship, simultaneously human and formal'.

# XV

# BIBLIOGRAPHICA

By STRICKLAND GIBSON

THE Bibliographical Society published a photo-lithographic reprint of its *Short Title Catalogue* (1926)[1] in order to circumvent certain persons in an attempt to exploit the dependence of scholars on the Catalogue by issuing an unauthorized reprint in the United States. The new and enlarged edition of the Catalogue will not be ready for publication for some years to come.

The object of a *Bibliography of English Translations from Medieval Sources*[2] is to answer certain questions, 'whether a given work has ever been translated, whether an existing translation is adequate, and what relationship several translations of a given work bear to one another'. The entry under 'Chaucer' consists largely of renderings of the *Canterbury Tales* into modern English.

*Moreana, 1478–1945*[3] is a list of the principal publications by and about More preparatory to *Materials for the study of Thomas More*. The list is arranged in one alphabetical order.

The bicentenary of the death of Swift was marked in the United States by an exhibition at the University of Texas and by a list of studies on Swift published in the last half-century. These were noticed last year in *Y.W.*, xxvi, 164–5. A similar list of studies on Pope by James E. Tobin was also published.[4]

[1] *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books printed abroad.* The Bibliographical Society, pp. xvi+609. £2 2*s*.

[2] *Bibliography of English Translations from Medieval Sources*, by Clarissa P. Farrar and Austin P. Evans. New York: Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xiii+534. 37*s*. 6*d*.

[3] *Moreana 1478-1945. A Preliminary Check List of material by and about Saint Thomas More*, by Frank Sullivan and Majie Padberg Sullivan. Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Mo. pp. 178.

[4] *Alexander Pope; A List of Critical Studies published from 1895 to 1944*, by James Edward Tobin. New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co pp. 30. 75*c*.

William Miller has compiled a useful list of writings relating to Charles Dickens and his works (1836–1945)[5] arranged under the headings, Personal, Critical, Poetical, Dramatic, Musical, Anthological, Plagiaristic, Topographical, and Bibliographical.

The ninetieth birthday of Bernard Shaw was commemorated by an exhibition sponsored by the National Book League. The Catalogue[6] contains descriptions of autograph MSS., first editions, portraits, etc.

The following articles appeared in *The Library*.[7] Eloise Pafort in *A Group of early Tudor School-books* (March) undertakes the difficult task of listing and arranging a large number of editions, mostly undated, of grammatical treatises chiefly by Stanbridge and Whittinton, many of them not recorded in *S.T.C.* They are mainly in Latin, but Stanbridge's *Parvula* introduces a number of colloquial sentences in the vernacular appropriate to school-life.

In the same number Paul S. Dunkin's *Issues of 'The Fairy Queen', 1692* gives the result of an examination of six copies of this operatic adaptation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* attributed to Elkanah Settle. An examination of six copies of the 1692 edition and of three copies of a 1693 version in the Folger Library showed that in the nine copies at least five, and possibly six, different issues of the 1692 edition are represented.

In *Single-page imposition in 'Foxe's Acts and Monuments'* (June) Leslie M. Oliver discusses the numerous cancels and single leaves found in the second edition of the *Acts and Monuments* (1570). In *The quarto of Field's 'Weather-Cocke'* (1612) William Peery calls attention to variants not previously noted. *Printers' 'Copy Books' and the Black Market in the Elizabethan book trade* (Sept.) by Francis R. Johnson enlarges on a custom of printing houses by which workmen were allowed one or more copies of each book

[5] *The Dickens Student and Collector*, compiled by William Miller. Chapman and Hall. pp. xii+351. 30*s*.

[6] *Bernard Shaw; Catalogue of an Exhibition at 7 Albemarle Street, London, to celebrate his ninetieth birthday*. C.U.P. for the National Book League. pp. 54. 1*s*. 6*d*.

[7] *The Library* (*Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*.) New Series, Vol. XXVI, No. 4; Fifth Series, Vol. I, Nos. 1, 2. O.U.P.

they helped to print. The writer believes that this custom was an encouragement to workmen to 'make-up' extra copies from rejected sheets, which may perhaps furnish an explanation for the issue of many defective copies of Elizabethan books.

W. W. Greg, in the same number, discussing Shirley's masque *The Triumph of Peace* (1633), continues the investigation which William A. Jackson and Miss Emma Va. Unger printed in the Pforzheimer Catalogue by extending it to six copies of *The Triumph* in the British Museum. It is difficult to summarize the conclusions: as Greg says, *The Triumph of Peace* is a bibliographer's nightmare.

Also in September in *Gabriel Harvey's Three Letters: a first issue of his Four Letters*, Francis R. Johnson describes a unique copy in the New York Public Library. John Sparrow discusses in *Some later Editions of Sir John Davies's 'Nosce teipsum'* reprints of that work published in 1689 (or 1688) and 1697. The later edition has an anonymous preface 'by an Ingenious and Learned Divine' which contains expressions identified by Sparrow as translations of part of a poem by Ralph Bathurst prefixed to Hobbes's *Human Nature* (1650).

The review by B. A. Wright of *Milton's Complete Poetical Works in photographic facsimile*, Vol. 2, contains some valuable observations on the difficult questions affecting the first edition of *Paradise Lost*.

In the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*[8] an article by Carl J. Weber, *The Manuscript of Hardy's 'Two on a Tower'*, gives an account of the passage of the author's MS. into print in the pages of the *Atlantic Monthly* (1882). The MS., which was lost for many years, is now in the Houghton Library at Harvard. It is partly in Hardy's hand and partly in Mrs. Hardy's, and is a conflation of two MSS., one of which was sent to the publisher to safeguard a possible loss of the original MS. At least three hands besides Hardy's can be identified, and the writer's aim is to identify, separate, and appraise their respective contributions.

In the same volume Leo Kirschbaum in *Author's copyright in England before 1640* travels over some already well-worked ground.

[8] Vol. 40. New York. $3.

His article is largely a detailed examination of certain books in the Pforzheimer Catalogue. From the material available he finds that there is 'not one authentic case (outside of royal grant) of some one not in the Stationers' Company owning and controlling copyright —the right to print, publish, and sell books'. There are, however, a few instances known of author's copyright and these, Kirschbaum states, 'confirm the conclusion that ownership of copyright by non-stationers was not only a rare but a financially dangerous business'.

The title of David A. Randall's *Plea for a more consistent policy of Cataloguing by Auction Galleries* tells its own story. See also in this connexion *T.L.S.* (2 March): *The Frank Hogan sale*, an answer to criticisms of American Book Auction descriptions, and (23 March) *The Rôle of the Book Auctioneer.*

*S. in Ph.* (April) prints *Recent Literature of the Renaissance (1945)* with sections devoted to Drama and Stage, Shakespeare, Non-dramatic Literature, Spenser, and Milton. There is an article (Oct.) by T. G. Steffan on *Byron autograph letters in the library of the University of Texas* which lists seventy four letters, &c. (Jan. 1807 –19 Jan. 1824) including a will dated 23 August 1811 in which Byron stipulates that he be buried with his dog at Newstead. *M.L.Q.*, (May) contains a *Bibliography of critical Arthurian literature for the year 1945* by John J. Parry. *T.L.S.* (30 March) gives a detailed criticism of Carl J. Weber's bibliography of Housman's *A Shropshire Lad* printed in an edition of the poem published by Colby College, Waterville, Maine. A brief bibliography of James Joyce by P. S. O'Hegarty appeared in *The Dublin Magazine* (N.S., Vol. 21): it is confined to the first editions.[9]

In recent years much attention has been devoted to the routine of printing-houses in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially by American bibliographers. The influence of the printer and his workmen on literary texts is not to be underestimated, and McKerrow many years ago urged students to look at a book 'not only from the point of view of the reader interested in it as literature, but also from the point of view of those who composed,

[9] Notes on the various editions of *Ulysses* will be found in the 1926 (Paris) and 1936 (London) editions of that work.

corrected, printed, folded, and bound it'. Some valuable contributions to a further understanding of this subject are *Notes on Standing Type in Elizabethan Printing* by Fredson Bowers, and *Press Corrections and Presswork in the Elizabethan Printing Shop*, by Francis R. Johnson.[10] The significance of headlines is also discussed by Dunkin in his *Issues of 'The Fairy Queen'* (see above p. 259).

The Bodleian Library received a very important gift of Shelley MSS. from Sir John Shelley-Rolls, Bt. It consists of fourteen of Shelley's note-books, five volumes containing transcriptions of poems and of prose works made by Mary Shelley, drafts of poems and prose works by Shelley, pieces written by Mary Shelley, twenty-seven autograph letters of Shelley (1810–22), 119 letters of Mary Shelley (1823–50), and some relics. No restriction of access is attached to the gift.[11]

The report of the Yale University Library states that the Library possesses 80 per cent of all the items definitely known to have been written by Defoe or ascribed to him.[12]

The University of California published a decennial report of the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library[13] which was received by bequest in 1934. The library is especially rich in the English drama from 1640 to 1700, and ranks in that field as one of the best in the United States. In the Restoration period it possesses at least two-thirds of all the editions of plays published from 1660 to 1700. It has, moreover, the Bixby copy of the First Folio, six copies of the Second, two of the Third, and three of the Fourth Folio, several Shakespeare Quartos, and a representative collection of the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, Chapman, Ford, and Shirley. One of the aims of the library is to build up a scholar's library of limited range. To give this effect special attention is being given to literature published in the century following upon 1640 with Dryden as the central figure. The total number of Dryden volumes at the end of 1944 was over 775. The Clark Library has also an extensive collection of books by and relating to Oscar Wilde.

[10] *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America.* Vol. 40.

[11] *Bodleian Library Record*, II. pp. 144-5. *Bodleian Annual Report, 1945-46.*

[12] *Yale Univ. Library Report, 1945-6*, p. 13.

[13] *William Andrews Clark Memorial Library. Report of the first decade, 1934-44.* Univ. of California: Los Angeles. pp. 78.

The Edinburgh Bibliographical Society[14] published *Authorship attributions in the early play-lists, 1656–1671*, by W. W. Greg The play-lists are those of Rogers and Ley (1656), Edward Archer (1656), and Francis Kirkman (1661 and 1671). Kirkman's list mainly represented his own stock, which he not only sold and lent, but also read. Greg finds, however, that 'the results of his boasted opportunities of acquiring knowledge about the pre-Restoration drama can only be described as disappointing'. The *Transactions* also contain *The Anonymous Designations in Boswell's 'Journal of a tour to the Hebrides' and their identification* by L. F. Powell. A tabulated list contains sixty-three designations of which Powell has succeeded in identifying more than two-thirds.

•

Very few important English MSS. were sold by auction. The most notable were *The Master of Game* and other English and French MSS. on hunting, hawking, etc. (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), £360; *A myrrour to devote peple* (fifteenth century), £280; *A tretys on a book called Stimulus Amoris that is to say the prikke of Love of oure Lord Jesus Christ* (fifteenth century), £34; a draft of the first three chapters of *Directions to Servants* in Swift's hand, £880; a letter of Samuel Johnson (6 Feb. 1759) on the death of his mother, £88; the autograph MS. of Burns's *The Lass o' Ballochmyle*, £300; a commonplace book of Charles Lamb containing extracts from the dramatists, etc., £300; and a series of letters addressed to William Allingham and his wife by the Brownings, Carlyle, Dickens, Emerson, Hawthorne, Leigh Hunt, Landor, Morris,Thackeray, Trollope and others.

The chief item of literary interest sold at auction was a volume containing nine Shakespeare quartos dated 1600, 1608, and 1619, but really all printed in 1619.[15] This volume, which was found at Girsby Manor (Lincs.), fetched £1,000 at Hodgson's. A similar collection of the nine plays, in a seventeenth-century binding, is in the Folger Library at Washington.

Among the other more important books sold at auction were: Caxton's *Game and Playe of the Chesse* (1474), £1,900; Richard

[14] *Transactions*, Vol. 2, Part 4.

[15] *The Remarkable Story of the Shakespearian Quartos of 1619.* Printed for Hodgson and Co. pp. 12. 1*s.*

Rolle's *Contemplacyons of the drede and love of God* [1509], £320; *The Myrrour: and Dyscrypcyon of the Worlde* [?1529], £500; Elyot's *Bankette of Sapience* (1545), £62; Bieston's *Bayte & Snare of Fortune* [?1550], £82; Sir Thomas More's *Workes* (1557), £100; Castiglione's *Courtyer* (1561), £115; *The Boke of Wisdome*, trans. by John Larke (1565), £12 10s.; Ascham's *Scholemaster* (1570), £135; Gosson's *Playes confuted in five actions* [1582], £190; Whetstone's *English myrror* (1586), £105; *Gascoignes Whole woorkes* (1587) and his *Glasse of gouernement* (1575), £220; Lyly's *Euphues* (1588), £105; Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (1590–6), £280; Spenser's *Fowre hymnes* (1596), £230; Gabriel Harvey's *Foure letters* (1592), £230; Lodge's *Euphues shadow* (1592), £190; Peele's *Battell of Alcazar* (1594), £195; Lodge's *Wits miserie* (1596), £130; Nash's *Have with you to Saffron-Walden* (1596), £260; *The discouerie of the Knights of the Poste*, by E.S. (1597), £115; Chapman's *An humerous dayes myrth* (1599), £230; Munday and others, *The downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon* (1601) and *The death of Robert, Earle of Huntington* (1601), £200; *The morall philosophie of Doni. Englished by Sir Thomas North* (1601), £95; Daniel's *Certaine small poems* (1603–5), £85; Breton's *A poste with a packet of madde letters* (1605), £90; *Greenes Carde of fancie* (1608), £135; Greene's *Arcadia* (1610), £100; Donne's *The first* (and second) *anniversarie* (1612), the first edition of part 2 with an unrecorded errata slip of twenty-one lines (see John Sparrow's article, *T.L.S.*, 29 June), £130; *Greenes Groatsworth of witte* (1617), £120; Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (1620), £440; Burton's *Anatomy of melancholy* (1621), £125; Walton's *Compleat angler* (1653), £700; Fielding's *Tom Jones* (1749), £70; Gray's *Elegy*, first edition and first issue (1751), £1,050; Jane Austen's *Sense and sensibility* (1811), £72; Keats's *Poems* (1817), £440; Coleridge, A prospectus of a course of lectures on the old poets, dramatists, etc. (1818), £32; Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey and Persuasion* (1818), £105; and Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre* (1847), £195.

A large and representative collection of first editions of nineteenth and twentieth century authors were sold as part of the Esher Library. At the Hogan sale in New York the Rosebery copy of the First Folio fetched $50,000, Caxton's Chaucer (1478), $13,000, and Herbert's *Temple* (1633), $2,500. The Hogan collection also contained several Shakespeare quartos.

# INDEX I

## AUTHORS AND TITLES

*Owing to limitations of space a number of titles in this Index are abbreviated.*


Abbott, C. C., *Boswell*, 202
Adamson, J. W., *The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon*, 85
Adkins, M. G. M., *Dramatic Satire against the Puritan*, 145; *Citizens in 'Philaster'*, 150.
Adolph, H., *Studies in the 'Perles-vaus'*, 87
Ahlgren, A., *Definite Article with 'Nouns of Possession'*, 40
Aitken, J. (ed.), *English Letters of the Eighteenth Century*, 213, 241
Allen, D. C., *Note on Lyly's 'Midas'*, 139; *Spenser's Orology*, 156; (ed.) *Essayes by Sir W. Cornwallis the Younger*, 159; *Notes on Donne*, 167; *Milton and the Sons of God*, 173
Alington, C. A., *Browning and Beauty*, 236
Alspach, R. H., *Two Songs of Yeats*, 256
Altick, R. U., *'Conveyers', etc.*, 129
Anikst, A., *Shakespeare in Russia*, 135
Antoine, M. S., *Rhetoric of J. Taylor's Prose*, 169
Arberry, A. J., *New Light on Sir W. Jones*, 208; *Asiatic Jones*, 209
Ardenne, S. T. d', *The Devil's Spirit*, 32
Armstrong, E. A., *Shakespeare's Imagination*, 120
Armstrong, W. A., *Eliz. Conception of the Tyrant*, 122, 162
Aronson, A., *The Anatomy of Taste*, 217
Arundell, H. W., *'Pride and Prejudice,'* 230
Aspinall, A., *Scott's Baronetcy*, 230
Aubin, R. A., *Black as the Moor of Venice*, 136
Auerbach, E., *Mimesis*, 10
Austen, W. B., *G. Harvey's 'Lost' Ode on Ramus*, 113

Bagster-Collins, J. F., *G. Colman the Younger*, 213
Bailey, J. O., *Hardy's 'Mephistophelian Visitants'*, 251
Baine, R. M., *Rochester or Fishbourne*, 185
Barke, J., *The Wind that Shakes the Barley*, 216
Baker, C., *The Road to Concord*, 252
Baker, S. J., *The Australian Language*, 57
Bald, R. C., *C. Lamb and the Elizabethans*, 139
Baldensperger, F., *La vie et l'oeuvre de Shakespeare*, 133
Barzun, J., *We Who Teach*, 7
Bate, W. J., *From Classic to Romantic*, 215
Battenhouse, R. W., *'Measure for Measure' and Doctrine of Atonement*, 123
Baum, P. F., *Chaucer's Metrical Prose*, 77
Beall, C. B., *J. Eliot's 'Ortho-Epia-Gallica'*, 158
Beattie, W., *G. Douglas's 'Palice of Honour'*, 111
Belgion, M., *Reading for Profit*, 7
Bentley, Mrs. H. H., *Dickens and Richard Bentley*, 233 (also Bentley, H. H.)
Binns, L. E., *Newman Decides*, 237 (also Ollard, S. L.)
Black, G. F., *Surnames of Scotland*, 51
Bland, D. S., *Basic English*, 53
Blankner, F., *Literary Pattern as a Graph of Social Evolution*, 16

Bennett, H. S., *Medieval Literature and the Modern Reader*, 101
Bennett, J. A. W., *Lombard's Letters*, 93; *Fame of G. Douglas's 'Eneados'*, 110
Bennett, Joan, *Virginia Woolf*, 247
Bennett, W. H., *West Germanic Consonant Lenthening*, 30
Bledsoe, T. F., *Poe's 'Valley of Unrest'*, 255
Bligh, E., *Tooting Corner*, 26
Blunden, E., *Shelley*, 223
Boas, G., *'Troilus and Cressida' and the Time Scheme*, 123
Boas, F. S., *Miss L. Campbell and 'The Mirror for Magistrates'*, 115; *Introduction to Stuart Drama*, 137; *A Lost Restoration Play Restored*, 186
Bolinger, D. L., *Visual Morphemes*, 29
Bonnerot, L., *Keats and Wordsworth* 229
Bowers, F., *Standing Type in Eliz. Printing*, 262
Bowra, C. M., *Background of Modern Poetry*, 23
Braddy, H., *The Cook's Mormal*, 77; *Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers*, 82
Bradshaw, P. V., *Seen in Perspective*, 26
Bray, D., *Difficult Passages in the Sonnets*, 132
Brestl, J., *The Sun's Bright Child*, 134
Briggs, H. E., *Swift and Keats*, 229
Brinkley, R. F., *Doll Tearsheet*, 129, (also Jennings, A. and de Quincey, A.)
Brogan, H. O., *Rachel Esmond*, 236
Bronson, B. H., *Johnson Agonistes*, 200
Brooke, T., *Latin Drama in Renaissance England*, 117
Brooks, C. (ed.), *The Percy Letters, vol. ii*, 191
Brooks, E. St. J., *Sir C. Hatton*, 162
Brown, C. B., *Contribution of Latin to English*, 46
Brown, J. J., *Johnson and First Roller Spinning Machine*, 203
Brown, W. C., *Gay's Mastery of Heroic Couplet*, 196
Brownfield, C., *'By Saint Patrick,'* 121
Bühler, C. F., *New MS. of M.E. Tract on Proportions*, 94
Byrne, M. St. C., *'Like Images'*, 120

Cady, E. H., *Neuroticism of W. D. Howells*, 254
Cain, H. E., *Motivation in 'Romeo and Juliet'*, 127
Callan, N., *'Thyn Owne Book'*, 66, 94
Calver, E., *Present Tense Forms in English*, 41
Cameron, K. N., *A New Shelley Legend*, 224
Campbell, L. B., *Parts added to 'The Mirror for Magistrates', by J. Higgins and T. Blenerhasset*, 114
Canby, H. S., *A New Land Speaking*, 12
Carman, J. H. *Symbolism of the 'Perlesvaus'*, 87
Carter, J., *Dickens and Bentley*, 233
Case, A. E., *'Gulliver's Travels'*, 196
Castelli, A., *G. Chaucer*, 69
Chambers, Sir E. K., *Sources for a Biography of Shakespeare*, 132; (ed.) *Landor: Poetry and Prose*, 131
Chapman, R., *Noreweie and Galeweie*, 91; *'The Youngest Wren'*, 129, (also Ruhl, M. R. and Gwyn, C.)
Chapman, R. W., *Mrs. Piozzi's Omissions from Johnson's Letters to Thrales*, 202; *Notes on Johnson and Boswell*, 203
Chase, F. M., *Whitman's Mockingbird*, 253
Chisholm, F. P., *General Semantics*, 29
Christensen, F., *Creative Sensibility in Wordsworth*, 219
Christian, M. G., *Middleton's Residence at Oxford*, 153
Church, M., *First English Pattern Poems*, 111

Churchill, R. C., *The Baconian Myth*, 134; *Genius of J. Swift*, 198
Clark, A. M., *Studies in Literary Modes*, 21
Clark, D. L., *Milton's Schoolmasters*, 175
Clark, E. M., *The Towneley 'Peregrini'*, 98
Clausen, W., *Beginnings of English Character Writing*, 160
Closson, H., *Shakespeare*, 135
Connolly, C., *Condemned Playground* 250
Collins, A. S., *Timon of Athens*, 122
Coffin, R. P. and Witherspoon, A.M. (eds.), *Seventeenth-Century Prose and Poetry*, 165
Craigie, Sir W. A., *Critique of Pure English from Caxton to Smollett*, 36; *Pure English of the Soil. Inflected English*, 37; *Dictionary of Older Scottish Tongue*, 54
Crawford, C. E., *Pope's Debt to E. Young*,198
Creed, H. H., *Coleridge on 'Taste'*, 220
Curle, R., *The Brownings*, 273, (also French, H. D.)

Daniells, R., *English Baroque and Deliberate Obscurity*, 164
Davies, E. T., *Political Ideas of R. Hooker*, 159
Davies, G., *Conclusion of 'Absalom and Achitophel'*, 182; *Date of 'Britannia and Rawleigh'*, 187
Davis, H., *Stella*, 197
Dawson, G. E., *Copyright of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works*, 130
Delcourt, J. (ed.), *Chaucer. Contes de Cantorbéry*, 71
Dempster, G., *Manly's Conception of the Early History of the 'Canterbury Tales'*, 72
Deneke, H., *Grace Hadow*, 25
Derby, J. R., *Paradox of F. Jeffrey*, 233
Derolez, R. L., *garsecg*, 32
Deutschbein, M., *Hamlet und Montaigne; 'To be or not to be'; Shakespeare's kosmischen Mächte*, 127
Diekhoff, J. S., *'Paradise Lost'*, 171
Dobrée, B., *Daniel Defoe*, 195
Donner, H. W., *Introduction to 'Utopia'*, 104
Douglas, D., *Norman Conquest and British Historians*, 89
Draper, J. W., *Tempo of Desdemona's Speech; Tempo of Shakespeare's Speech*, 131
Dunbar, H. H., *Dramatic Career of A. Murphy*, 207
Duncan, E. H., *Jonson's 'Alchemist' and Literature of Alchemy*, 147
Dunkin, P. S., *Issues of 'The Fairy Queen'*, 259
Dunlap, R., *Donne as Navigator*, 167

Eaves, T. C., *J. Highmore's Portrait of Rev. E. Young*, 198
Eccles, M., *Chapman's Early Years*, 151
Ekfelt, F. E., *Graphic Diction of Milton's Prose*, 175
Eisenring, A. J., *'De Doctrina Christiana'*, 174
Ekwall, E., *Surnames in Medieval London*, 52; *American and British Pronunciation*, 54
Elwin, M., *Thackeray*, 234
Emery, J. P., *Murphy's and Smart's 'Hilliad'*, 204; *Arthur Murphy*, 207
Entrikin, I. W., *S. J. Hale and Godey's 'Lady's Book'*, 241
Erhardt-Siebold, E. von, *Old English Riddle, No.* 4, 62; *Riddle* 39; *Riddle* 74 *and Empedokles' Fragment*, 63
Evans, B. I., *Thackeray in his Letters*, 235
Evans, D. A., *Shakespeare and 'Mirror of Knighthood'*, 131
Evans, W. M., *'The Rose' by Wilson and Lovelace*, 168
Eyre, F., *The Quiet Spirit*, 27

Fairchild, H. N., *Byron and Monk Lewis*, 222

Farrar, C. P. and Evans, A. P., *Bibliography of English Translations from Medieval Sources*, 87, 258
Feibleman, J., *The Theory of 'Hamlet'*, 126
Fellowes, E. H., *'It was a lover and his lass'*, 130
Firth, J. B., *English School of Phonetics*, 47
Flatter, R., *Modern Stage-Directions in Shakespeare*, 128
Fogle, R. H., *Empathic Imagery in Keats and Shelley*, 227
Forest, L. C., *A Caveat for Critics ... Psychology*, 119
Fox, A., *Plato for Pleasure*, 14
Foxcroft, H. C., *A Character of the Trimmer*, 176
Fredén, G., *Tide of Verona*, 127
Fullerton, A. B., *The Five Craftsmen*, 76
Furuskog, R., *Katherine Group MS. Bodley 34*, 95

Gabrielson, A., *Några Terminologiska Frågor i Engelsk Fonetik*, 42
Galway, M., *Chaucer among Thieves*, 81
Gardiner, H. C., *Mysteries' End*, 99, 117
Gardner, H. L., *Donne's Verse Letters*, 167
Garrod, H. W., *Scholarship, Its Meaning and Value*, 21; (ed.) *J. Donne; Poetry and Prose*, 166
Gates, P. G., *In Defence of Leigh Hunt*, 234
Gilman, W. H., *Melville's Liverpool Trip*, 254
Goldberg, M. H., *Carlyle, Pictet and Jeffrey*, 232
Gordon, G., *The Discipline of Letters*, 22
Gordon, R. K., *'Eve of St. Agnes'*, 229
Goring, W. T., *'My Lady' of 'Modern Love'*, 252
Granville-Barker, H., *Preface to 'Othello'*, 125
Greene, D. H., *Text of J. M. Synge*, 256
Greening-Lamborn, E. A., *Sir Walter's Heraldry*, 230
Greg, W. W., *Staging of 'Lear'*, 130; *The Damnation of Faustus*, 143; *Shakespeare and Jonson*, 148; *Shirley's 'Triumph of Peace'*, 260; *Authorship attributions in the early play-lists*, 263
Gregor, D. B. *Letter from Countess Guiccioli*, 222; *Plagiarism or Parallelism?*, 223
Griffiths, G. S., *'Antony and Cleopatra'* 126
Grigson, G. (ed.), *The Mint*, 26; (ed.) *Before the Romantics*, 192
Groot, J. de., *The Shakespeares and 'The Old Faith'*, 132
Guidi, A., *Coventry Patmore*, 239
Guido, A., *Humor of Juliet's Nurse*, 131

Hall, R. A., Jr., *Bound Forms*, 42
Hall, V., Jr., *Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 102
Haller, W., *'Hail, Wedded Love'*, 171
Hamilton, M., *Religious Principle in 'Beowulf'*, 60
Hamilton, R., *W. H. Hudson*, 247
Hanford, J. H., *Milton Handbook*, 169
Harding, D. P., *Milton and Renaissance Ovid*, 170
Harris, Z. S., *From Morpheme to Utterance*, 29
Harrison, T. P., Jr., *Flower Lore in Spenser and Shakespeare*, 130, 156
Hatcher, A. G., *Twilight Splendour, etc.*, 43
Hatto, A. T., *'Venus and Adonis'—and the Boar*, 121
Havens, R. D., *Southey's Revision of his 'Life of Wesley's* 219; *'Hellas' and 'Charles the First'*, 225
Hawkins, J. E., *Lear and the Psalmists*, 121
Hayford, H., *Melville's 'Agatha' Letters*, 254

Healey, G. H. (ed.), *Meditations of Daniel Defoe*, 191
Heilman, R. B., *Falstaff and Mickle-whimmen*, 136, 200
Henderson, R. (ed.), *Poems by G. Crabbe*, 194
Heningham, E. K., *Genuineness of 'Vita Æduardi Regis'*, 89
Henning, J., *Dickens and Goethe*, 234
Henrey, R., *The King of Brentford*, 214
Herrick, A., *Eighteenth-Century Verse*, 205
Herrick, M. T., *Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism*, 103
Hill, L. H., *Madden's Divisions of 'Sir Gawain'*, 91
Hiscock, W. G., *A Christ Church of Miscellany*, 137
Hitchins, H. L. (ed.), *Canterbury Tales*, 72
Hobday, C. H., *Social Background of 'King Lear'*, 122
Hodgson, Messrs., *Quartos of 1619*, 129
Hoefling, M. C., *A Study . . . Satiric Verse Characters of Dryden*, 178
Hoenigswald, H. M., *Sound Change and Linguistic Structure*, 29
Holaday, A., *'Troia Britannica' and 'The Ages'*, 148
Holt, L. E., *E. M. Forster and S. Butler*, 256
Holthouse, E. H., *Scott's First Love*, 230
Hooker, E. N., *Purpose of 'Annus Mirabilis'*, 181
Hooker, H. M., *Dryden's 'Georgics' and English Predecessors*, 180
Hoole, W. S., *Shakespeare and the Charleston Stage*, 135
Hopkins, A. B., *Dickens and Mrs. Gaskell*, 234
Hoppe, H. R., *'John of Bordeaux'*, 130, 144
Horne, C. J., *King versus Bentley*, 188 195
Hort, G. M., *First Born of Ariel*, 226
Houghton, W. E., *Meaning of 'Eve of St. Mark'*, 228
Howard, E. J. (ed.), *Sir T. Elyot's 'Of the Knowledge which maketh A Wise Man'*, 105
Howard, L., *'Invention' of Milton's 'Great Argument'*, 172
Howarth, R. G., *Scholarship and Skelton*, 109; *Congreve's First Play*, 189
Howell, A. C., *Res et Verba*, 168
Hulbert, J. R., *Thirteenth Century English Literary Standard*, 38; *'Beowulf' and the Classical Epic*, 60
Humphreys, A. R., *Rights of Women in Age of Reason*, 217
Hunter, W. B. Jr., *Eve's Demonic Dream*, 173; *Milton's Materialistic Life Principle; Milton and Thrice Great Hermes*, 174

Irwin, W. R., *Satire and Comedy in H. Fielding*, 199

Jackson, Sir B., *Fifty Years of Stratford-on-Avon; The Apparel Oft Proclaims . . .*, 134
Jackson, K., *The Name 'Leeds'*, 48
Jarvis, R. C., *The Death of Walpole: H. Fielding, etc.*, 199
Jeffares, A. N., *Byzantine Poems of Yeats*, 256
Jeremy, M., *Caxton's 'Golden Legend' and Varagine's 'Legende Aurea'*, 96
Jespersen, O., *Mankind, Nation and the Individual*, 29
John, E., *Shakespeare's Angels*, 119
John, L. C., *B. Jonson's Epigram CXIV*, 157
Johnson, E. C., *Lamb and Manning*, 231
Johnson, F. R., *Marlowe's Astronomy*, 140; *Printers' Copy Books, etc.* 159; *G. Harvey's Three Letters*, 260; *Press Corrections in Eliz. Printing Shop*, 262
Johnson, J. K. (ed.), *Journals of C. K. Newcomb*, 240

Jones, C. E., *Works attributed to E. Ward*, 190; *Letters to H. Croft from Johnson and Mrs. Montagu*, 203
Jones, F. L., *The Shelley Legend*, 224; *Inconsistency of 'Alastor'*, 225
Jost, K., *Crist 558-585*, 64
Judson, A. C., *Seventeenth-Century Lives of Spenser*, 155
Jump, J. D., *M. Arnold and 'Saturday Review'*, 238

Kallish, M., *Associationist Criticism of Hutcheson and Hume*, 216
Kane, R. J., *Tolstoy, Goethe, and 'Lear'*, 136
Kanters, R., *Le Romantisme Anglais*, 216
Kavanagh, P., *The Irish Theatre*, 8
Keeler, L., *'Historia Regum Britanniae' and . . . Chroniclers*, 90
Keister, D. A., *Lady Kent and the Two Sir Edwards*, 169
Keith, C., *Byron's Letters*, 222
Kenmare, D., *Haydon's Tragedy*, 237
Kenny, H., *West Virginia Place Names*, 50
Kenyon, K. M., *Keats and Ourselves*, 227
Ketton-Cremer, R. W., *Horace Walpole*, 205
Keynes, G., *Blake*, 213; (ed.), *Poetical Works of R. Brooke*, 250
Kirby, T. A., *Carlyle and Chaucer; I. Q. Adams and Chaucer*, 83; *Carlyle and Irving*, 232
Kirschbaum, L., *Shakespeare's 'Hypothetical Marginal Additions*, 130; *Good and Bad Quartos of 'Doctor Faustus'*, 141; *Light on 'The Jew of Malta'*, 144; *Author's Copyright before 1640*, 260
Kittredge, G. L. (ed.), *Sixteen Plays of Shakespeare*, 128
Kliger, S., *'Urbs Æterna' in 'Paradise Regained'*, 173
Knickerbocker, W. S. (ed.), *Twentieth Century English*, 30, 168
Knight, G. W., *Hiroshima*, 11
Knights, L. C., *Explorations*, 119, 126, 132
Kocher, P. H., *Bible in Renaissance Astronomical Treatises*, 109, 161; *Christopher Marlowe*, 139
Koenig, V. F., *The Wager Cycle*, 127
Kokentz, H., *The Towneley 'Resurrection'*, 98; *'Beast-eating Clown'*, 130
Kubach, R. R., *Was Keats the Sensitive Plant?*, 227
Kuhl, E. F., *Chaucer and Westminster Abbey*, 82

Laird, J., *Philosophical Incursions into English Literature*, 13, 131
Lampman, J., *Character and Poetry of Keats*, 229
Langenfelt, G., *Roots of Propword 'one'*, 40
Lawrence, W. W., *Hamlet and Fortinbras*, 126
Lederer, J., *Donne and Emblematic Practice*, 167
Lefranc, A., *A la découverte de Skakespeare*, 133
Legouis, P. (trans.), *Dryden: Poèms Choisis*, 178
Lenoël, O., *Katherine Mansfield*, 248
Letts, M., 'Mandeville', 95
Levison, W., *England and the Continent in Eighth Century*, 58
Lewin, H., *Falstaff Uncolted*, 121
Lewis, D. B. W., *The Hooded Hawk*, 203
Lind, I. D., *Richard Jago*, 206
Lindbach, E., *Hamlet*, 126
Löfvenberg, M. T., *M. E. Lexicography and Etymology*, 34
Looker, S. J. (ed.), *The Worthing Cavalcade; R. Jefferies*, 244
Lorimer, H. L., *Homer and Pope*, 198
Lynam, E. (ed.), *R. Hakluyt and his Successors*, 159
Lynd, R. *Dr. Johnson and Company*, 213

Mabbott, T. O., *Gascoigne on Marcus Aurelius and 'Boemia'*, 108; *Chatterton and Byron*, 223

McCleary, G. F., *A Victorian Classic*, 239
McCloskey, J. C., *Plot Device of False Report*, 127
Macdonald, H., *Portraits in Prose*, 27
Macdonald, W. L., *A French Life of Pope*, 198
McGlinchee, C., *Romance in a Reference Book*, 130
McGinn, D. J., *Allegory in 'Pierce Pennilesse'*, 158
McKechnie, S., *Lamb of the India House*, 231
Mackenzie, A. M., *Scottish Pageant*, 27
McKenzie, B. A., *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, 132
Mackey, W. F., *Yeats's Debt to Rousard*, 258
McManaway, *Cancel in Quarto of '2 Henry IV'*, 128
MacNalty, Sir A. S., *Sir T. More as Public Health Reformer*, 103
McNeal, T. H., *'Henry IV' and Speights' Chaucer*, 131
McNully, J., *The Man Shelley*, 223
McPeek, J. A., *Genesis of Caliban*, 121
Madariaga, S. de, *A Passage in 'Hamlet'*, 130; *Don Juan as a European Figure*, 221
Malone, K., *Two Good A.-S. Words*, 45; *Variation in 'Widsith'*, 64; *Style and Structure in the Prologue to 'Cant. Tales'*, 76
Maritain, J., *Art and Scholasticism* (trans., Scanlan, J. F.), 14
Martin, L. C., *Oliver Elton*, 25
Matthiesen, F. O., *Henry James*, 245
Maxwell, I., *French Farce and J. Heywood*, 115
Maxwell, J. C., *Coleridge and Priestley*, 221
Meikle, H. W. and Beattie, W. (eds.), *Poems of R. Burns*, 194
Meissner, P., *Gestaltung des Tragischen bei Shakespeare*, 127
Migliorini, B., *Linguistica*, 29
Miles, J., *Major Adjectives in English Poetry*, 16
Milgate, W., *Date of Donne's Birth*, 166
Miller, E. S., *Roister Doister's Funeralls*, 115
Miller, W., *Dickens Student and Collector*, 259
Millhauser, M., *Noble Savage in 'Frankenstein'*, 227
Moore, A. K., *Chaucer and Matheolus*, 78
Moore, J. R., *Iago*, 125
Morgan, A. E., *Nowhere and Somewhere*, 105
Morgan, C., *Reflections in a Mirror*, 20; *The Artist in the Community*, 21
Morozov, M. M., *'Othello'*, 125
Morris, C., *Signs, Language and Behaviour*, 29
Mossé, F., *Manuel de l'Anglais du Moyen Age*, 59
Mounts, C. E., *Virtuous Duplicity in 'F.Q.'*, 156; *Housman's Twisting of Scripture*, 256
Muir, K., *The Future of Shakespeare*, 119; *'Timon of Athens' and the Cash-Nexus*, 122
Mullett, C. F., *Hugh Plat*, 161; *T. Walkington and his 'Optick Glasse'*, 168; *Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688*, 187

Nahm, M. C., *Aesthetic Experience and its Presuppositions*,14
Nash, R., *Milton, Jonson and Tiberius* 170
Nearing, H. Jr., *Allusions to 'Richard II'*, 136
Newstead, H., *Background of 'Partonopeus de Blois'*, 88
Newman, S. S., *Stress System of English*, 42
Nicholson, Hon. H., (ed.) *Essays by Divers Hands, Vol. XXIII*, 19
Nicoll, A., *Late Nineteenth Century Drama*, 243
Nida, E. A., *Morphology*, 29

Nitze, W. A., *The Bleeding Lance and Philip of Flanders*, 87
Nolan, J. B., *Shakespeare Crosses the Rhine*, 135
Nosworthy, J. M., *Structural Experiment in 'Hamlet'*, 126; *Textual Anomalies in 1604 'Doctor Faustus'*, 142; *Henry Porter*, 146

O'Brien, M. E., *Keats's Forerunners*, 229
Ogle, M. B., *Comestor, Methodius and Saracens*, 84
Oliver, L. M., *W. Wager and 'The Trial of Treasure'*, 116; *'Foxes' Acts and Monuments'*, 259
Orwell, G., *Critical Essays*, 23
Orwen, W. H., *Spenser's 'Stemmata Dudleiana'*, 155
Osborne, W. A., *Essays and Studies*, 15
Owen, E., *Milton and Selden on Divorce*, 171

Pafort, E., *Early Tudor School-Books*, 103, 250
Page, F., *Dickens and Owen Meredith*, 233
Palmer, J., *Comic Characters of Shakespeare*, 123
Parker, E., *Matthew Arnold*, 238 (also Steel, C. H. and others)
Parr, J., *Edmund's Nativity in 'King Lear'*, 130; *Byron's Malignant 'Caput Algol'*, 152
Parry, J. J., 1945 *Bibliography of Arthurian Material*, 86
Parsons, C. O., *H. Ainsworth . . . in 'Miser's Daughter'*, (also Micklewright, F.H.A.); *Material for Study of 'Silas Marner'*, 239; *Notes on Stevenson* 240
Partridge, E., *Journey to the Edge of Morning*, 24
Peacock, R., *The Poet in the Theatre*, 9
Pearson, H., *Life of O. Wilde*, 244
Peery, W., *N. Field's Dates*, 149; *Notes on Field*, 150, 259.
Perkinson, R. H., *Epic in Five Acts*, 167
Pike, K. L., *Intonation of American English*, 55
Pinto, V. de S. (ed.), *Essays and Studies, Vol. XXXI*, 19, 101, 170; *Sir W. Jones and English Literature*, 208
Pope-Hennessy, Dame U., *C. Dickens and Richard Bentley*, 233
Pottle, F. A., *The Idiom of Poetry*, 15
Powell, L. F., *Sir W. Jones in the Club*, 208; *Anonymous Designations in . . . 'A Tour to the Hebrides'*, 263
Pratt, R. A., *Karl Young on Chaucer's Learning*, 68; *Chaucer Borrowing from Himself*, 69; *Geographical Problems in 'Troilus and Criseyde'*, 81
Praz, M. (trans.), *Shakespeare: Teatro, Vol. ii, iii*, 136; *J. Donne; R. Crashaw*, 167
Pritchett, V. S., *The Living Novel*, 24
Prouty, C. T. (ed.), *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*, 108, 125, 128, 130, 134, 139, 144, 161, 229
Putney, D. S., *Alas, Poor Eliza*, 200

Rattrey, R. F., *'Aguecake'*, 129
Ray, G. N. (ed.), *Letters and Private Papers of W. M. Thackeray*, 234
Reade, A. L., *Johnsonian Gleanings, Part X*, 201
Rees, O. (ed.), *An A-N Rhymed Apocalypse*, 86
Reese, G., *R. Browning and his Son*, 237
Reid, F., *The Milk of Paradise*, 18
Ribner, I., *Dryden's Shaksperian Criticism*, 136
Riddehough, G. B., *Queene Elizabeth's Translation of Boethius*, 158
Roberts, J. H., *'Vision and Design' in V. Woolf*, 257
Robertson, D. W. Jr., *Mannyng's Treatment of the Commandments*, 92
Rollins, H. E., *Keats's Elgin Marble Sonnets*, 229

Rosenfeld, S. and Southern, R. (eds.), *Theatre Notebook*, 9
Rossiter, A. P. (ed.), *Woodstock*, 145
Royde-Smith, N., *Mind of Mrs. Sherwood*, 219
Rubow, P. V., *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, 132
Rulikowski, M., *Shakespeare na scenach polskich*, 135
Russell, T. W., *Voltaire, Dryden and Heroic Tragedy*, 183

Salter, F. M., *J. Skelton's Contribution to the English Language*, 35
Sandison, H. E., *Vanytyes of Sir A. Gorges Youthe*, 157
Sandys, O., *Caradoc Evans*, 149
Schaus, H., '*Comus*', '*Hero and Leander*', '*Venus and Adonis*', 170
Scherer, M., *About the Round Table*, 86
Schlatter, R. (ed.), *History of Kingdom of Basaruch*, 192
Schlauch, M., *Marital Dilemma in* '*Wife of Bath's Tale*', 79
Scott, F. R., *Life and Works of Sir R. Howard*, 183
Scott, W. S., *The Fantasticks*, 165
Scudder, H. H., *Thackeray and Sir Martin Archer-Shee*, 236
Seaton, E., '*Goode lief my wyf*', 77; '*Ant. and Cleopatra*' *and Book of Revelation*, 121; '*Comus*' *and Shakespeare*, 170; *Coleridge and Priestley*, 221
Seebor, E. D. and Remark, H. H., *First French Translation of* '*The Deserted Village*', 204
Selincourt, E. de. and Darbishire, H. (eds.), *Poetical Works of Wordsworth, Vol. III*, 218
Semper, L. J., '*By Saint Patrick*', 121
Sells, A. L., *Return of Cleveland in* '*The' Pirate*', 230
Sencourt, R., *Byron and Shelley at Geneva*, 223
Sensabaugh, G. F., *Milton on Learning*, 171; '*Areopagitica*' *Adapted; Milton in the Revolution Settlement*, 175
Severs, J. B., *Chaucer's Originality in the* '*Nun's Priest's Tale*', 78; *Did Chaucer revise the* '*Clerk's Tale*?', 80
Seybolt, R. F., *Legendo Aurea*, 97
Shahani, R. G., *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, 132
Shanley, J. L., *Spenser's Temperance and Aristotle*, 156
Shaw, G. B., *Geneva, Cymbeline Refinished, etc.*, 135
Sheldon, E. K., *Pronouncing Systems in Eighteenth Century Dictionaries*, 39
Shield, H. A., *Links with Shakespeare*, 134
Sidgwick, J. B. (ed.), *Shorter Poems of Landor*, 231
Simpson, E. M., *Date of Donne's* '*Hymne to God*', 166
Simpson, P., *Supposed Crux in* '*Tempest*', 130; *Castle of the Rosy Cross*, 147
Sitwell, E., *Fanfare for Elizabeth*, 106 '*Measure for Measure*', 123; (*ed.*) *Poems of R. Bottrall*, 250
Sledd, J., *Baret's* '*Alvearie*', 36
Small, S. A., '*Lear*' *Quarto*, 130
Smith, H., *English Metrical Psalms*, 111; *Sir T. Wyatt*, 112
Smith, Robert M., *The Shelley Legend*, 223
Smith, Roland M., *Limited Vision of St. Bernard*, 80; '*Lear*' *and Merlin Tradition*, 131; *Una and Duessa; Irish Names in* '*F. Q.*', 156
Smith, W. W., *Burns and Scottish Flora*, 214
Smyser, H. N., '*Charlemagne and Roland*' *and Auchinleck M.S.*, 92
Snoddy, T. G., *Michael Bruce*, 206
Sochaczewer, H., *Thackeray and Goethe*, 235 (also Phillips, W. A. and MacCarthy, D.)
Southward, E. C., *The Knight Yder and the Beowulf Legend*, 61, 88
Sparrow, J., Sir J. Davies's *Nosce Teipsum*, 157, 260
Speaight, R., *Shakespeare and Politics*, 121

Spears, M. K., *M. Prior's 'Alma'*, 196
Spens, J., *The Prince in the Tavern*, 128
Spitzer, L., *Patterns of Thought and Etymology*, 44; *The Gentiles*, 45
Starnes, De W. T. and Noyes, G. E., *English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson*, 38
Starr, N. C., *Coleridge's Sir Leoline*, 220
Stauffer, D., *The Nature of Poetry*, 17
Stearns, M. W., *Chaucer's Use of Aristotelian Psychology*, 67
Steele, R. and Day, M. (eds.), *English Poems of Charles of Orleans*, 94
Steffan, T. G., *Byron letters in University of Texas*, 261
Stegemeier, H., *Problems in Emblem Literature*, 161
Stein, A., *Donne's Obscurity*, 166
Steuert, Dom H., *Prose Style of Thomas Watson*, 106
Stevenson, A. H., *Shirley's Dedications and his Return to England*, 153
Stevenson, D. L., *The Love-Game Comedy*, 124
Stewart, G. R., *Names on the Land*, 49
Stoll, E. E., *An Othello All Too Modern*, 125; *Mainly Controversy*, 125
Strachan, L. R., *Tennyson Queries Answered*, 236
Strout, A. L., *Letters of Lockhart to Croker*, 231
Stuart, D. M., *The English Abigail*, 10
Sullivan, F. and M. P., *Moreana*, 258
Svendsen, K., *Sonnet on Massacre in Piedmont*, 171
Swaen, A. E., *Riddle 9 and 8*, 64
Swedenberg, H. T. Jr., *George Stepney*, 188
Sweet, H., *A.-S. Reader* (rev. Onions, C. T.), 59
Sykes, W. J., *Hazlitt's Place in Literature*, 232

Talbert, E. W., *Jonson's Courtly Spectacles*, 147
Tatlock, J. S. P., *Medieval Laughter*, 101
Templeman, W. D., *M. Arnold, Macaulay and Espinasse*, 238
Thecla, M., *S. Thomas More and the 'Catena Aurea'*, 105
Theresa, M., *'The Muses Fairest Light'*, 168
Thompson, L. C., *Keats and Shelley*, 226
Thorndike, L., *Univ. Records and Life in the Middle Ages*, 85
Tillemans, T., *J. Skelton, A Conservative*, 110
Tillett, N. S., *Is Coleridge Indebted to Fielding?*, 199, 220
Tilney-Bassett, J. G., *E. Tilney's, 'The Flower of Friendshippe'*, 109
Tillotson, G., *Newman's Essay on Poetry*, 237
Tintner, A. R., *Spoils of H. James*, 255
Tobin, J. E., *A. Pope: Critical Studies*, 258
Todd, R., *Tracks in the Snow*, 212
Tompkins, J. M., *Tourneur and the Stars*, 152
Townsend, F. L., *Artistry of T. Heywood's Double Plots*, 149; *Sidney and Ariosto*, 157
Tristram, H., *On Reading Newman*, 237
Trowbridge, H., *Rules in Dryden's Literary Criticism*, 179
Troyer, H. W., *Ned Ward of Grubsheet*, 196
Trueblood, P. G., *Flowering of Byron's Genius*, 221
Turnbull, D., *English Elegies*, 223
Turnbull, J. M., *An Elian Annotation*, 231
Tweedsmuir, Lady (ed.), *The Clearing House: A Selection from J. Buchan*, 149
Tyler, H., *'Thrillers' at Eton*, 225

Ullmann, S. De, *Language and Meaning*, 29

Unwin, Sir S., *The Truth About Publishing*, 28
Ure, P., *Towards a Myth*, 246
Uttley, F. L. (ed.), *The Chorister's Lament*, 93

Vachell, H. A., *Now Came Still Evening On*, 25
Vandiver, E. V., *Dickens' Knowledge of Shakespeare*, 136
Verkoren, L., '*Lift not the painted veil*', 226
Vulliamy, C. E., *Ursa Major*, 204

Wadepuhl, W., *Heine and Shakespeare*, 136
Walker, R. S. (ed.), *J. Beattie's London Diary*, 193
Walter, J. H., '*With Sir John in it*', 128
Warner, R., *The Cult of Peace*, 12
Watkins, R., *Moonlight at the Globe*, 134
Watson, J. W. Jr., *Northumbrian O.E. ēo and ēa*, 31, 64
Watson, M. R., *The 'Spectator' Tradition*, 199
Weatherly, E. H., Churchill's *Literary Indebtedness to Pope*, 204
Weber, C. J., *MS. of Hardy's 'Two on a Tower'*, 260
Webster, H. T., *Gissing and Maugham*, 153
Wegelin, C., *Dickens and Irving*, 233
Weir, J. L., *Letter of King James II*, 190
Weisinger, H., *English Treatment of Classical-Romantic Problem*, 240
Wellek, R., *Concept of Baroque*, 164
West, A. F. (trans.), '*Philobiblion*' *of R. de Bury*, 84
West, E. J., *Contrast in 'M. of Ven.'*, 127
Westfall, A, *It Started with a Bullfight*, 134
Wheatley, V., *Thackeray*, 235
Whitbread, L., *O.E. Whale-hunting*, 65
White, D. M., *Brooke-Broome Question*, 129
White, N. I., '*Shelley Legend*' *Examined*, 224
Wiley, P. L., *Renaissance Exploitation of Cavendish's 'Life of Wolsey'*, 107
Willey, B., *Coleridge on Imagination and Fancy*, 219
Williams, H., *H. Irving as Romeo*, 134
Williams, M., *Lady Luxborough Goes to Bath*, 205
Williams, R. M., *J. Dyer's Degree*, 204
Williams, R. T., '*Inside the Coach*', 200
Williamson, G., *Occasion of an 'Essay of Dramatic Poesy'*, 179
Wilson, E. C., *Prince Henry and English Literature*, 163
Wilson, E. F. (ed.), *J. of Garland's 'Stella Maris'*, 82
Wilson, H. S., *Gabriel Harvey*, 113
Wilson, J. D., *Henry IV, Parts I and II*, 127
Wilson, J. H., *Rochester's 'A Session of Poets'*, 184
Wilson, R. H., *Brave New World as Shakspere Criticism*, 136
Winsatt, W. K., *Johnson and Scott*, 203
Witcutt, W. P., *Blake*, 211
Wood, F. T., *English Eighteenth Century Provincial Playbills*, 217
Wood, W., *Investigation of Hambleton Dialect*, 53
Woodcock, G., *William Godwin*, 210
Woodward, W. E., *Tom Paine*, 211
Wormald, F., *A.-S. Illumination after Norman Conquest*, 86
Worthington, J., *Wordsworth's reading in Roman Prose*, 218
Wrenn, C. L., *Henry Sweet*, 48
Wright, B. A., *Notes on 'Par. Lost' and 'Comus'*, 172
Wright, C. T., *Eliz. Female Worthies*, 161

Young, C. B., '*St. Agnes Eve*' *and 'Cymbeline'*, 136, 228
Zeeveld, W. G., *Social Equalitarianism in a Tudor Crisis*, 106
Zeydel, E. H., *Hrotsvitha*, 98

# II

# SELECTED SUBJECTS


American Place-Names, 48–51
Anglo-Norman Studies, 86, 89
Anthologies, 26–8, 165, 192
Arnold, Matthew, 238–9
Arthurian Romance, 86–8
Astrology, 152–3
Australian English, 56–7
Austen, Jane, 230
Authors' Copyright before 1640, 260–1
Authorship attributions in early play-lists, 263

Baroque style, 164
Beattie, James, 193–4
Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John, 150–1
Bentley, Richard (Cambridge), 188–9, 195
Bentley, Richard (publisher), 233
*Beowulf*, 60–1, 88–9
Bible, Use of in Renaissance Astronomical Treatises, 109, 161
Bibliographical Society Transactions, 259–60
Bibliographical Society of America, 260–1
Bibliography of English Translations from Medieval Sources, 86, 258
Bibliography of Arthurian Literature (1945), 261
Blake, William, 211–13
Bodleian Library, 262
Book Auctions, 263–4
Boswell, James, 200–4, 263
Bottrall, Ronald, 250
Brooke, Rupert, 250
Bruce, Michael, 206
Buchan, John (Lord Tweedsmuir), 209
Burns, Robert, 194–5, 214, 216
Butler, Samuel, 256–7
Byron, Lord, 221–3, 261

Carlyle, Thomas, 232
Cavendish, George, *Life of Wolsey*, 107
Chapman, George, 151–2
Character Writing, 160
Chaucer, Geoffrey, Chauceriana and general criticism, 66–71; *Canterbury Tales*, 71–80; *Legend of Good Women*, 80; *Troilus and Criseyde*, 81; *Fortune*, 81; Chaucer and Alice Perrers, 82; Chaucer and Westminster Abbey, 82; Allusions by Carlyle, 83
Christ Church, Oxford, plays at, 137–8
Classic and Romantic, 215–16, 240–1
Coleridge, S. T., 199, 200, 219–21
Colman, George, the Younger, 213
Congreve, William, 189
Cornwallis, Sir W., the Younger, 159–60
Crabbe, George, 194

Defoe, Daniel, 191, 195, 262
Dickens, Charles, 233–4, 259
Dictionaries, 36, 38–40, 46, 54
Donne, John, 166–7
Douglas, Gavin, 110–11
Drama, Late XIXth Century, 242–4
Dryden, John, 177–8, 262

Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 263
Elizabeth, Queen, *Translation of Boethius*, 158–9
Elyot, Sir T., 105–6
Emblems, 165
English Abigail, 10
English Letters (XVIIth Century), 213; (XIXth Century), 241
English Metrical Psalms, 111–12
English Pattern Poems, 111
English Phonetics, 47–8
English Place-Names, 48–9
English, Standards of, 33, 36–7

English Provincial Playbills (XVIIIth Century),
English Word-Formation, 43–4
*Essays by Divers Hands*, Vol. XXIII, 19–20
*Essays and Studies*, Vol. XXXI, 19, 101, 126, 170
Etymologies, 44–5
Evans, Caradoc, 249

Fairchild, Studies in Honor of, 108, 125, 128, 130, 134, 139, 144, 161, 229
Fiction, Art of, 24
Field, Nathan, 149–50, 259
Fielding, Henry, 199–200
Fishbourne, Christopher, 185–6
Foister, E. M., 206–7

Gay, John, 196
Godwin, William, 210
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 90
*Golden Legend*, 96–7
Goldsmith, Oliver, 204
Gordon, George, 22
Gorges, Sir A., 157
Gower, John, 66, 94

Hakluyt Society, 159
Halifax, Marquess of, 176–7
Hardy, Thomas, 251–2, 261
Harvey, Gabriel, 113–14, 155
Hatton, Sir Christopher, 162–3
Hazlitt, William, 232
Henry, Prince, 163
Heywood, John, 115
Heywood, Thomas, 148–9
Hooker, Richard, 159
Housman, A. E., 256, 261
Howard, Hon. Edward, 186
Howard, Sir R., 183
Howells, W. D., 254–5
Hrotsvitha, 98
Hudson, W. H., 247
Hutcheson, F. and Hume, D., 216–17

Irish Theatre, 8

Jago, Richard, 206
James, Henry, 245–6, 255
James II, King, Letter of, 190
Jefferies, Richard, 244–5
Jeffrey, Francis, 232–3
Jones, Sir W., 208–10
Johnson, Samuel, 200–4, 213
Jonson, Ben, 147–8, 157
Joyce, James, 261

Keats, John, 226–30
King, William, 188–9, 195

Lamb, Charles, 139, 231
Landor, W. S., 231
Linguistics, 29–30
Lockhart, J. G., 231

Mandeville, 95–6
Mansfield, Katherine, 248–9
Manuscripts, Sales of, 263
Maritain, J., 13–14
Marlowe, Christopher, 139–44
Medieval Laughter, 101
Medieval Universities, 85
Melville, Herman, 254
Meredith, George, 252
Meredith, Owen, 233
Middle English Romance, 91–2
Middleton, Thomas, 153
Milton, John, Handbook, 169; source questions, 169–70; marriage and divorce, 171; sonnet, 171; *Par. Lost*, 171–3; *Par. Regained*, 173; *De Doctrina*, 174–5; prose works, 175; schoolmasters, 175
*Mirror for Magistrates*, parts added to, 114–15
More, Sir Thomas, 103–5, 258
Morgan, Joseph, 192–3
Morris, William, 239
Murphy, Arthur, 207
*Mysteries' End*, 90–100, 117–18

Nashe, Thomas, 158
Newcomb, C. K., 242
Newman, J. H., 237

Old English Studies, 58–60
Old English Verse, 30, 62, 64

Old English Riddles, 62–4
*Oxford English Dictionary*, 34–5

Paine, Tom, 211
Percy, Thomas, 192
*Philosophical Incursions into English Literature*, 13, 131, 214
Plat, Hugh, 161
Poe, E. A., 255
Poetry, Characteristics of, 15–18, 23
Pope, Alexander, 198–9, 204, 258
Porter, Henry, 146
Printing Houses (XVIth and XVIIth Centuries), 262
Pronunciation, 54–6

*Ralph Roister Doister*, 115–16
Renaissance Latin Drama in England, 117
Renaissance Literary Criticism, 102–3
Rochester, Earl of, 184–6

Scott, Sir W., 230–1
Shakespeare, William, New trends in criticism, 119–21; political interpretations, 121–3; studies of single plays or groups, 123–8; textual questions, 128–30; source studies, 131; speech forms, 131; sonnets, 132; biography, 132–3; heresies, 133–4; performances, 134–5; allusions and influence, 135–6; translations, 136; folios and quartos, 262, 263, 264
Shaw, G. B., 259
Shelley, Mary, 227
Shelley, P. B., 223–7, 262
Sherlock, William, 187–8
Sherwood, Mrs., 239
Shirley, Henry, 153–4, 260
Short Title Catalogue, 258
Sidney, Sir P., 157–8
Skelton, John, 35, 109–110
Smollett, Tobias, 206
Southey, Robert, 219
Spenser, Edmund, 155–7
Stepney, George, 188
Sterne, Laurence, 206
Stevenson, R. L., 240
Surnames, 51–2
Sweet, Henry, 48, 59
Swift, Jonathan, 196–8, 229
Synge, J. M., 256

Taylor, Jeremy, 169
Tennyson, Lord, 226
Thackeray, W. M., 234–6
*Theatre Notebook*, 9
Theatre, Poetry in, 9
Tourneur, Cyril, 152–3
Towneley Plays, 98–9
Tudor School-Books, 103, 259

Wager, William, 116
Walpole, Horace, 205
Ward, Edward, 190, 195–6
Whitman, Walt, 252–4
Wilde, Oscar, 244
William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 262
*Woodstock*, 145–6
Woolf, Virginia, 247–8, 257
Wordsworth, William, 218–19, 229
Wyatt, Sir Thomas, 112–13

Yale University Library, 262
Yeats, W. B., 246, 255–6
Young, Karl, 68, 115

## Shakespeare Survey 1

General Editor ALLARDYCE NICOLL

The first volume of a new international year book of Shakespeare studies. This issue contains nine main articles, reviews of the year's London and Stratford productions, international notes, and book reviews; contributors include Una Ellis-Fermor, Hardin Craig, Micheál MacLiammóir, George Rylands and John Dover Wilson. There are 24 pages of plates.
12*s.* 6*d. net*

## Wordsworth's View of Nature

NORMAN LACEY

A new study of the poet's beliefs and their ethical consequences, tracing the events and influences which gave them their impetus. 8*s.* 6*d. net*

## George Eliot

JOAN BENNETT

A critical study of the novels which seeks to assess the quality of George Eliot's mind and art, to relate them to the development of the English novel and to the moral problems of their time and of ours. *Summer 1948. About* 8*s.* 6*d. net*

## Elizabethan & Metaphysical Imagery

ROSEMOND TUVE

An examination of the practice of Elizabethan and metaphysical poets in the light of contemporary critical theories about the nature of imagery. 33*s. net*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

# BOWES & BOWES

**University Booksellers**

★

We have a large stock of Text-books and General Books, both New and Second-hand, English and Foreign, in all branches of Literature, Art and Science.

*We invite you to place your name on our mailing list for catalogues of books, both new and second-hand. Please let us know your interests*

★

**1 & 2 TRINITY STREET**
**CAMBRIDGE**

# BLACKWELL'S

***University Booksellers***

There in the Broad, within whose booky house
Half England's scholars nibble books or browse.
Where'er they wander blessed fortune theirs:
Books to the ceiling, other books upstairs;
Books, doubtless, in the cellar, and behind
Romantic bays, where iron ladders wind.

*John Masefield*

*Books on every subject for the scholar and student*

We pay special attention to orders received by post

**BROAD STREET, OXFORD**