UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_172874
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME XXII

1941

Edited for

The English Association

BY

FREDERICK S. BOAS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1944

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
London Edinburgh Glasgow New York
Toronto Melbourne Capetown Bombay
Calcutta Madras
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

WAR-TIME conditions have continued to affect, though to a less degree than previously, the *personnel* of the contributors to *The Year's Work*. Professor Allardyce Nicoll, who has been responsible since Volume XI for the Chapter on 'Shakespeare', is at present engaged on Government duties in Washington. His place has been taken this year by his colleague, Professor Tucker Brooke, for whose ready and valuable co-operation we are much indebted. The connexion between *The Year's Work* and Yale University and the field of American scholarship has thus been happily preserved. Mr. Arnold Davenport, who in Volume XXI dealt with 'The Poetry and Prose of the Later Tudor Period', has now been called up on military service. In these circumstances Professor L. C. Martin has been good enough to undertake this chapter in addition to that on 'The Poetry and Prose of the Earlier Stuart Age and the Commonwealth', which he has contributed since Volume XII.

It will be remembered that Miss Dorothy Whitelock last year undertook at short notice the chapter on 'English Language: General Works'. She dealt with the principal books on this subject published in 1939 and 1940, but owing to limitations of time did not include notices of articles in periodicals. We are now further indebted to her for notices of these 1939 and 1940 articles, together with some books of those years previously not available, in addition to her survey of the 1941 publications in the English linguistic field.

In the Index every endeavour is made to list each publication noticed, whether book or article, under the name of its author. Considerations of space and economy do not permit of a grouping also under subject-matter, and usually it should not be difficult to trace a publication within the framework of its appropriate chapter. But it is to be hoped that at some future time, when financial conditions are easier, it may be found possible to issue a comprehensive Index to sets of volumes of *The Year's Work* published between specified dates.

F. S. B.

ABBREVIATIONS

Amer. Sp. = American Speech.
Archiv. = Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen.
B.M.Q. = British Museum Quarterly.
C.H.E.L. = Cambridge History of English Literature.
C.U.P. = Cambridge University Press.
D.U.J. = Durham University Journal.
E.E.T.S. = Early English Text Society.
E.L.H. = A Journal of English Literary History (U.S.A.).
Eng. Stud. = Englische Studien.
Étud. ang. = Études anglaises.
Germ.-rom. Monat. = Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift.
H.L.Q. = Huntington Library Quarterly.
J.E.G.P. = Journal of English and Germanic Philology.
Med. Æv. = Medium Ævum.
M.L.N. = Modern Language Notes.
M.L.Q. = Modern Language Quarterly (U.S.A.).
M.L.R. = Modern Language Review.
Mod. Phil. = Modern Philology.
N. and Q. = Notes and Queries.
O.U.P. = Oxford University Press.
P.M.L.A. = Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.
P.Q. = Philological Quarterly.
Q.Q. = Queen's Quarterly (Kingston, Ont.).
Rev. ang.-amér. = Revue anglo-américaine.
Rev. de Litt. Comp. = Revue de la Littérature Comparée.
R.E.S. = Review of English Studies.
R.S.L. = Royal Society of Literature.
S.A.B. = Shakespeare Association Bulletin (U.S.A.).
Sh.-Jahr. = Shakespeare Jahrbuch.
S. in Ph. = Studies in Philology.
Spec. = Speculum.
T.L.S. = Times Literary Supplement.
U.T.Q. = University of Toronto Quarterly.
Y.W. = The Year's Work.

CONTENTS

I. LITERARY HISTORY AND CRITICISM: GENERAL WORKS 7
By UNA ELLIS-FERMOR, M.A., D.Lit., F.R.S.L., Reader in English Language and Literature in the University of London (Bedford College).

II. ENGLISH LANGUAGE: GENERAL WORKS . . . 18
By DOROTHY WHITELOCK, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. Hilda's College, Oxford.

III. OLD ENGLISH 43
By G. N. GARMONSWAY, M.A., Lecturer in English Language and Literature in the University of London (King's College).

IV. MIDDLE ENGLISH I. CHAUCER 51
By DOROTHY EVERETT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

V. MIDDLE ENGLISH II. BEFORE AND AFTER CHAUCER 69
By GLADYS D. WILLCOCK, M.A., Reader in English Language and Literature in the University of London (Royal Holloway College).

VI. THE RENAISSANCE 84
By FREDERICK S. BOAS, LL.D., D.Lit., F.R.S.L.

VII. SHAKESPEARE 101
By C. F. TUCKER BROOKE, Sterling Professor of English, Yale University, U.S.A.

VIII. ELIZABETHAN DRAMA 117
By FREDERICK S. BOAS.

IX. THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE I. THE LATER TUDOR PERIOD . . 136
By L. C. MARTIN, B.Litt., M.A., King Alfred Professor of English Literature in the University of Liverpool.

X. THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE II. THE EARLIER STUART AGE AND THE COMMONWEALTH 151
By L. C. MARTIN.

XI. THE RESTORATION 165
By Beatrice White, M.A., Reader in English Language and Literature in the University of London (Westfield College).

XII. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY 173
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 . 193
By Dorothy Margaret Stuart, F.R.S.L.

XIV. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER. II . 211
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 228
By John Southgate, B.A., of the British Museum.

INDEX 236

I

LITERARY HISTORY AND CRITICISM: GENERAL WORKS

By Una Ellis-Fermor

There were again very few general critical works published in 1941, though there were some half-dozen notable articles; this is perhaps symptomatic of the times and the conditions of publishing.

George Sampson's *Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*[1] is the only extensive survey that appeared during the year, but it is a notable one. To compress the contents of the fourteen-volume *Cambridge History of English Literature* into 1094 pages (including an index) would itself have been a difficult feat; but more than that has been required. Since the last volume of the original work was issued, knowledge has been extended. Antiquarian research and the development of the technical study of bibliography (to instance only two representative fields) have, through their impact on biographical and textual studies, affected, if not our opinion of the content, our knowledge of the provenance of much earlier literature. Since that date, moreover, something has been added to the literature itself and this matter is further increased by the decision to include in the present volume much contemporary work; its predecessor omitted that of then living authors.

This double process of modification (or correction and substitution) and extension is carried through within the framework of the original design. In order to facilitate reference from the epitome to the complete work, each of the first fourteen chapters corresponds, even to its title, with a volume in the original and each subsection with a chapter. In certain cases, as the author points out in his preface, little alteration has been necessary and portions have been incorporated as they stood. But in some parts the reader will expect and will find modifications.

The fourteenth chapter ('The Nineteenth Century, Part III'),

[1] *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*, by George Sampson. C.U.P. pp. xiv + 1094. 15*s*.

This is not a book for the immature reader or for those ignorant of Lessing's ideas and argument; but, despite the brevity of some of its generalizations, it is a stimulating contribution to the criticism on this subject.

Desmond MacCarthy's *Drama*,[5] belonging to 1940, is included this year as it was unintentionally omitted in vol. xxi of *Y.W.* This is a collection of brief critiques of some of the most notable London productions of the past quarter of a century, covering a wide range of dramatists from Shakespeare and his contemporaries to Ibsen, Strindberg, Tchehov, and other continental playwrights, down to Galsworthy, Shaw, and O'Casey in our own day. His acute perception of the fundamental aesthetic problems that affect drama and his wide literary as well as theatrical experience raise MacCarthy's book above the level of the average English dramatic reviews. It is one in which all scholars of the drama will find matter worth considering.

Herbert Palmer in *A Brief History of the Poetry of Despair* (*English*, iii, no. 16) takes as starting-point the emergence, about the year 1928, of 'what seemed a new note in English poetry—a note of intense despair'. He describes its general characteristics in the work of T. S. Eliot and his successors and traces such previous indications as he can find in English and American literature from Cowper to the Georgians. The examination is of necessity 'brief' and there is little scope for qualification or detail.

Four publications on various aspects of the relation between literature and education belong to the year. L. A. G. Strong's [6] sane and readable little volume might well be included in the library of every school and college in which 'English' is studied and taught. In a period in which this subject is treated seriously, if not always wisely, this book is timely. It contains the plain good sense and the modest, open-minded advice of a man who was for twelve years a teacher and has long been a writer fully conscious of the severe discipline that is an inseparable accompaniment of the craftsman's joy. It is a selection from talks (or the

[5] *Drama*, by Desmond MacCarthy. Putnam. pp. x + 377. 9*s*. 6*d*.

[6] *Reading for Pleasure*, by L. A. G. Strong. Methuen. pp. xii + 178. 5*s*.

gist of talks) broadcast to schools, and ranges from general questions as to why we read and write to technical discussions of style and narrative structure.

H. V. Routh's [7] volume gives a clear, brief account of what is, as the author says, 'a comparatively unfamiliar subject to the general reading public'. He considers the nature and extent of cultural influence, the need for its diffusion and the position and ideal qualifications of the disseminator of English culture abroad, especially when he is a teacher attached to an Institute and in close, though not necessarily closely defined, relations with the representatives of his country's government. There is much valuable practical advice both to the organizers at home and the field-workers abroad; the pitfalls that await both are frankly described. On the technical side Routh lays emphasis on the New Philology (Basic and the kindred English and American systems) in the teaching of English to foreigners.

Bernard Groom in *The Unity of Literature and its Place in Education* (*English*, iii, no. 16) traces the development of the teaching of English since 1918 and especially since the publication in 1921 of the Report on 'The Teaching of English in England'. He notes the steadily increasing importance attached to History, the continued assumption that the study of Classics alone is enough, and deprecates 'the modernist' teaching that neglects the English classics. His strongest plea is for the study of Comparative or General Literature.

From America comes a volume that corresponds in some ways with L. A. G. Strong's. Mortimer J. Adler [8] writes popularly for the general reader, including at once those who have received little or no education and those who have suffered from what they have received. His trenchant criticism of the weaknesses of educational methods in this field, his vigorous faith, and his constructive idealism apply with equal cogency to the systems on both sides of the Atlantic. The teacher of literature may

[7] *The Diffusion of English Culture outside England: A Problem of Post-War Reconstruction*, by H. V. Routh. *Current Problems*. C.U.P. pp. viii + 134. 3*s*. 6*d*.

[8] *How to Read a Book*, by Mortimer J. Adler. Jarrolds. pp. 205. 8*s*. 6*d*.

not always like the manner of this book, but he cannot well afford to disregard its matter.

Michael Roberts's lecture to the R.S.L. on *The Dignity of English Thought*[9] is a closely argued and serious examination of the responsibilities, first of the Society and second of all thinking men and women. He examines the nature of dignity, concluding that it depends, in each sphere, 'on maintaining a sense of proportion without submitting to circumstance', and that it is indicated 'by a gesture within a given code'. Hence he traces the relation between dignity and authority and reveals the temptations to abdicate that now threaten authority in the domain of thought. Public dignity of thought can only be maintained by a 'resumption of the responsibility of leadership'. He then describes the dignity peculiar to English thought and the danger in which it stands to-day, indicating the main specific causes of that danger, from within and from without. This memorable plea for the safeguards of tradition concludes with a warning against substituting the wrong kind of authority on the one hand or relying on automatic progress on the other; it ends with a call for 'the gesture of confidence in an ultimate victory'.

Two other essays in the same R.S.L. volume deserve attention here.

In *The Effect of Scientific Thought on the Arts and Literature* Percy E. Spielmann traces the contemporary break-away of the arts from traditional forms to the need to reflect the life of our time, which has parted company with its past 'in a manner that has been quick and catastrophic'. Moreover, the sense 'that the production of art along accepted lines has been worked out', itself leads to the exploitation of personality. He finds, in each art in turn, that scientific conceptions have been misapplied so as to tamper with the sources of inspiration and of artistic expression. Spielmann's interpretation covers the condition of art in general, but there are precise comments on the form it takes in poetry and literature in particular.

In *The Poet and the Novel* Richard Church, describing the characteristic poetic development, discusses the peculiar diffi-

[9] In *Essays by Divers Hands: Transactions of the R.S.L.*, vol. xviii, ed. by St. John Ervine. O.U.P. 1940. pp. xvi+165. 7*s*.

culties that meet the maturing poet in present-day society, inasmuch as he can no longer enter upon what should then be his inheritance, the epic form. The novel, not the poetic form on a grand scale, now touches the great body of readers. Church, speaking as a poet and a novelist, makes some acute comments on the psychological and technical processes involved in the poet's acceptance of this substitute.

Among the English anthologies comes a reissue of the day-book of Bowyer Nichols,[10] originally published in 1895. This will be new to many readers as it has been out of print since 1922. The selection and the introduction by George Saintsbury are unaltered, but a new preface has been written by Logan Pearsall Smith. Both the introduction of 1895 and the preface of 1941 agree in their appreciation of the discernment and discrimination which went to the compiling of this anthology.

Another anthology comes this year from the Oxford Press which last year gave us two so widely different as Lord David Cecil's *Oxford Book of Christian Verse* and C. H. Wilkinson's *Diversions*. Bernard Darwin's[11] belongs to the group which are based, not on period, subject-matter, or kind, but on the individual taste of the selector. Certain authors are generously represented (Dickens, Hazlitt, Borrow, Lamb, Scott, Thackeray, Stevenson) and certain aspects of English life. The emotional range of this selection of 135 extracts from 82 authors is refreshing to the reader, as is the frequent passing from the familiar to the unfamiliar.

On the border of English anthologies comes Lincoln Schuster's anthology of letters.[12] Some 35 of its 117 extracts are by Englishmen (the Brownings, Shelley, Keats, Thomas Huxley, Shaw, Chesterfield, Johnson) and a large proportion of these may fairly claim to be regarded as 'literature'.

[10] *Words and Days. A Table-Book of Prose and Verse*, compiled by Bowyer Nichols. With a Preface by Logan Pearsall Smith. O.U.P. pp. xxxiv+391. 5*s*.

[11] *At Odd Moments. An Anthology*, selected by Bernard Darwin. O.U.P. pp. 352. 6*s*.

[12] *A Treasury of the World's Great Letters from Ancient Days to our own Time*, ed. by M. Lincoln Schuster. Heinemann. pp. xlvi+496. 12*s*. 6*d*.

On the border-line of English studies generally may be mentioned D. L. Sayers's *The Mind of the Maker*,[13] of which a chapter is given to a detailed study of the artistic process of the novelist, and an article by Stith Thompson on the relations of *Folklore and Literature* (*P.M.L.A.*, March).

Bernard Darwin's introduction and the compilers' note to the reader describe the scope and aim of a book[14] which is an outstanding contribution to the world's reference volumes. The difficulties of compiling an anthology have special significance for the makers of anthologies of quotations, for each reader is inclined to bring his own test—often a purely individual one—and judge with bias a collection whose criterion, on the other hand, is the familiarity of certain passages to a large number of persons. But even the reader of limited taste or knowledge will find here much that is familiar to him, and nothing that he can fairly deny to be probably familiar to others more widely read or of more retentive memory.

The sections are arranged in a way more convenient for reference than that of all but a few predecessors. Thus, the main body of familiar quotations from authors writing in English stand first (pp. 1–570); those from the Book of Common Prayer and the Bible are listed separately next, and are followed by a miscellaneous group—anonymous passages, ballads, nursery rhymes, and (a welcome addition) extracts from *Punch*. The bulk of the foreign quotations are in the originals, with English translations; those from the less known languages are represented in English only. (Here again the criterion of general familiarity must be borne in mind.) The index is a masterly compilation and the claim of the editors, that a passage can be found provided the searcher knows any important word in it, would appear to be justified.

The merits of this volume as a work of reference are so clear as hardly to need stating. It may be added that its attraction as a volume for random reading is at least equal to its value for more serious or utilitarian purposes. By means of this double merit, as a work of entertainment and as a solid and reliable

[13] *The Mind of the Maker*, by Dorothy L. Sayers. Methuen. pp. xii + 186. 6*s*.

[14] *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*. O.U.P. pp. xviii + 880. 25*s*.

work of reference, it may act as a wholesome corrective to the growing tendency to inaccurate quotation.

In the introduction to his history of Anglo-Latin poetry,[15] Leicester Bradner rebuts the charge, so often brought against them, that these writings have no intrinsic worth. Unlike du Bellay, he believes that something which can claim the title 'poetry' can be made in a foreign tongue; at least if that tongue be Latin. He proceeds, therefore, to trace from the humanists to the present day that Latin poetry which was 'a branch of the literature of England'.

The survey ranges through the Elizabethan age and late Renaissance (taking in the Scots writers up to and during the seventeenth century) to the history of the new tradition from about 1660 onwards, and concludes with a brief survey of Latin verse since Landor, closing, as is fitting, with certain extracts from the verse of A. D. Godley.

The book is illustrated, with discrimination and not to excess, by quotations long enough to give the flavour of a writer. There is, as appendix, a chronological list of publications of Anglo-Latin poetry. This makes no claim to bibliographical completeness, but, taken together with the complementary alphabetical reference of the index, it furnishes a serviceable guide to the reader.

Emery Neff's study of European Poetry[16] is mainly concerned—except for an introductory chapter on 'Tradition and Reason', which leads up to the early work of Goethe in the second chapter—with the four chief literatures of Europe from the late eighteenth century to the close of the nineteenth. In this period, as the author says in summing up, 'An epoch in literary history stands out clearly'. He traces the emancipation from the tradition of seventeenth-century France, the revival of lyric poetry, and the rediscovery of the sources of inspiration in nature, religious experience, Hellenic civilization, and new social ideals through German, English, French, and Italian poetry until its final manifestation in France itself in the late

[15] *Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry, 1500–1925*, by Leicester Bradner. O.U.P. pp. xii + 383. 16*s*.

[16] *A Revolution in European Poetry, 1660–1900*, by Emery Neff. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xiv + 279. 20*s*.

nineteenth century. 'Within the hundred years between the meeting of Goethe and Herder in 1770 until the abandonment of verse by Rimbaud lie the masterpieces of a poetic revival.'

Though such a survey, made in such compass, must necessarily touch only the main authors and though the choice and interpretation of even their works must often be referred arbitrarily to the taste of the individual writer, there is great interest for the student of any one of these literatures in reconsidering familiar poetry solely as part of the main stream of a great European literary evolution. For the student of English there is, that is to say, considerable illumination to be gained from seeing the work of Blake, Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, and Arnold strictly in relation to that of Goethe, Herder, Hölderlin, Heine, Leopardi, Hugo, Lamartine, Vigny, and ultimately of Baudelaire and Rimbaud. For the reader whose acquaintance with one or more of these is at an elementary stage, this volume has the additional virtue of serving as an introductory anthology of considerable charm, for there is much quotation, always in the original languages with an accompanying translation, and such lyrics as are reasonably brief are, most wisely, quoted at full length.

Studies in English of the University of Texas[17] was received too late to be distributed to some of the contributors to whose chapters its contents belonged. Attention may therefore be called here to the following essays not noticed by them. Elmer B. Atwood in *The Youth of Paris in the 'Seege of Troye'* discusses the treatment of the infancy and early life of Paris in this M.E. poem, and decides that the main source is the Latin prose work, *Excidium Troiae* (MS. Rawl. D. 893). But he holds that the poet drew not from a single source, but from a recollection of several. In *Bunyan's Court Scenes* Clarence E. Dugdale discusses Bunyan's fidelity to contemporary procedure in *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Holy War*. Ralph B. Long, in *Dryden's Importance as a Spokesman of the Tories*, reviews this aspect of Dryden's work in the light of the evidence afforded by contemporary controversial books, pamphlets, and periodicals. Herschel Baker's *Strolling Actors in Eighteenth-Century England* throws some fresh light on this branch of the

[17] *Univ. of Texas Publication*, No. 4126. Austin: Texas. pp. 184. $1.00.

profession from the journal of Roger Kemble. Joseph J. Jones gives a pleasant account of Byron's enthusiasm for America and of certain American impressions of the poet in *Lord Byron on America*, and C. L. Cline throws further light on the same writer in *Unpublished Notes on the Romantic Poets by Isaac D'Israeli*. Later nineteenth-century biography is represented by Harry Ransom's *The Brownings in Paris, 1858* (an account of a recently discovered letter from the Brownings to Miss Bayley); and the late nineteenth-century theatre by Edward G. Fletcher's account of the beginnings of electric lighting, *Electricity at the Savoy*.

II

ENGLISH LANGUAGE: GENERAL WORKS

By Dorothy Whitelock

Louis H. Gray's *Foundations of Language*[1] is not primarily concerned with English. It is a thorough introductory study of basic problems intended for the specialist and the layman alike, providing an up-to-date outline of phonetics, of the physiological and psychological bases of language, of theories of origin, &c. It is on the whole free from dogmatism and shows tolerance and a sense of proportion, as, for example, in the treatment of the 'substratum' theory of linguistic change. The most interesting parts concern the origin of gender and the morphological importance of the pronoun. The work is not always exact in detail, at least as regards the English language: a 'regular' development from OE. *curon* would not have final *n* in Modern English; *priest* is not of Old French origin, but from OE. *prēost*; if *father* and *mother* owe their medial consonant to analogy with *brother*, why should the same development occur in *gather*, *together*, &c.? The value of this work for English studies can only be indirect.

In the course of his work Gray makes a plea for further attention to linguistic psychology. This is hardly adequately met by *Psychology of English*,[2] by M. M. Bryant and J. R. Aiken. This book seems directed against a sinister influence on language from persons variously and vaguely described as 'some rhetoricians', 'teachers of correct writing', or 'the authorities', who, if their views are correctly represented, would crush all natural expression in the interests of so-called logic. The book may well serve a useful purpose in combating such an attitude, but the authors are mistaken in their belief that the influence of psychological factors has been entirely ignored by previous studies on syntax, semantics, &c. In fact, M. Sandmann in his article *On Linguistic Explanation* (*M.L.R.*, April) claims 'The time is past when the generation previous to ourselves went

[1] *Foundations of Language*, by Louis H. Gray. New York: Macmillan Co. 1939. pp. xvi+530. $7.50.

[2] *Psychology of English*, by M. M. Bryant and J. R. Aiken. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. 1940. pp. 229. $2.50.

joyfully to work, confident in their power to build up a historical grammar based on psychology'. In spite of their attack on the rulings of 'authorities', the authors fail to preserve a detached attitude of scientific observation, but themselves pass judgement on certain usages. It would be easy to collect instances of highly questionable statements, only too frequently introduced by the adverb 'unquestionably', and of inaccuracies in detail, for *welsh* is not from the OE. noun *wealh* but from the adjective *wielisc*; the use of *he* with the impersonal pronoun *one* is recorded in good writers from 1477 to 1886 in *O.E.D.*; *going to* as a future auxiliary is considerably more than a century old and is common in British English. This book may bring new ideas to a section of the public. The scholar has little to learn from it; he will hardly be grateful for the addition of *nonsentence* and *long-cutting* to linguistic terminology.

Two other general works, *A Grammar of Living English*[3] and *The Foundations of English*,[4] prove to be merely text-books for students, but each is good in its kind. The former, which aims at making students 'both intelligent and curious about their language', is based on sound principles and is free from the narrow, prescriptive aims and the false history of many elementary grammars. The second is a more unusual book, for it not only covers general matters and an outline of English, but also has useful chapters on Greek, Latin (both classical and vulgar), and Romance, as a preliminary to the study of loan-words. It is admirably clear and is based on recent authorities. Another elementary text-book, *Word Ways*,[5] by J. C. Hixson and I. Colodny, is less satisfactory. While the student may glean from it a fairly correct outline, he will acquire strange ideas, such as a belief that Ælfric wrote in East Saxon.

A. H. Gardiner's pamphlet, *The Theory of Proper Names*,[6] is

[3] *A Grammar of Living English*, by G. H. McKnight, T. B. Haber and W. W. Hatfield. New York: American Book Co. 1939. pp. vi+304. $1.20.

[4] *The Foundations of English*, by E. D. Myers. New York: Macmillan Co. 1940. pp. xx+301. $3.

[5] *Word Ways*, by J. C. Hixson and I. Colodny. American Book Co. 1939. pp. vi+338. $1.75.

[6] *The Theory of Proper Names: A Controversial Essay*, by A. H. Gardiner. O.U.P. 1940. pp. 67. 5*s*.

mainly an attack on the opinion of Bertrand Russell and others that proper names are 'words for particulars'. The author examines the Greek term for proper name, and, after dealing with problems such as the position of surnames, collectives, and plurals, and 'singular' names, i.e. of unique objects, like the sun, he concludes that Dionysius' contrast between words used individually and words used commonly is not 'a watertight definition' and that we must fall back on Mill's criterion of 'meaninglessness'; that is to say, 'Ordinary words . . . directly convey information; proper names merely provide the key to information'. He goes beyond Mill in insisting that a proper name is 'a word in which the identifying, and consequently the distinguishing, power of the word-sound is exhibited in its purest and most compelling form'. In the light of his theory he surveys the classes of object that call for designation by proper names. The essay is philosophic rather than linguistic. To a mere linguist some standpoints seem strange. Why, for example, should proper names composed of more than one word be 'less legitimate specimens'? The general conclusions seem reasonable, whereas Russell's theory, which causes him to exclude *Socrates* and to state that 'the only words that one does use as names in the logical sense are words like "this" or "that"', is so far removed from linguistic thought as to have no significance. Whether it is good logic or not must be left for others to decide.

A. G. Kennedy, in *Recent Trends in English Linguistics* (*M.L.Q.*, June 1940), gives a rapid survey of work from about 1900, mentioning development in the phoneme theory and in scientific phonetics, the widespread acceptance of the international phonetic alphabet, the rich and varied study of syntactical practice, and the increased interest in semantics.

The Two Englishes,[7] by W. Barkley, contains a spirited plea for spelling reform, in relation to national unity, foreign trade, imperial government, and education. He writes amusingly, but neither the arguments nor the examples are unfamiliar, and a good deal of false linguistic history is included. The simplification of the OE. inflexion system is attributed entirely to

[7] *The Two Englishes*, by William Barkley. Pitman. pp. 53. 2*s*. 6*d*.

the Norman Conquest and we are told that '*gh* (in *dough*) did duty for a time as an experiment to spell *f* as in *enough*'. No reference is made to published views on the other side. The specimen of the proposed system is not so free from inconsistencies as it claims to be: [ǫ:] is spelt *au* in *braut* 'brought', but *or* in *reform*, and the child will have to learn that [ə] is spelt *e, a, o, au, er* (*the, a, ov, authorrity, mater*). We are not told how the teacher is to justify this, when the advocates of the system disapprove of etymological explanation.

An attempt to systematize English practice in another field is made by Alice M. Ball, whose *Compounding in the English Language*[8] states the rules for printing compounds with or without hyphens as she has formulated them for the Department of State in America. In a lengthy section and with much repetition she justifies these and compares previous views and practice. The question is, of course, a complicated one and there will always be difference of opinion on border-line cases. British readers may feel that stress has received insufficient attention. It is not merely long habit that causes one to write *daylight*, &c., as one word (a habit that the author does not propose to alter), but a question of stress is involved. Moreover, a distinction should surely have been made between expressions such as *stone ceiling* and *paper mill*. Most people would surely feel a hyphen desirable in the latter, to indicate that the first element is not descriptive, but states the purpose of the mill.

A considerable body of work has been done on phonology. W. Horn, *Vom Einfluss des Schriftbildes auf die Aussprache im Englischen* (*Anglia*, Jan. 1940) adds examples of spelling-pronunciations to those given in previous works by himself or others. He brings examples of development between the earlier and later editions of Daniel Jones's *English Pronouncing Dictionary*. His other examples include place-names and personal names, and terms which laymen pronounce according to the spelling, while they keep their traditional form in professional use, e.g. [*fǭsl*] 'foresail', [*kil*] 'kiln'.

A. A. Hill contributes a detailed study, *The Early Loss of* [*r*]

[8] *Compounding in the English Language*, by Alice Morton Ball. New York: H. W. Wilson Co. 1939. pp. x + 226.

before Dentals (*P.M.L.A.*, June 1940), in which he distinguishes between the general loss of post-vocalic [r] in south-eastern districts and the assimilation of [r] to certain front consonants in some dialects, said to have occurred about 1300. He claims to be the first to make a systematic list of all consonants concerned. The distribution is general but in all dialects it is sporadic only. The sound change must, therefore, be regarded as a tendency towards assimilation felt everywhere, but held in check by desire to arrest the change, a phenomenon of regression studied for French by Dauzat and others.

In *The Short Vowels in French Loan Words like 'City', &c.* (*Anglia*, Jan. 1939) N. E. Eliason applies the results of experiments on vowel duration to solve the problem of difference in vowel length in loan words like *city*, *damask*, *tenant* on the one hand and *dine*, *mason*, &c., on the other. The work in which these experiments are given in detail has not been accessible.[9] As the results show that a vowel is short before a light stress, not so short before a secondary stress, long before absence of stress, the author follows Eckhardt in considering the difference between the two groups to be dependent on the amount of stress on the second syllable, and differs from Luick's view that words of the *city* group belonged to upper class vocabulary and retained a short vowel as in French. Where the author differs from Eckhardt is in attributing the short vowel to a following light, not secondary, stress.

There is also a group of studies more immediately concerned with American material and developments than with British, but containing results too important for understanding the general development of English to be ignored in this place. H. Penzl's two articles, *'Kompromissvokal' und Lautwandel* (*Anglia*, Jan. 1939) and *The Vowel-Phonemes in 'Father', 'Man', 'Dance', in Dictionaries and New England Speech* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan. 1940) may be considered together. In the first he throws doubt on the opinion that at the end of the eighteenth century a (mainly lengthened) [æ] > [a:] without any connexion existing with sixteenth-century [a]. The Grammarians, he says, show that [a:] and [æ:] were contemporary at the end of the eighteenth

[9] *The Effect of Stress upon Quantity in Disyllables*, by N. E. Eliason and R. C. Davis. Indiana Univ. 1939.

century and they also recognize an intermediate sound. The American, Worcester, was in favour in 1830 of a compromise vowel in *fast, dance*, &c., regarding *a* as in *hat* as an affectation, the full Italian sound as in *part* as a vulgarism. Penzl uses material from *The Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada* to prove the existence of the half-long compromise vowel.

In the second article he discusses in greater detail the various American pronunciations of *father, man, dance*. Dictionaries fall into three main groups according as they recognize one vowel in all three types; or admit one vowel in *father*, another in *man*, and divide words of the *half, path, dance* types among these two vowels; or finally, have three different vowels. The actual evidence for New England shows only two phonemic types, *man* and *father*, though with some variation in quality and quantity according to phonetic circumstances. The varying distribution of *dance, half*, &c., among the two types has led to a theoretical creation of an intermediate type, justified by occasional attempts at compromise by speakers familiar with both pronunciations.

A series of articles by H. Whitehall, mainly using American evidence, may have far-reaching results for the study of the great vowel shift. In *Middle English ū and Related Sounds*,[10] he points out that previous investigators into the history of this sound have paid too much attention to the first element of the diphthong, whereas grammarians even as late as Ellis are describing a diphthong with a short first and a long second element. The real problem, therefore, is to discover when the first element developed more significance than the second. The postulation of a diphthong with [u:] as second element not only explains rhymes such as *now* : *brew* but also gives meaning to orthoepists' statements often considered unintelligible. A minute examination of a mass of occasional spellings supports this theory, for on the one hand *ou* is frequently written for ME. *eu, iu, ü, ō*[1], and, on the other, ME. *ū* is represented by the spelling *oo*. The author admits that there is evidence for a different

[10] *Middle-English ū and Related Sounds: Their Development in Early American English*, by H. Whitehall. Language Monograph No. 19. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America. pp. 79.

treatment of ME. *ū*, and suggests tentatively that this variant originated in the assimilation of the long second element to a following voiced consonant, and that it was later generalized and gives the present-day standard pronunciation, though the other type persists in certain dialects both in England and U.S.A. Incidentally in the course of the investigation he noted signs of a development of ME. $\bar{o}^2$ to [*u*] or [*uə*] in the parent dialects of New England, and of a variant treatment in East Anglia of *o* before *s*, *f*, *th*, which levelled it with the reflex of ME. $\bar{o}^2$. Traces of this can be found in early New England sources.

In *The Quality of the Front Reduction Vowel in Early American English* (*Amer. Sp.*, April 1940), the same author examines similar evidence to test the correctness of the assumption that the quality of [I] in unstressed syllables remained unchanged from the sixteenth century until to-day. Spellings with *ee* support those orthoepists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who indicate a tense sound, and there is therefore a strong probability that the lowering is of comparatively recent origin. This suggests the possibility that stressed [I] also is due to late lowering.

In *The Historical Status of Modern English* [I] (*Language*, April–June 1940) he considers this problem, suggesting that as the grammarians seem trustworthy in their statements about unstressed *i*, we should take them seriously when they indicate a high stressed vowel, particularly in view of *ee* spellings and rhymes with ME. $\bar{e}^1$. He concludes that the high-point vowel survived in some cases until about 1800, a conclusion which necessitates a modification of Luick's explanation of the late ME. lengthening of *i* to [e:], but that already in Early Modern English a new lowered type was gradually gaining ground and by the second half of the eighteenth century this ousted the older type from cultivated speech in England. He would connect this replacement with the change of the reflex of ME. $\bar{e}^2$ from [e:] to [i:], the result being the preservation of a phonemic distinction threatened with obliteration; and in this connexion he notes that the only dialect to retain an unambiguous tense *i*, West Somerset, is the one dialect with consistent traces of unraised ME. $\bar{e}^1$ and $\bar{e}^2$.

Whitehall then, in collaboration with Theresa Fein, turns his

attention to *The Development of ME. ŭ in Early Modern English and American English* (*J.E.G.P.*, April). This article claims that occasional spellings can best be explained by Kökeritz's theory that ME. *u* changed by a process of centralization. It interprets the grammarians' statements as indicative of a mixed vowel, or some variant of [*oe*]. The problem of rhymes of *u* with *o*, and of *o* spellings, is considered more fully in another article, *An Elusive Development of 'short o' in Early American English* (*Amer. Sp.*, Oct.), along with spellings of ME. *o* as *u*, *oo*. Whitehall concludes that a raising of *o* to *u* can be proved for the north-midlands, but that originally this development was much more widespread. It would afford a parallel to the frequent raising of *e* to *i*, and the normal raising of ME. *ē* and *ō*. He feels that any collective explanation of the great vowel shift is as yet unthinkable, but that this development of *o* may provide 'a vital missing block in the general structure'. He does not, however, discuss the precise relationship of this development to divergent treatments of ME. *o*. No doubt there are many features in this series of articles that will not gain universal acceptance, but they show that earlier assumptions will have to be revised, and they offer reasonable solutions to some problems. Moreover they vindicate the statements of orthoepists.

L. S. Hultzén points out in *Seventeenth-Century Intonation* (*Amer. Sp.*, Feb. 1939) that Charles Butler's comment on melodies has been completely ignored. After examining it in detail he concludes that the most significant uses of the tone-patterns found in works of modern phoneticians were already noted by Butler.

Two studies on early grammars have appeared. O. Funke follows up his work on Petrus Ramus (see *Y.W.* xix. 32) and on Bullokar (*ibid.* 154) with an article on *Ben Jonson's English Grammar* (*Anglia*, Jan. 1940), which shows that the debt to Ramus's *Grammatica* is large even in Book II, considered by Herford and Simpson to be a 'mainly independent work'. Jonson departs from his source in having a two-case system, and in his arrangements of the pronouns, but Funke considers his treatment of the verb unintelligible without reference to Ramus.

In *The Motivation of Lindley Murray's Grammatical Work* (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct. 1939) A. W. Read gives a sketch of Murray's life and the conditions in which the grammar was produced. He notes that, besides its immediate influence, his work had an indirect effect in spreading an interest in the study of English.

H. T. Price in *Grammar and the Compositor in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct.), examines the habits of early compositors by comparing printed texts with those manuscripts which the work of bibliographers has shown to be the actual copy used. His results show that the compositors normally changed the spelling and the punctuation, but left the author's grammar unchanged. From about 1650 they interested themselves in the form of the genitive, and occasionally changed a preterite. It was only when setting up from a printed text, where the spelling was already normalized, that they found time to attend to the grammatical forms.

Among works on syntax must be mentioned H. Marchand's *Syntaktische Homonymie: Das umschreibende 'do'* (*Eng. Stud.*, May 1939), which is a detailed study of the origin of *do* to form a purely periphrastic tense. Marchand agrees with Koziol that this originated in popular speech and has nothing to do with the causative use, but does not agree that it first had an emphasizing character in the literary language and lost it later. If this were so, why should it have acquired afresh in the sixteenth century the emphasizing character of Modern English? It is impossible here to enter into the detail of his argument. His conclusions are that in purely periphrastic use it is adopted into ME. verse, for technical reasons, from popular speech, where, however, it was emphatic, and only later spread to ME. prose. Meanwhile, from Shakespeare's time, the emphatic use was adopted from the colloquial into the literary language. At two periods, therefore, we have a conflict between homonyms: in Middle English between the causative and the periphrastic uses, in early Modern English between the periphrastic and emphatic uses.

Though appearing in article form, Hans-Oskar Wilde's *Aufforderung, Wunsch und Möglichkeit* (*Anglia*, Aug. 1939, Jan. 1940), has the length and compass of a book. It sets out to show the

interworking of linguistic structure and psychological processes, which the author considers can be best illustrated by a study of the subjunctive in English. In very great detail, with elaborate statistics, he shows how the choice between indicative inflexion, subjunctive inflexion, or periphrastic expression, is conditioned by person, tense, type of sentence, or modal harmony; and he makes a careful study of the development towards analysis, which reveals, among other things, that synthesis is commonest in clauses introduced by unambiguous conjunctions, such as *þeah*. The question of the extent of Romance influence at various periods is considered. For example, he claims that only eight of the forty periphrastic expressions that appear in ME. can be assigned to this source. There are many points of detail that may interest scholars who feel less concern with his general conclusions relating to an inner connexion between linguistic development and political, social, and religious conditions.

In *The Progressive Tense: Frequency of its Use in English* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) L. Dennis counts the occurrences of this tense in selected extracts, and concludes that the chief expansion is since 1800, that the figures obtained for more colloquial styles of writing suggest that its use in speech was commoner than written records indicate, and that it is more frequent in American prose than in British. It must, however, be realized that statistics based on a comparatively small section of material can only be approximate. For example, the absence of *going to* + infinitive from these samples between Swift and the mid-nineteenth century may be accidental.

E. E. Ericson's *Observations on New English Syntax* (*Anglia*, Jan. 1939) merely collects some instances of three usages, of *did* with transposed order to express a conditional subjunctive, of *was*, instead of *were*, in transposed clauses to express conditions contrary to fact, and of the split infinitive.

C. C. Fries in *On the Development of the Structural Use of Word Order in Modern English* (*Language*, July–Sept. 1940) shows the gradual process by which word-order became fixed in two 'grammatical forms', (1) the 'actor-action-goal' construction, e.g. 'the man struck the bear', and (2) the 'character-substance' or modifier-noun construction. His tables show that

about the year 1000 52·5 per cent. of accusative objects preceded the verb, but by about 1500 only 1·87 per cent. did so. This change causes nouns standing before impersonal verbs to be interpreted as subjects, as in *a wolf wanteþ his fode*. Under (2) he notes that the use of the periphrastic genitive becomes more frequent when the post-positive genitive disappears.

C. T. Logan comments in *The Plural of Uncountables* (*Amer. Sp.*, Oct.) on a recent tendency to use words like *imagination*, *identity*, &c., in the plural. H. T. Price in '*Like himself*' (*R.E.S.*, April 1940) collects several examples of this idiom to combat J. M. Robertson's opinion that its occurrence in *Henry V* shows parts of this play to be beneath Shakespeare's level.

In the province of vocabulary there is a group of studies supplementing the *O.E.D.* Sir William Craigie's pamphlet *Completing the Record of English*[11] discusses what still needs to be recorded, and gives a selection of additions, under various heads such as political administration, education, &c. He mentions that attention should not be confined to new words, but that adjectival and attributive collocations should be added.

G. G. Loane's article, *Chapman's Compounds in the N.E.D.* (*N. and Q.*, Sept. 6), notes the occurrence in Chapman of compounds recorded by the *O.E.D.* only from a later date, e.g. *bath-tub* from 1884, *dead-calm* from 1840. Of particular interest are *all-conquering*, *blue-haired*, *earth-shaking*, *never-ending*, all of which are first attributed to Milton by *O.E.D.*; but the author should not have included *sea-girt* in this list, for the *O.E.D.* records it from 1621.

Other collections of material for later supplements to *O.E.D.* are made by St. Vincent Troubridge in *Notes on the Oxford English Dictionary* (*N. and Q.*, Aug. 31, Sept. 6, 13, 20, Oct. 4, 11, 18, Nov. 1, 22), where he is mainly concerned with earlier or, in the case of obsolete words, later datings; by Y. M. Biese in *Some Additions to the Oxford Dictionary* (*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 1939), and by D. L. Bolinger, *Among the New Words* (*Amer. Sp.*, April), both being concerned with new terms, many of a military character. The weakness of Bolinger's article is in his only giving the American instances.

[11] *Completing the Record of English*, by Sir W. Craigie. Society for Pure English, Tract No. 58. O.U.P. pp. 37. 3*s*. 6*d*.

F. P. Wilson in his pamphlet *Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life*[12] shows how Shakespeare not only draws upon, but transmutes the diction of common life, with an instinct for what in the language of his day was permanent. He discusses some of the difficulties that arise from words that have changed their meaning and associations, and he examines Shakespeare's use of the pun, the image, and the proverbs.

In *Interrelations of English Dictionaries of the Seventeenth Century* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec. 1939) G. E. Noyes makes notes and comments on D. T. Starnes's article, *English Dictionaries of the Seventeenth Century* (see *Y.W.* xviii. 40). She discusses mutual borrowing between successive revisions of Bullokar and Cockeram, and also the debt of other early lexicographers to their predecessors.

Spenser's Use of 'Stour' (*M.L.Q.*, Sept.), by F. M. Padelford, gives a complete list of occurrences of this word, noting its extension from 'assault', 'blow', through 'perilous situation', 'plight', to 'calamity', 'affliction'. He interprets it as 'plight' in the *Shepheardes Calendar*, Jan., l. 51. (See also below, p. 139.)

Only the more important can be noted of the many notes and articles that deal with individual words. In *The Etymology of English 'big'* (*Language*, Oct.–Dec. 1939) W. M. Austin reverts to Skeat's comparison with Norw. *bugge* 'a strong or important man' and would derive this from ON. *byggja*, with an original meaning 'one settled or established'.

J. A. Walz on *The Interjection 'Hurrah'* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan. 1940) claims this word to be a soldiers' and sailors' cry borrowed into German from English, and quite distinct from the word which occurs in Bürger's *Lenore* (1773) and which is of pure German origin, expressing speed.

C. H. Livingston in *English 'funk'* (*M.L.N.*, April 1940) makes a careful survey of English and Scottish usage and concludes that the adjectival use is the older. He explains it by comparison with French patois *funik*, *feunique*, &c., 'sauvage', 'sujet à s'effrayer', which eventually goes back to Latin *phreneticus*.

W. H. Kirk discusses in *A Note on the Verb 'Wage'* (*P.Q.*, Jan.

[12] *Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life*, by F. P. Wilson. Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy. 1941. O.U.P. pp. 33. 2*s*. 6*d*.

1939) the various uses of this verb as an example of *Sinnestreckung*.

H. Whitehall in *The Etymology of 'Lad'* (*ibid.*, Jan.) expands the short article he submitted in 1937 as a specimen of the Middle-English Dictionary, and, after a very full survey of material and variant opinions, comes back to the idea of a connexion with Gothic *-laups*. The ultimate connexion, he says, is with the root **leudh* 'to grow'.

Finally, E. J. Dobson in *The Etymology and Meaning of 'Boy'* (*Med. Æv.*, Oct. 1940) claims that the variant pronunciations in early Modern English show that it had Anglo-Norman or O.Fr. *ui*, and suggests a connexion with *embuier* 'to fetter', *boy* being originally 'a man in fetters', 'a slave', 'a serf'. He takes the ordinary ME. meaning to be 'churl', not 'male child' before 1400. He denies any connexion with OE. *Boia*, which he explains, no doubt correctly, as of continental origin, and he would see this foreign name in place-names in *boi-*.

Place-name studies are represented first by a general work, E. Tengstrand's *Genitival Compounds in Old-English Place-Names*[13] which claims only to be preparing the ground for a full investigation into 'the conditions under which words not denoting persons entered in their genitival form into Old English place-names'. It consists of over 400 pages of closely packed matter. It begins with a detailed chronological survey of previous views, involving much tedious repetition, but revealing how great are the existing divergence and vacillation of opinion. Tengstrand proposes to investigate only 'plausible' examples, and therefore to submit to a special examination compounds in the genitive case, e.g. *Holanbeorges(tun)*, as these are rarely open to divergent interpretation. In this volume he gives the material only, leaving conclusions to a later work. He prefaces his material, however, with a study of boundary marks such as *pæs clifes ende* or the rarer type *pone hundes pyfel*, where the article agrees with the noun qualified, and concludes that in the first type the genitive expresses a generic term and the syntactical relationship is 'partitive-possessive' (e.g. the relation

[13] *A Contribution to the Study of Genitival Compounds in Old-English Place-Names*, by E. Tengstrand. *Nomina Germanica* 7. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell. 1940. pp. lxviii + 354.

'between an area and its edge, a building and its wall') whereas in the second type the genitive is qualitative. Locative relationship is expressed by prepositional phrase or relative clause. Until the conclusions drawn from his material appear, judgement must be withheld as regards the value of the whole work. It is clear that much patient research has gone into the collection of material and the author has contributions to make to individual problems of interpretation. But it cannot be called an easy book, for the style often lacks clarity, and the anxiety to give a full statement of all previous views on any subject under discussion causes the reader to lose the thread of the argument. The volume will at present be of more use as a reference book than as a general study, though the appearance of a second volume may reverse this verdict.

The third volume of O. S. Anderson's *The English Hundred-Names*[14] (*Y.W.* xv. 44–5, xxi. 25–7) completes an important place-name study. The south-eastern counties are dealt with, and there is also a survey of the hundred-names as a whole, a chapter on the conclusions to be drawn with regard to the origin of the hundred, and an excursus on the Cornish hundreds. Anderson accepts the usual view that the hundred is a tenth-century organization, but shows that the names support the opinion that some earlier division existed, for many give evidence of ancient communities such as the *Hæppingas*, and some, like *Wodneslaw*, Wye, and *Ghidenetroi* (if 'tree of the goddess'), indicate that the meeting-place was in use from heathen times. So many contain elements indicating an intimate connexion with the popular assembly that it is difficult to accept Miss Cam's theory that the association between hundred and manor was the more primitive arrangement. As the place-names of all the counties dealt with in this volume have been recently studied, not very much new matter is brought to light, but occasionally a new form or parallel affects an older interpretation, as when the author compares with the much discussed Manshead (Bedfordshire) the OE. *(ge)mǣnnesheafod* recorded for Hampshire, and translates 'hill of assembly'. He differs rather frequently

[14] *The English Hundred-Names: The South-Eastern Counties*, by O. S. Anderson. Lunds Univ. Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 37. No. 1. Lund: Gleerup. 1939. pp. xvi + 242. 10 kr.

from Wallenberg when dealing with Kent, and does not always state fully the opposing view, as when he accepts *hæphlinc* for Haddling.

In the survey of elements an interesting feature is the frequent conformity of the names of meeting-places mentioned in OE. documents to the normal types of hundred-name, e.g. *Clofeshoh, Aclea, Wulfamere, Willherestrio, Ægelnoðesstan*, &c. His alternative interpretation of the element *stow* in Bunsty and *Wichestanstou* as 'burial place' is attractive. It could then easily refer to a church in which a saint's relics rested (Hibaldstow) and so be generalized to refer to a religious foundation of any kind.

H. Kökeritz has brought out *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight*,[15] a work characterized by the standards of thoroughness and accuracy we have learnt to associate with Scandinavian work. It has a long introduction, treating of the history of the island, the information gleaned from the names with regard to legal antiquities, old industries, &c., and the phonology of the names. One section examines in detail the early accounts of the Teutonic invasion, but the place-names, beyond supporting an early date by supplying a sprinkling of names in *-ing*, throw no light on the problem. Kökeritz mentions in this connexion contacts with the local nomenclature of Kent, Sussex, and Hampshire, but surely this is inconclusive, for when we examine the instances, e.g. the byform **nige* (for *niewe*), *brǣdu, hūfe, ceole, *sciete*, we find that their occurrence in Kent is very doubtful. While they indicate connexions with Hampshire and Sussex, there is nothing to show that they date from a very early period. They could arise from late contact with neighbouring areas.

The same applies to the evidence from phonology: *e* for OE. *y* is not uncommon, but when the author says, 'the fact that Wight was originally a Jutish settlement implies that *e-* forms were once indigenous there', he is assuming without question an earlier date for this development than is always accepted; and a little later he is claiming 'a continuous area from Kent

[15] *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight*, by Helge Kökeritz. *Nomina Germanica* 6. Uppsala: Lundeqvistska Bokhandeln. 1940. pp. cxii + 306 + 2 maps. 12 kr.

to Dorset in which OE. *y* could become *e*, and suggesting 'Jutish substratum' as an alternative explanation only.

His study on phonology is detailed, and he deals with this subject also in his article *The Juto-Kentish Dialect Boundary* (*Amer. Sp.*, Oct. 1939). Among points of interest are signs of an early change of OE. *eo* to *ea* to compare with the sporadic occurrence of *ea* (*ia*) for *eo* in some Kentish and Mercian texts; some instances of 'Kentish' *ie* for *eo*; and *a* for OE. *æ* from i- mutation of *a* before nasals.

In interpreting the names, he inclines to some extent to Zachrisson's 'terminal theory'. This reaction from personal names to topographical features was natural and perhaps desirable, and on the whole Kökeritz pursues a commonsense policy. In a word like Bembridge his topographical explanation (*binnan-*) is an improvement on the older suggestions. Yet there are many instances where one may well feel happier with a recorded personal name than with an addition to the growing list of terms for 'hill' or 'valley', postulated by advocates of the terminal theory, which left no trace in the later language. We are here asked to assume **mūl*, **bik(k)a*, **dod*, all meaning 'hill', and **bacge*, **bēade*, 'valley', when the personal names *Mūl*, *Bicca*, *Dodda*, *Bacga*, *Beada*, are in existence.

The Place-Names of West Lothian,[16] by A. Macdonald, is the first book to apply to a Scottish county the technique of the English Place-Name Society. The lack of anything to correspond to the introductory volume has necessitated a chapter of historical introduction which deals clearly and concisely with the scanty evidence for early times, in which place-names play their part. Those few recorded before about 1200 show an almost equal mixture of Welsh, Gaelic, and English, with the Welsh as perhaps the oldest, though already in the eighth century they have English equivalents. An interesting feature of the area is the number of names compounded with *tun* after the Conquest, with Norman names such as Walter, Hugh, &c., as Waterstone, Houston, the most interesting being Philpingstone (*Philpdawystoun*, 1165), i.e. 'Philip de Eu's farm'. One can also trace the substitution of standard English for Scottish

[16] *The Place-Names of West Lothian*, by Angus Macdonald. Oliver and Boyd. pp. xl + 179.

forms, e.g. the participle in *-and* gives way to *-ing* in Standing Stone (1653) and *ai* is replaced by *oa* in Broadmeadow (1663).

Articles on place-names include three presidential addresses on *The Historical Bearing of Place-Name Studies* given by F. M. Stenton to the Royal Historical Society. Though they are more concerned with the historical than the linguistic aspect, the first, *England in the Sixth Century* (*Trans. of the R. Hist. Soc.*, 1939), includes an assessment of the extent and nature of the Celtic element. It shows that, while the survival of the names of natural features presupposes a prolonged intercourse in the North, the Central and West Midlands, and in Wessex, there is no certain instance outside the extreme South-West, of the survival of a British habitation name. The impression given by the names is of broken life in British villages. In *The English Occupation of Southern Britain* (*ibid.*, 1940) a cautious attempt is made to distinguish Anglian and Saxon elements, and it is pointed out that the elements *rod*, *grēd*, may imply Frisian connexions. *Anglo-Saxon Heathenism* (*ibid.*, 1941) collects place-names containing heathen elements, most new matter relating to the element *wēoh*.

In *Wiltshire Place-Names* (*Antiquity*, March) H. C. Brentnall suggests that *Kairdurberg*, the Celtic name of Brokenborough, stands for *Kairdubric* 'fort on the Lesser Avon', and that the original OE. name was *Brōchæmeburh*, a rough translation of this, presumably altered later by popular etymology. He notes also how the names *Cada*, *Bera*, and *Badda* occur in connexion with *burg*, and with *Baddanburg* he compares *Mount Badon*. He would identify this with Liddington Castle, which, he says, has an alternative name, Badbury, not given in the Place-Name Society's volume.

Angus McIntosh in *Middle English 'Gannokes' and some Place-Name Problems* (*R.E.S.*, Jan. 1940) examines the use of the word in the *Chronicle of Thomas Castleford* and in Robert of Brunne, and also place-name evidence. He notes that *Gannoc* is often used to refer to the castle of Degannwy from the first half of the thirteenth century, and it may have arisen through confusion of final *oe* and *oc*, or by analogy with Welsh names in *-og* or with the Staffordshire Cannock. The common noun is used

only in Welsh settings, and may be a product of the name as applied to this castle. Some of the English place-names are located on or near earthworks, and so far none have been recorded before the late thirteenth century.

M. Förster has an article on *Der Name Edinburgh* (*Anglia*, Jan. 1940) in which he declares, after a re-examination of the evidence, that the English form and the Gælic *Dùn-eideann* both go back to OE. *Eadwines-burh* and that no earlier name is known.

Ernest Weekley's *Jack and Jill*[17] should have been considered last year. It is an outline of the history of Christian names in England and clearly embodies the results of many years of observation. In the nature of things many conclusions, such as some interesting remarks on changes in fashion, are bound to be based on general impression rather than precise statistics, but some may be confirmed by documentary evidence. For example, the statements on the rapid replacement of Old English by Norman names after the Conquest can be supported by the evidence of the *Liber Vitae* of Thorney Abbey (Additional MS. 40,000). It is only to be expected that in a work covering so vast a field, specialists on various branches will discover minor errors. For example *sige* and *stān* should not be omitted from the list of the commonest Old English elements; St. Oswald, king and martyr, may be at least a contributory cause of the popularity of the name; Rowena may be alternatively derived from OE. *Hrōðwynn*; Adrian became Abbot of St. Augustine's, not Archbishop of Canterbury, in 668. These are, however, minor points. The book is pre-eminently readable and few will read it without profit. Among other things it contains a collection of interesting oddities from a wide range of sources.

Foreign influences on English are considered in some articles. C. T. Carr in *Some Notes on German Loan-Words in English* (*M.L.R.*, Jan. 1940) adds fresh matter to his pamphlet *German Influence on the English Vocabulary* (see *Y.W.* xv. 39–40), some of it rather ephemeral, some of more permanent interest, as e.g. the addition to his translation loans of *higher criticism*, *ice-*

[17] *Jack and Jill: A Study in Our Christian Names*, by Ernest Weekley. Murray. 1939. pp. xii + 198. 5*s*.

age, markworthy. Meanwhile E. Taube in *German Influence on the English Vocabulary in the Nineteenth Century* (*J.E.G.P.*, Oct. 1940) thinks that the German contribution to scientific language is often underestimated, because frequently the words are coined from Greek or Latin roots. He gives lists, but most words of any general interest are already in Carr's study, which he does not appear to know.

In *Relations between English and Jutlandic* (*Acta Philologica Scandinavica*, xiii. Part 3. 1939) G. Schütte lists the correspondences claimed between these languages, describing as 'mere nonsense' the theory that they date from an archaic time when the Angles and Jutes were united. For example, the definite article in cases like *the man* was not English at the date of the invasion, and both English *scissors* and Jutlandic *sisser* are of Romance origin. He explains the similarities—to which he adds others such as the loss of distinction between *sik* and *hans* and the dropping of grammatical gender in some Jutlandic dialects —by the more acceptable theory of trade connexions.

Various aspects of word-formation have received attention. A. C. Bartlett, *Full-Word Compounds in Modern English* (*Amer. Sp.*, Oct. 1940), thinks that linguistic historians underestimate the vitality of English in forming compounds, and gives lists of recent examples.

J. Ellinger in *Die mit Präpositionen zusammengesetzten Adverbien 'here', 'there', 'where'* (*Eng. Stud.*, Oct. 1939), opposes Mätzner's statement that formations of the *herein* type are archaic and *unelegant* by collecting examples of their employment. These show that many, such as *wherewith, hereafter*, are still used in twentieth-century prose. He does not consider how far they are still living in standard conversational use.

H. Wentworth similarly discusses whether a method of formation is obsolete in *The Allegedly Dead Suffix -dom in Modern English* (*Mod. Phil.*, Feb.). Previous writers have had divergent opinions, and so he collects a mass of examples especially for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Many of the words are, however, jocular and momentary compounds. Comparatively few recent formations, e.g. *boredom* and *officialdom*, are in common use and recognized by the dictionaries.

Y. M. Biese's *Neuenglisch tick-tack und Verwandtes* (*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 1939) is a detailed consideration of a type of compound that can be divided into two subdivisions, the *tick-tack* type with vowel variation, the *helter-skelter* or rhyming type. He regards such formations as of popular origin and compares the use of reduplication, with or without variation, in other languages. In English the words often refer to repetitive action, or have an intensitive, frequently pejorative, sense. His discussion of origins differs from previous views mainly in the importance he attaches to the frequent interchange between a pale vowel in the first element and a dark one in the second, especially between *i* and *a*, as in *riff-raff*, *pitter-patter*, which, he thinks, arose when *a* was still a back vowel. After *a* was fronted, formations with *o* in the second element were preferred, such as *filly-folly*.

L. V. Berrey's chief concern in *Newly-Wedded Words* (*Amer. Sp.*, Feb. 1939) is with the blending, as in *scrutator*, *squiggle*, &c. Much of the material is made up of ephemeral coinages, but a plea is made for a more serious attention to the 'subtle blending of words'. Blendings are dealt with also in D. L. Bolinger's *Word Affinities* (*ibid.*, Feb. 1940), an article on 'sound symbolism' or 'sound suggestiveness' in the formation and use of words.

A recent formation not included in Koziol's *Handbuch der englischen Wortbildungslehre* is the theme of K. Thielke's note, *Neuenglische Kose- und Spitznamen auf -s* (*Eng. Stud.*, May 1939), namely the slang use of *-s* to form endearments like *mums*, *ducks*, or nicknames like *Wedders* from *Wedderburn*.

Several of these articles have been concerned with slang. Besides these, G. E. Noyes gives a bibliographical sketch of the beginnings and development of specialized cant glossaries in *The Development of Cant Lexicography in English* (*S. in Ph.*, July); and W. W. Gill in *Some Additions to the Slang Dictionaries* (*N. and Q.*, June 1, 1940) has a list of 69 new words and usages, including examples of rhyming slang such as *battle* 'a wife' rhyming 'trouble and strife'. St. Vincent Troubridge (*ibid.*, June 29, 1940) makes further additions to this list.

F. Schabel's *Zur neueren englischen Dialektforschung* (*Eng. Stud.*, Oct. 1939) is a sketch of methods and aims of dialect

studies in general. He discusses the dangers of over-great reliance on the record, or on the speech of one individual, criticizing Kökeritz's study of the Suffolk dialect, and he makes a plea for a linguistic atlas of Britain. The work includes a bibliography of publications on English dialects since the turn of the century.

W. Matthews, *South-Western Dialect in the Early Modern Period* (*Neophilologus*, April 1939), has some interesting evidence drawn from churchwardens' accounts mainly between 1446 and 1550, a period during which material for dialect study is very sparse. They relate to parts of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and Dorset, and reveal, among other things, that *e* for ME. *i*, which Wyld thinks reached London from the SE., is already found in the SW. in the mid-fifteenth century, and that the unrounding of ME. *o* to *a* is not as common as in London dialect, a fact which throws doubt on the supposed south-western origin of this feature. Various forms of interest for the history of consonants occur also: it is noteworthy that the statement of the *Writing Scholar's Companion* (1695) that *shu* for *su* is a 'vulgarism after the western manner' is not borne out here. The author has made a useful contribution to the study of early Modern English, though occasionally one feels he has neglected to consider the possibility of inverted spellings.

Early evidence of a different kind is carefully examined by H. Kökeritz in *Alexander Gill* (*1621*) *on the Dialects of South and East England* (*Studia Neophilologica*, 1938–9). From this study it emerges that the *che vor' ye* of *Lear* and other Elizabethan plays represents 'I warrant you'. *V* for *w* has usually been regarded as vulgar speech of the capital, but Kökeritz brings place-name material to demonstrate the blurring of the two sounds in East and South-East England. Various other interesting details are discussed, and a fact of more general interest emerges, namely that the language of Gill's *Mopsae* has much in common with eastern dialect.

Minor records of English dialects occur in *Notes and Queries*, where W. W. Gill supplies lists of *Somerset Dialect Words and Provincialisms* (July 8, 15, Sept. 16, 1939), *Wiltshire and Somerset Words* (June 22, 1940), *Cheshire and Dorset Words* (Aug. 3, 1940), and *Manx Dialect Words and Phrases* (Oct. 4). The main contribution to dialect vocabulary is, however, Parts III and IV of

the second volume of W. Grant's *The Scottish National Dictionary*[18] (see *Y.W.* xii. 38–9), which has now got as far as *clat-an-clay*.

Colonial English is represented solely by S. J. Baker, *New Zealand Slang*,[19] as A. G. Mitchell's *The Pronunciation of English in Australia*[20] has not been accessible. Baker calls his work 'a dictionary', but it is actually a historical study with words arranged and discussed under chapter-headings such as 'Early Times', 'Gold', 'Debt to Australia'. It does not appear that New Zealand has as yet supplied many terms to standard English.

It would be impossible to treat fully the great mass of work on American English, even if it were all obtainable in this country. The most important among the works that proved inaccessible are Kurath's *Linguistic Atlas of New England* and his *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England*,[21] both of which appeared in 1939 and have already supplied material for other scholars' works. Some of these have already been considered.

The difficulty of representing the many variant pronunciations of American vowels has occasioned C. K. Thomas's article *American Dictionaries and Variant Pronunciations* (*Amer. Sp.*, Oct. 1939) in which he admits the complicated nature of the problem and agrees with Professor Wilson that there is a tendency to neglect the South. B. Emsley's *Progress in Pronouncing Dictionaries* (*ibid.*, Feb. 1940) is merely a brief historical sketch. Material for studying different pronunciations is supplied by the phonetic transcriptions that run through *American Speech*, and a revised edition of these has been issued separately.[22]

[18] *The Scottish National Dictionary*, by W. Grant, vol. ii, Part III, *Bunkers—Catma*; Part IV, *Catmuggit—Clat-an-clay*, Edinburgh: Scottish National Dictionary Assoc. pp. 142.

[19] *New Zealand Slang: A Dictionary of Colloquialisms*, by S. J. Baker. Christchurch, New Zealand: Whitcombe and Tombs. pp. 114. 2*s.* 6*d.*

[20] *The Pronunciation of English in Australia*, by A. G. Mitchell, a lecture delivered before the Australian English Assoc. 1939.

[21] *Linguistic Atlas of New England*, ed. by H. Kurath and others, vol. i, Part I, Maps 1–119; Part II, Maps 120–242; and *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England*, by H. Kurath. Brown Univ., Providence, R.I. 1939.

[22] *Phonetic Transcriptions from 'American Speech'*, revised by J. D. Zimmerman. Columbia Univ. Press. pp. xii + 83.

A group of articles is concerned with the results of experiments to measure the length of vowels. H. A. Rositzke in *Vowel-length in General American Speech* (*Language*, April–June 1939) confirms previous findings that a vowel is longer before a media than before a tenuis. General American differs from British English in pronouncing [æ] and [a] long, so that duration is not phonemic, and the distinction between so-called 'long' and 'short' vowels is really one of quality.

Some irregular traces of influence from the initial consonant on the length of the preceding vowel are further examined by R.-M. S. Heffner in *A Note on Vowel Length in American Speech* (*ibid.*, Jan.–March 1940), who concludes that variations are individual and inconsistent. Heffner also, with the help of W. N. Locke and W. P. Lehmann, produces in *Notes on the Length of Vowels* (*Amer. Sp.*, Feb., Dec. 1940, Oct. 1941) further evidence that in *caught*, *cot*, &c., it is not durational differences that are significant.

Two other articles in this periodical are concerned with the vowels of dialects, R. I. McDavid's *Low-back Vowels in the South Carolina Piedmont* (April 1940) and J. B. McMillan's *Vowel Nasality as a Sandhi-Form of the Morphemes -nt and -ing in Southern American* (April 1939).

Parts X and XI of *A Dictionary of American English*[23] (see *Y.W.* xvii. 53–4) have appeared this year. Their interest is much the same as in previous parts. With Part X is issued a prefatory note to Vol. II, in which a selection of the more interesting words is arranged under subject headings, and a list is added of words in previous parts for which an earlier English date can now be supplied. Some of them, like *dairy-farm*, or *dancing room*, are words for which it was difficult to accept American origin. Probably the earlier American recording of some words in this issue will prove to be equally accidental—*graveyard*, for instance, or the phrase *lose one's grip* (1876); the opposite expression, *retain a grip*, is recorded in English use in 1861.

A work affording important material for this dictionary has

[23] *A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles*, by Sir William Craigie and J. R. Hulbert. Part X (*Gold Reserve—Honk*); Part XI (*Honk—Land-Pirate*). O.U.P. pp. x+254. 17*s.* per part.

now reached completion, namely *An American Glossary*, by R. H. Thornton, the third volume of which has appeared posthumously, edited by Louise Hanley, in *Dialect Notes* from 1931 on. In July 1939 it was completed with the entries from *Yard* to *Zenith City*, plus Addenda and Appendix.

Meanwhile works on various branches of lexicography have been pouring out. A. W. Read in *Notes on 'A Dictionary of American English, Parts I–VI'* (*Amer. Sp.*, Dec. 1939) gives lists of omitted words, mainly rarities. The volumes of this periodical are full of specialist vocabularies, such as those of certain areas, Virginia, New England, &c., place-names, the jargon of various professions and trades, ranging from army and cadet slang, through the technical terms of traders, photographers, &c., to the argot of forgers and confidence men. It is impossible to deal with them individually. Many will be of use to the lexicographer of slang rather than of the standard language.

Of greater importance are some more detailed studies of the contributions to vocabulary made by individual American authors. E. H. Criswell supplies in *Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers*[24] not merely a dictionary of the new words contained in the diaries of the members of the expedition of 1804–6, but also a survey of the methods of word-formation used in naming new fauna and plants, and a scientific account of these themselves. There are 171 previously unrecorded words and compounds, apart from 412 zoological or botanical terms, and, besides these, 301 terms with earlier dates than those in *O.E.D.*, including *menthol* and *lumbersome*. Though the material is important, one doubts whether it justifies 314 large pages of print. The method involves a great deal of repetition and several words are of a mere passing interest. It is, however, a very thorough piece of work and has already provided material for the *Dictionary of American English*.

Another specialist study is J. M. Purcell's article, *Melville's Contribution to English* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.), which states that this author had one of the most individualized vocabularies among nineteenth-century American authors, and has been neglected by lexicographers. Many of his examples, however, belong to

[24] *Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers*, by E. H. Criswell. Columbia: Univ. of Missouri. 1940. pp. ccxii + 102. $1¼.

the domain of slang. The most interesting words are survivals or revivals of words considered obsolete, e.g. the noun *landrat*, last recorded in 1632, and the intransitive verb *bower*, last used by Spenser.

R. B. Nye contributes an article, *Lowell and American Speech* (*P.Q.*, July 1939), which traces the development in Lowell's attitude. From 1845 to 1870 he was advocating the use of the American language in literature and opposing those who felt it too far from the standards of British usage. After 1870 he sets more store on compliance with tradition, and on the ability of the true poet to write well in any dialect or speech.

H. Wentworth complains in *Mr. Horwill and American Language Levels* (*P.M.L.A.*, Jan. 1939) that the author of *Modern American Usage* fails to realize that certain usages do not belong to all levels of American speech, and that expressions like *once-over*, *slant*, should be labelled 'slang' or 'colloquial'.

S. Robertson in *British-American Differentiations in Syntax and Idiom* (*Amer. Sp.*, Dec. 1939) comments on some differences which have attracted little attention. He states, for example, that Americans would never use the order *Give it me*, and would add *so* to expressions like *You shouldn't have done*. I. W. Russell contributes some *Notes on American Usage* (*ibid.*, Feb.) concerned with *like for*, *any more* in the affirmative, and *shambles*. J. T. Krumpelmann has an article on *Charles Sealsfield's Americanisms* (*ibid.*, Feb., April).

A short article by A. R. Dunlap, *'Vicious' Pronunciations in Eighteenth-Century English* (*Amer. Sp.*, Dec. 1940) shows the purist early at work in America, for it quotes a complaint in a newspaper of 1769 against pronunciations such as *nacher* 'nature', *forchune* 'fortune', &c.

Many references to differences between British and American usage occur in C. Stratton's *Handbook of English*,[25] which is a combination of encyclopaedia, dictionary of hard words, and guide to correct usage, the choice of entries apparently dictated by practical considerations. The standard of usage is mainly American, but only the English usage is given with regard to *shall* and *will*.

[25] *Handbook of English*, by Clarence Stratton. New York and London: Whittlesey House. 1940. pp. viii + 352.

III

OLD ENGLISH

By G. N. Garmonsway

Year after year the contributions of scholars to the study of Old English are noticed in these pages, but rarely is the value and purpose of such studies ever discussed in the works under survey, or any estimate attempted of the future of these studies. For this reason—and for many others—H. M. Chadwick's *The Study of Anglo-Saxon*[1] is fundamentally important. It establishes the value for Englishmen of the study of Anglo-Saxon, and looks forward to the time when it will be recognized as the key to an important period of our ancient culture, studied not only by privileged University students but also by others who wish to use their leisure time profitably and interestingly. Unfortunately in the past, as a part of University curricula, it has been taught and studied mainly on narrow linguistic lines; it has been cut away from its historical and cultural connexions, and valued as a University subject either with the half-acknowledged purpose of stiffening courses on English literature, or considered only as of importance as a stem of the old Germanic philological tree from which with subsequent graftings sprang the English language of to-day. Far otherwise was its importance estimated by Joseph Bosworth, the founder of the Chair of Anglo-Saxon which Chadwick holds:

> The Professor's duties are to promote the study of the Anglo-Saxon language and the languages cognate therewith, together with the antiquities and history of the Anglo-Saxons. In short, they are to cover the whole field of Anglo-Saxon studies.

With what devotion and success Chadwick has fulfilled these wide terms of the deed of foundation is realized by scholars to-day, more especially by his own students who have been privileged to see the bare bones of some University courses made alive at Cambridge.

In the first chapter of the book the author gives an account of the literature and monuments of the Anglo-Saxon period.

[1] *The Study of Anglo-Saxon*, by H. M. Chadwick. Cambridge: Heffer, pp. xii + 78. 3*s*.

He points to the fact that the literature is the oldest in Europe after Latin and Greek, and is particularly unique in the long series of historical and legal records which cover the history of England and its institutions for a period of nearly five centuries. The value of Anglo-Saxon studies is described, whether for the linguist or for the student of history or political institutions. 'It was the formative period of our national culture.' Here it is suggested that earlier historians neglected pre-Conquest England, among other reasons, because they were ignorant of the language, and 'deterred from making use of it by a form of mental inertia—the feeling that Latin and French are the only languages of those ages which the historian need trouble to study'. To appreciate the interest of the period to the full, the writer concludes, all its activities—intellectual, social, political, and artistic—should be taken into account. 'If this is done, it will be found that very few countries in the world—certainly none in the northern half of Europe—have a past which can compare in length and varied interest with that of our own country.'

Other kindred and contributory studies are shown to be of importance: in particular, stress is laid on the value of Scandinavian and Celtic studies which throw side-lights on the Anglo-Saxon scene. The final chapter discusses the future of these studies and suggests that much could be done to foster them if local authorities and the clergy took a more intelligent interest in the antiquities of their locality. W. L. Renwick has recently given an excellent guide which can lead the student without a teacher on the right track, and with Chadwick's assurance that Anglo-Saxon—at least the prose—is a very easy language to learn, it is to be hoped that this book will influence others outside the University world to take more than superficial interest in pre-Conquest England.

It is probable that the inherent difficulties of *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn* account for the fact that we have had, up to the publication of R. J. Menner's work,[2] no comprehensive edition of this text since that of John Kemble, printed for the Ælfric Society in 1848. However that may be,

[2] *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, ed. by Robert J. Menner. New York: M.L.A.A. London: O.U.P. pp. xi + 176. 12*s*.

the present publication has been worth waiting for: it is exhaustive and scholarly, and courageously confronts the very numerous problems which present themselves. In comparison with this text, most of Old English verse is covered by well-trodden tracks: here the editor has had to cut his way through difficulties where no one before him has ever attempted to blaze the trail. To help us to understand the full meaning of the verses, the Introduction provides a fascinating Old English *Road to Xanadu*, wherein is revealed the mental make-up of the writer. As Lowes, Willey, and Tillyard have done for more modern periods, Menner shows to what extent the content and form of the poem derive from an amalgam of contemporary beliefs and a body of knowledge inherited from diverse sources of book-learning. There are discussions ranging from one on the dialogue, quasi-riddle form, in which the verses are framed, to one on the use of the Pater Noster and the Palm Tree. No single volume could more aptly illustrate Chadwick's thesis of the scope and interest of Anglo-Saxon studies. Particularly revealing are those sections which analyse the Oriental, Germanic, and Christian elements in the poem. This is a model edition of an Old English text.

We are greatly indebted to Robin Flower and Hugh Smith for producing a facsimile[3] of the Parker Chronicle and Laws (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 173), and to the Early English Text Society for their decision to include this publication in their series. Much benefit would accrue to English scholars if this innovation in their excellent series of publications could be followed, when peace comes, by the issue of suitably edited facsimiles of other Old English texts, for which there is an outstanding need. The editors of the present volume regret, in their brief Preface, that the war has prevented the publication of an introduction: they propose, however, giving 'an exhaustive discussion of the palaeographical and bibliographical problems of this unique manuscript' at the first available opportunity, and this will be issued together with a binding case for the whole work. Meantime on each plate there is a caption giving the minimum necessary information as to the contents of each page of the manuscript. We shall look forward

[3] *The Parker Chronicle and Laws.* A Facsimile, ed. by Robin Flower and Hugh Smith. O.U.P. (for E.E.T.S.). pp. iv + 1[a]–56[b]. 63*s*.

to the completion of this work, and congratulate the editors and the printers on the edition so far advanced.

Kemp Malone has an interesting paper (*R.E.S.*, April) on *Grundtvig as a 'Beowulf' Critic*. He presents Grundtvig as the first and greatest of *Beowulf* scholars, and draws attention to the fact that although his reputation rests primarily on his identifications, and his textual criticism, yet as a literary critic his work has never received its proper due, owing possibly to the fact that he wrote in Danish and in publications often inaccessible to English scholars. Malone remarks that Grundtvig's criticism had its roots in the enlightenment of the eighteenth century, modified by the romanticism of his own day: his criticism anticipates current views when it emphasizes the religious tone of the poem, and takes it for granted that *Beowulf* was composed, not merely revised, by a Christian poet. Finally, it agrees with current criticism in assuming that the *Beowulf* poet was a conscious literary artist, who may have wished to glorify the North, and a particular period of its history, by a story of a hero who met and overcame, not merely human foes, but trolls, dragons, and monsters—the embodiments of the forces of evil.

Malone prints translations of many of Grundtvig's critical passages to illustrate these contentions.

Malone also in a short article *Hygd* (*M.L.N.*, May) shows how the poet of *Beowulf* draws the character of the Geatish queen so as to make it consistent with the meaning of her name 'mind, thought, reflexion, forethought'. She is first introduced as young, but virtuous and generous, a model of behaviour in contrast to the arrogant and forceful Thryth, whose name, as Malone points out, means 'strength, might, power, force'. It is clear that the names of the two queens 'contributed largely to the development of their characters and careers in story (as distinguished from history)'. Malone concludes by referring to the scene of Beowulf's return from Hygelac's disastrous last expedition, when Hygd realizing the impending dangers of the times, offers the throne to Beowulf: her strength of character had clearly received recognition from the Geatas for they had acknowledged her as regent in her lord's absence. Malone's interpretation of lines 1926 and 1932 is not orthodox, but as usual a disturbing challenge to orthodoxy.

W. S. Mackie continues his series of notes upon the text and interpretation of *Beowulf* in *Miscellaneous Notes* (*M.L.R.*, Jan.): the previous article appeared in *M.L.R.* (Oct. 1939) and was noticed in *Y.W.* xx. 27. Most of his suggested interpretations carry conviction, e.g. *fela feorhcynna* (l. 2266), which he would render as 'many living creatures', understatement for 'every living creature'—i.e. including the hawk and the horse mentioned in the previous lines, as well as mankind in general. In l. 2588, Mackie is probably right in taking *grundwong ofgyfan* to mean 'retreat' instead of 'die'. The lines following, however, should have been discussed along with this passage. The poet, having spoken of Beowulf's reluctance to retreat, generalizes and speaks of man's usual reluctance *alætan lændagas* 'to relinquish his life, however transitory'. To interpret *sec* (l. 2863) as 'sick', and not emend to *secg* is tempting, but the form *sec* for *secg* also occurs in *Waldhere*, i. 5, and should be reckoned with.

Sherman M. Kuhn has examined the gloss to the Vespasian Psalter as printed in the facsimile of the Modern Language Association, Rotograph 332, and published the results of his investigations in an article, *The Gloss to the Vespasian Psalter: Another Collation* (*J.E.G.P.*, July). His results have also been checked against the original MS. Cotton Vespasian A 1 by T. C. Skeat of the British Museum. In 1932 Ruby Roberts published *A New Collation of the Vespasian Psalter and Hymns* (Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages I), and Kuhn's paper shows the accuracy of this earlier work. Of the seventy minor errors in Sweet's transcription noted by Miss Roberts, six seem doubtful to Kuhn, and he is able to justify the form given by Sweet in each case. He prints, however, two further lists of readings (1) errors in Sweet's text, not mentioned by Miss Roberts, and (2) scribal alterations, noted neither by Sweet nor by her. As Kuhn says, the justification for the careful work which both he and Miss Roberts have given to checking Sweet's transcription lies in the fact that 'if the Vespasian is a genuine Mercian text, and if the Mercian dialect was actually the direct ancestor of modern standard English, the importance of a perfect text is obvious'.

L. Whitbread in *The Third Section of 'Deor'* (*Mod. Phil.*, May)

sifts and summarizes the more important views of commentators on the textual problems involved in this section of the poem, and adds some interpretations of his own. He begins by preferring the reading *Mæðhilde* as a compound name in the genitive, and re-establishes the interpretation of *monge* as 'many', rejecting the theories of Malone and Norman. *Geates* is construed as objective genitive, and line 15 rendered 'her passion for Geat', rather than 'the passion of Geat' for her (Mæðhild); moreover Whitbread maintains that the direct object of *binom* (16) is *hi*, with the indirect object *slæp ealle* in the dative (instrumental) singular—*slæp* being an elided form of *slæpe*, final *e* having been left out before the initial vowel of the following *ealle*—and renders *hi* as feminine, i.e. Mæðhild. The article concludes with a note on the two names Mæðhild and Geat.

In his article *Some Lost Saints' Lives in Old and Middle English* (*M.L.R.*, April), R. M. Wilson continues his interesting researches into our early lost literature. Next to stories of early and contemporary heroes, it was natural that the lives and legends of the saints should provide popular subjects for our early literature, whether written or oral, in Latin or the vernacular. As Wilson says, 'they combined the merits of devotional reading with the attraction of the marvellous. As we should expect the legends were usually written in Latin, but popular demand and the attempts of the clergy to provide a substitute for purely secular literature, soon led to the composition of versions in the vernacular'. If, in the course of time, these popular versions have been lost, references to them can occasionally be traced in Latin works which have survived: such references have been searched out and examined in this article. Admittedly some of these clues prove somewhat indefinite, but Wilson has been able to show in many cases that they point to the existence at some earlier period of versions in the vernacular.

In *Notes on the Language of Ælfric's English Pastoral Letters in Corpus Christi College 190 and Bodleian Junius 121* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.), George K. Anderson comes to the conclusion that the variations between the language of the two versions seem to indicate a slightly later date for the Bodleian MS. 'If the date of about 1065 is correct for Bod. Jun. 121, the date of CCCC 190 should be about 1045–50.' The author takes into account the

fact that the two manuscripts are of slightly different dialect and show different orthographical tendencies, pointing out that judgements as to the relative dates of these two MSS. are therefore hazardous. Tables of examples of conflicting evidence on the question of date are given and discussed very convincingly, with an expert knowledge of the development of the English language at the close of the Saxon period.

In an effective article, *An Old English Encomium Urbis* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.), Margaret Schlauch shows how the structure of the fragment devoted to the praise of Durham owes much to the succession of laudatory poems on cities which were written in the Middle Ages. The scope of the poem is limited to a few topics: the grandeur of the city, its fortunate location, the saints and holy relics for which it is celebrated. The article shows how these set topics of description ultimately derive from those laid down by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (of the first century A.D.), Menander, and Hermogenes in the *Exercises* 'a handbook which officially codified rhetorical doctrine on encomia for later centuries, and suggested exercises for illustration'.

The topics laid down by Dionysius to be described were: the location of the city, its origin, with special reference to the founder, whether god or hero, the deeds of the inhabitants in war and peace, its size, its buildings, both sacred and profane, its neighbouring river, stressing its size, purity, and fertility as advantages to the inhabitants. Menander and Hermogenes include, in their classifications of topics, the accomplishments and virtues of the citizens, who become in Christian usage the saints and martyrs of the city. Praise for them occupies the major part of the poem on Durham, and of similar medieval eulogies in Latin.

Miss Schlauch quotes extracts from some of these: the long poem of Alcuin in praise of the city and church of York, the poem of Paulinus of Aquileia (802) on his city, and earlier examples such as one on Milan (composed in the eighth century) and on Verona. These poems are shown to present the closest parallels in structure and diction to the Old English poem on Durham, and examples of parallels are given to prove the author's case. She concludes that these similarities arise not from a slavish modelling of the Old English poem on any or all

of the Latin encomia, but are due rather to the rigid imitation by medieval Western Europe of rhetorical forms already firmly established in Latin schools, and by them derived unchanged from the Greeks.

Old English Etymologies is the title of an article by C. M. Lotspeich (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.). He discusses the words *aglæca, eoletes, nerhsnawang tintrega, endebyrdnes, læwede.* The explanation offered for the second of these is somewhat forced, depending as it does on the assumption that the *Beowulf* form is by metathesis for *el-wetes*<**el-wites*, a gen. of *el-wite*, 'a going elsewhere', 'a foreign journey'. It is stated that 'when the *w* got in front of the *l*, it vocalized and formed with the *e* a dipthong *eo*'. No other examples, however, are produced for such metathesis. The etymologies offered for the other words have more to commend them.

George T. Flom writes on *The Old English Herbal of Apuleius Vitellius C III* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.). This manuscript has interested him because of its contents, and because it provides in the English Herbal a striking example of Insular script in late Old English times. The various texts of the MS. were originally all separate volumes, up to the time when they were acquired by Sir Robert Cotton, and bound by him into one volume, the Herbal being the second text of the MS. The *Herbarium* was badly damaged by the fire in Ashburnham House in 1731, but it is interesting to note, says Flom, that greater damage had already been brought about by the pigment of the paints used in the illustrations, particularly the green, which had eaten through the parchment and obliterated completely the lettering on the other side wherever this colour was used. Flom discusses the pagination of the codex; and then, by reference to a photostat illustration, analyses the script of the *Herbarium*, drawing particular attention 'to the more perfect quadrangular *a* (and *æ*) than is seen anywhere else'. He concludes that the manuscript must have been written at Canterbury (or Rochester) about 1040–50.

IV

MIDDLE ENGLISH

I. CHAUCER

By Dorothy Everett

For the second year in succession American scholars have produced a work of outstanding importance for the study of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. This new book, *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'*[1], is, however, important in a very different way from J. M. Manly's and Edith Rickert's great publication of last year. Unlike their work on the text, it is not at all revolutionary, and much of the material and many of the conclusions it contains will already be familiar to students of Chaucer. The value of the book, indeed, mainly lies in its comprehensiveness and reliability. It brings together a large number of texts and a great deal of information hitherto widely scattered and sometimes not easily accessible, and the opinions expressed in it are, in general, well-founded and judicious.

The aim of the contributors is, in the words of the editor, 'to present in so far as possible the sources of the *Canterbury Tales* as Chaucer knew these sources or, where the direct sources are not now known, to present the closest known analogues in the form in which Chaucer presumably may have been acquainted with them' (Preface). The book consists of twenty-seven sections, the first of which deals with the literary framework of the *Tales* and the others (with one exception) each with a separate tale. (The exception is the seventh section which deals with the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*.) In most of the sections there is little or no discussion of how Chaucer actually handles his sources; the contributors have deliberately restricted themselves to the task of providing the texts which are necessary for the study of his methods and have usually left the reader completely free to use them as he will.

Obviously the texts are, therefore, the most important part of the book and very great care has been taken to select versions

[1] *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'*, ed. W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster. Univ. of Chicago Press. pp. xvi + 765. 60*s*.

which represent as closely as possible those which Chaucer himself used or may have used. Of course, the possibility of deciding, with any degree of certainty, which of the extant MSS. of a work comes closest to the one used by Chaucer must vary very greatly. Where (as in *Melibeus* and to a great extent in the *Clerk's Tale*) Chaucer is translating, it is possible to discover MSS. which come very close indeed to his 'original', and J. Burke Severs, who is responsible for the sections dealing with both these *Tales*, has been able to provide texts which are far more satisfactory for purposes of comparison than those hitherto available. With a tale like the *Man of Law's*, where Chaucer is merely following the course of the story, it is not possible to do more than select the MS. which most faithfully presents the source itself (Trivet's *Chronique*). For the great majority of the *Tales* no direct sources are known, but the scholars responsible for the sections dealing with these have sought to provide analogues which are not merely close in substance to Chaucer's work, but can be dated near his time. Among these analogues there are some that have not been previously published; for example, the Flemish *fabliau* which provides an analogue to the *Miller's Tale*, or the three *exempla* from MSS. in the British Museum which contain narratives similar to the *Pardoner's Tale*. The extracts from the *intermezzi* in Sercambi's *Novelle* are also largely 'new' publications.

The various sections of the book are by no means equal in interest and value, but in justice to the contributors it must be recognized that the inequality is quite as often due to differences in the nature of their subjects as to any particular merit or defect in the treatment of them. In drawing attention to certain sections (in addition to those already indicated) which are specially useful or interesting, the present writer is not, therefore, necessarily disparaging those that are not mentioned.

In the first section ('The Literary Framework of the *Canterbury Tales*') the questions of Chaucer's indebtedness to the *Decameron* and of his knowledge and use of the writings of Sercambi are very carefully reconsidered, and the authors, Robert A. Pratt and Karl Young, who are well qualified to give the final opinion on these controversial matters, conclude that there is no convincing evidence that Chaucer knew these Italian works. In Section II (on the *Knight's Tale*) good use is made of the

'excellent edition' of Boccaccio's *Teseida* produced in 1938 by S. Battaglia; and, with its help, it is found possible to decide to which of the groups of extant MSS. Chaucer's 'original' belonged. Section VII, on the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*, contains a most useful collection of excerpts from 'antifeminist' works, most of which were certainly known to Chaucer, and some of which were his direct sources. Section VIII and Section XIV (on *The Wife of Bath's Tale* and the *Franklin's Tale*) both provide, in addition to texts of the chief analogues of the central story, extracts from works used by Chaucer for some of his 'amplifications'; the Wife's discourse on 'gentilesse' is illustrated by extracts from Dante and the *Roman de la Rose*, and Dorigen's complaint by extracts from Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum*. The presence of these additional 'sources' helps to give some indication of Chaucer's methods of composition in his more complex tales and the same plan might well have been followed in some other sections, such as those on the *Man of Law's Tale* and the *Nun's Priest's Tale*.

In his section on the *Prioress's Tale* (XIX), Carleton Brown publishes the text of a version of the story of the boy murdered by the Jews which was recently discovered in MS. 32 in the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In the light of this early 'C' version, he reconsiders the conclusions which he formulated in his *Study of the Miracle of Our Lady told by Chaucer's Prioress* (1910) about the relations of the various extant versions of the *Miracle* and about the form of it which Chaucer knew and used. This section must, unfortunately, be one of the last publications we shall have from Carleton Brown whose wide knowledge of Middle English has for so long been an inspiration and a guide to those interested in the literature of this period.

It would have been impossible to handle the section on *Sir Thopas* in the same way as most of the others, since this *Tale* depends for its existence on its author's knowledge of a whole class of literature. Mrs. Loomis has solved the difficulty by providing a large number of extracts from Middle English romances to illustrate the various topics introduced into *Sir Thopas*. There are, for example, extracts describing the appearance of heroes, others describing their pastimes or their arming, and yet others giving catalogue lists such as occur several times in *Sir Thopas*. These extracts give a far clearer idea of the

kind of verse that was in Chaucer's mind as he wrote than any mere analysis of the characteristics of the romances.

Most of the sections of this book will be found useful both by beginners in Chaucerian studies and by those who are further advanced. For the latter, indeed, the book as a whole is indispensable, for a very large and important part of the available material essential for any examination of Chaucer's methods and interests is contained in it.

In connexion with the book, mention may be made of the article by George R. Coffman entitled *Chaucer's Library and Literary Heritage for the 'Canterbury Tales'* (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.) which is in reality a review of it. Coffman comments on those features of the book which have specially interested him and mentions several problems suggested by the reading of it which are, in his opinion, worthy of further investigation.

The interest aroused by Manly's and Rickert's *Text of the Canterbury Tales* (cf. *Y.W.* xxi. 46–50) has been shown in many reviews, and in at least two of them there are criticisms and suggestions well worth noting. Robert K. Root's review in *S. in Ph.* (Jan.) deals chiefly with the discussion, in Vol. II, of the classification of the MSS. He notes that the common variants which are cited in support of the genetic relationships of a group of MSS. are 'often of so trivial a character' that their value as evidence is of 'very dubious validity'. These trivial variants have been listed indiscriminately with significant ones, the editors remarking that 'the groupings are established not so much by the significant character of the variants as by the consistency and persistence of the agreements' (I, xi). To this statement Root rejoins that, even if pure accident is ruled out, there are other possible explanations of persistent trivial agreements between MSS. (e.g. two scribes may possess similar mental habits) and he points out that 'even a multiplicity of trivial agreements' cannot prove that the scribes were copying from the same or a similar exemplar.

It was recognized by the editors themselves that they had 'only partially succeeded in arriving at a genetic classification of MSS', but, in Root's view, their success is even more limited than is at first apparent. Of the larger groups which they recognize, *a*, *b*, and *c* are 'clearly attested genetic groups', but

the 'rather nebulous group' designated *d* is not. As for the large composite group, *b–cd*, which appears when, in some parts of the *Tales*, *d* is joined by MSS. of other groups (cf. Vol. II, 42), it is clear from the editors' own statements that the interrelations within it are so confused that they have been unable to arrive at 'any clear and convincing affiliation', even in regard to a single tale or link. Since the classification is so complicated and variable, how, asks Root, can it be 'any clear guide to the establishment of a critical text'? Actually, as he proceeds to point out, it seems obvious that the 'critical' text given in Vols. III and IV was not constructed on any uniform procedure, but each 'problem of doubtful reading seems to have been determined on its own merits'.

The second review was contributed by Carleton Brown to *M.L.N.* (Dec. 1940). Brown also emphasizes the difficulties which the editors encountered in attempting to classify the MSS. and some of the weaknesses of their methods, but he is mainly concerned to prove that the MSS. afford evidence of the existence of an earlier (unrevised) form of the text and a later (revised) one. He therefore examines a number of passages the MS. variations of which appear to indicate extensive alteration by Chaucer himself, and he concludes that 'as a whole, the textual evidence . . . seems to show conclusively that group *d* often represents the unrevised (and therefore the earlier) form of the text'. He suggests further that the order of *Tales* in group *d*, which exhibits some notable variations from that of the standard text, may be 'based upon an earlier arrangement which Chaucer later discarded', thereby rejecting Manly's own view that 'there is no single MS. or small group the order of which can be ascribed to him' (II, 476).

In *Three Notes on the Text of the 'Canterbury Tales'* (*M.L.N.*, Mar. 1941) Carleton Brown continues his examination of passages which may have been revised by Chaucer, discussing first the 'Host's Stanza' which stands at the end of the *Clerk's Tale* in some MSS. The common opinion is that it is a piece of Chaucerian work later discarded by the author; but Brown questions whether it was meant to be discarded, noting that it is to be found in all the MSS. of Manly's group *a* and in others (Hg, El, &c.) which are generally considered to offer the 'most

mature and well-considered text of the *Canterbury Tales*'. He next considers the link between Groups E and F. In MSS. of Manly's group *d*, where the *Franklin's Tale* follows the *Clerk's*, these two *Tales* are sometimes linked by two 7-line stanzas 'textually related' to the standard form of E 2419–40 and F 1–8 and usually regarded as a shortened spurious form of the E–F link. While agreeing that the second of these stanzas is unquestionably the work of a scribe, Carleton Brown argues that the first has a 'truly Chaucerian flavor'. In his view it is 'more reasonable' to regard it as the 'original kernel' from which Chaucer later expanded the Merchant's Epilogue, and he maintains that traces of the 'welding process' can still be seen in the Epilogue. In *d* MSS. these 7-line stanzas are called the Prologue to the Franklin's Tale, and in MS. Hg. the related passage (E 2419 ff.) is similarly designated, but in the *d* MSS. the stanzas are at the same time the epilogue to the *Clerk's Tale*, whereas, in Hg., E 2419 ff. has its usual function of epilogue to the *Merchant's*. This is taken by Brown to indicate that the order of tales was shifted from E^2 D E^1 F^2 (the *d* order) to D E^1 E^2 F^2 (the Hg. order), i.e. that the position of the *Merchant's Tale* in Hg. 'suggests a stage somewhat later than in group *d*'.

Lastly Brown considers the variant readings of the couplet in the *Merchant's Tale* (E 1305–6) which Brusendorff, in his book *The Chaucer Tradition*, used as the basis of his classification of the MSS. Brown refuses to believe that Chaucer left this couplet unfinished and he sees in the MS. variations another instance of his alteration of the text, the form in Manly's *d** group presenting the earlier, unrevised version of it.

Brown's purpose in examining these three passages is to add to the number of instances in which *d* (or *d**) MSS. seem to preserve the 'original' (unrevised) form of the text and he goes so far as to claim, at the end of his *Notes*, that it is 'certain' that in these MSS. 'we are dealing with early tradition'. In connexion with this view, the present writer may perhaps be allowed to mention that in her own review of Manly's and Rickert's book (*R.E.S.*, Jan. 1942) she gave some reasons for thinking, not only that *d* MSS. do not *consistently* present an unrevised (earlier) text, but that it is exceedingly unlikely that any MS. or group of MSS. should *consistently* present either an unrevised or a revised text.

There are, as usual, several articles and notes on the Canterbury pilgrims. In the Correspondence in *M.L.N.* (Jan., Feb.) J. S. P. Tatlock and Ramona Bressie continue the controversy about Chaucer's Monk to which reference was made last year (cf. *Y.W.* xxi. 50–1). To the same periodical (Nov.) F. L. Utley contributes a note, entitled *The Last of the Miller's Head?*, which adds yet another instance to the list given by Whiting and Wiley of men who could use their heads as the Miller did (cf. *Gen. Prol.* 550–1). Utley's example is David Ritchie, the original of Scott's Black Dwarf, Elshie of the Mucklestanes; but, after mentioning it, he concludes that 'there must be an end of these parallels as serving any useful point; for live examples are likely to prove endless'.

The Pardoner is the subject of three publications, the first and most comprehensive of which, *The Progress of Chaucer's Pardoner, 1880–1940*, by G. G. Sedgewick, appeared last year in the new American periodical *Modern Language Quarterly* (Dec. 1940). Sedgewick's aim is to review the chief 'judgments' made upon the Pardoner during the last sixty years, 'to sort out the established from the doubtful and to see the Pardoner afresh as he appears in 1940'. Referring to the many analogues to the Pardoner's story which have been discovered during these years, he remarks that 'research and criticism are pretty generally agreed' about the type of story to which 'the Pardoner gave classic shape', but he adds a warning that this story was never meant to be regarded as an end in itself, but as an *exemplum* in a sermon. The debt of the *Pardoner's Tale* as a whole to the medieval sermon has, he considers, been rightly emphasized, though attempts to prove it a 'typical' sermon have not been entirely successful. Nor is the Pardoner himself a 'typical' figure and in his case it is likely that there is some basis in fact for Manly's view that the pilgrims were drawn from 'life models'.

In the second section of his article Sedgewick discusses some of the 'heresies' into which scholars have been led through a faulty sense of proportion. One, which he calls the 'Sermon Heresy', is the result of focusing attention on the Pardoner's material, rather than on the Pardoner himself. Chaucer was not mainly interested in constructing a medieval sermon, but in presenting a 'remarkable charlatan of a preacher who, in the course of self-revelation', gives a 'sample of his trade-tricks'.

Hence discussion of whether his 'sermon' is 'typical' or not, or of the lack of logical coherence in it, are really beside the point.

The last section of the article is devoted to what the author calls 'subjective interpretation' of the Pardoner and his behaviour. By a detailed examination of Chaucer's various statements about the Pardoner and of the Pardoner's statements about himself, Sedgewick gradually builds up a picture of this character as he sees it, giving his own explanations of difficulties and apparent incongruities in Chaucer's portrayal of him (such as, e.g., the 'benediction', C 915–18, and the closing episode). Some parts of his interpretation may perhaps be criticized as super-subtle, but, as a whole, his article is an interesting and valuable piece of work.

In *The Credentials of Chaucer's Pardoner* (*J.E.G.P.*, Jan.) Marie P. Hamilton discusses the clerical rank of the Pardoner. Chaucer tells us that he was 'of Rouncivale' (i.e. he was apparently an agent for the Hospital of St. Mary Rouncival near Charing Cross), but his precise connexion with the Canons regular of St. Augustine who maintained this Hospital has not been determined. Miss Hamilton's view is that there is much to be said for the assumption that he was himself a member of that order.

We have evidence that Austin canons were accustomed to go on quest for their houses and there even exists a mandate, issued by John of Gaunt in 1372 and renewed in 1374, which requests protection and hospitality for three 'brethren and procters' on quest for the Hospital of St. Mary Rouncival itself. External evidence therefore indicates that the assumption is not inherently improbable; and, in his Prologue, the Pardoner seems to suggest that he belonged to some brotherhood in which 'manual labour, vows of poverty and chastity, and other distasteful features of the monastic life were expected of him'. His eloquent preaching is, in itself, no proof that he was in major orders, since lay-pardoners sometimes preached, but Miss Hamilton has found no evidence that they also officiated at Divine Service, as Chaucer's Pardoner apparently did. In addition to these clerical functions, which were all allowed to canons regular, the Pardoner exercised one which was not general. Regular canons were allowed to undertake the cure of souls only

by dispensation; hence the Pardoner is careful to announce that he has been granted this power.

The chief objections to regarding him as in sacred orders are his going untonsured and his remarks to the Wife of Bath (*Wife of Bath's Prologue*, 163–8). The latter Miss Hamilton terms a piece of 'characteristic bravado', the former she considers 'hardly surprising in one who confessedly violated the very principles of his calling'. Jusserand's suggestion that his papal licences were spurious is rejected by Miss Hamilton on the grounds that this misses the point of Chaucer's portrait, for, as she sees it, to 'Chaucer and his contemporary audience . . . the ultimate irony doubtless lay in the very orthodoxy of the Pardoner's credentials'.

In *The Friendship of Chaucer's Summoner and Pardoner* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) Charles R. Sleeth mentions a document, forming part of the register of John de Grandisson (Bishop of Exeter, 1327–69), which shows that it was sometimes through the connivance of the archdeacon's officials that a false pardoner was able to make 'the persoun and the peple his apes'. Sleeth suggests that this may explain what lay behind the friendship between Chaucer's Pardoner and Summoner.

It has hitherto been considered uncertain whether the Canon who joined the pilgrims at 'Boghton-under-Blee' was regular or secular, but Marie P. Hamilton in *The Clerical Status of Chaucer's Alchemist* (*Speculum*, Jan.) maintains that to medieval readers it would have been clear that he was a Canon Regular of St. Augustine. Referring to the passage in which the Yeoman protests that the canon in his story (who is certainly a regular) is not the same man as his master, Miss Hamilton argues that it would surely have been unnecessary for him to do this unless his master were of the same rank. His master's dress is exactly that prescribed for the Austin Canons, who were known as Black Canons to distinguish them from other canons regular. It is true that Chaucer represents himself as slow to recognize the rider who joins the pilgrims, and the Host is puzzled by him, but this was because of his shabbiness. Once his rank was recognized, his 'sluttish' appearance and the Yeoman's description of the way he and his master lived would have made it apparent to everyone that he was an apostate from his order.

There are only two articles on the Tales themselves, as distinct from their tellers. In *The Maidenly Virtues of Chaucer's Virginia* (*Speculum*, July) Karl Young considers the possible debt of the *Doctor's Tale* to the *De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium* of Vincent of Beauvais, the last ten chapters of which are devoted to 'instructions concerning the rearing of maidens'. F. Tupper maintained that parts of Chaucer's description of the virtues of Virginia were indebted to St. Ambrose's *Libri Tres de Virginibus* and he pointed to eight parallels between the two works. Young is able to show that the resemblances which Tupper noted between Chaucer's lines and the *De Virginibus* 'can be matched, in large measure, from Vincent's *De Eruditione*'. In addition, he mentions a number of details in Chaucer's description which can be paralleled in Vincent's treatise but not in the *De Virginibus*. Even the passage addressed to those that 'lordes doghtres han in governance', which is usually thought to be an allusion to Katherine Swinford, may have been in part suggested by Vincent's advice concerning the choosing of governesses and companions (cf. chapter xlv *De pudice societatis et famulatus eleccione*), though Young believes that there is a personal and topical allusion in it too.

Under the title *Chaucer and the Breton Lays of the Auchinleck MS.* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.) Mrs. Loomis continues her study of the connexions between Chaucer's poetry and the Auchinleck MS. (cf. *Y.W.* xxi. 53–4), finding further indications in the *Canterbury Tales*, notably in the *Franklin's Tale*, that Chaucer knew this MS. She thinks that between 1350 and 1400 the Breton lay was rather out of fashion and Chaucer would, therefore, have been more likely to know of it from 'olde bokes' than from contemporary discussion. There is no convincing proof that he read the *Lais* of Marie de France in the original, and it may therefore be supposed that he got his knowledge from English versions. Mrs. Loomis examines in detail what Chaucer has to say in the *Franklin's Prologue* about Breton lays and she notes that every one of the ideas expressed there could have been obtained from the prologue attached to *Lai le Freine* (and probably once attached to *Sir Orfeo* also) in the Auchinleck MS. 'To all intents and purposes', she writes, 'the *Franklin's Prologue* is simply a suavely charming summary of the earlier passage'.

A knowledge of *Sir Orfeo* is indicated, Mrs. Loomis maintains, by a number of correspondences ('slight in themselves' but 'they add up . . . into a curious series of parallels') between it and the *Franklin's Tale*, and also by features in other *Tales*, notably the transformation in the *Merchant's Tale* (E. 2036 ff. and 2227 ff.) of Pluto and Proserpina into the 'kyng [and queen] of Fayerye'. In *Sir Orfeo* the name of the fairy king is not given but it seems clear from ll. 391 ff. that it is the ruler of the dead who has become identified with the 'king o fairy'; and so it is in the *Merchant's Tale*. Evidence of Chaucer's knowledge of the third lay in the Auchinleck MS., *Sir Degaré*, is slighter, but Mrs. Loomis thinks it possible that Chaucer's use of the rape incident as an introduction to his version of the Loathly Lady story (*Wife of Bath's Tale*, D 882 ff.) may have been suggested by the 'incidental opening' of that lay.

That Chaucer could have read *Lai le Freine*, *Sir Orfeo*, and *Sir Degaré* in other MSS. than the Auchinleck is, of course, possible; but if Mrs. Loomis's earlier evidence that he knew and used the Auchinleck MS. is accepted, it would be most reasonable to suppose that he read these three Breton lays there too.

Chaucer's *Troilus* is examined from a new point of view in Henry W. Sams's article *The Dual Time-Scheme in Chaucer's 'Troilus'* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.). He observes that while the superficial impression gained from the poem is one of 'continuous action over one season between spring and winter', in fact there are two concentric time-schemes, one 'the actual, basic time-scheme of three years', the other 'the practical, artistic scheme of . . . the coming and departure of one summer'. Mention is made, just before Criseyde leaves Troy, of the three years which have elapsed since Troilus first began to love her (cf. V. 8–14), but within these three years the action falls into two sequences of comparatively short duration. The first of these, occupying Books I–III, takes place, as Sams shows, in the months of April and May; the length of the second, which occupies Books IV and V, is uncertain, for Chaucer refuses to be precise about it, but 'the nature and sequence of events indicate that it was a matter of a few months'. Apparently then there is a gap of nearly three years in the middle of the poem. It is not clear where Chaucer got the idea of this 'formal' time-scheme of

three years (it is not in *Il Filostrato*) but, in any case, he seems to have regarded it as 'more or less beyond his direct control'. Yet, while accepting it, he endeavours at the same time to produce an impression of continuous action, using for this purpose a sequence of images which suggest successive phases of the year. This, which is Sams's second, concentric time-scheme, does not begin at precisely the same point as the formal scheme. For instance, Book I is formally dated in April, but the image used in I. 523–5 refers to frost and snow and suggests an earlier date in the year; in Book II, which is formally dated in May, there is an image (ll. 764 ff.) suggesting March. Sams's attempt to show that this seasonal imagery can be traced in each book (ending with suggestions of autumn and winter in Books IV and V) is least convincing in reference to the last book, where there are no images comparable in scale or effectiveness to the earlier ones.

J. S. P. Tatlock has contributed to *P.M.L.A.* (Mar.) an article entitled *The People in Chaucer's 'Troilus'*, the main purpose of which is to express his opinions of the characters of the poem. His introductory remarks are, however, largely concerned with the poem as a whole and are intended, in part at least, as a corrective to some of the views of recent critics. *Troilus*, Tatlock holds, is a 'romantic' poem but in it romance is blended 'with delicate and perceptive truth to humanity'. Comparing *Troilus* with *Il Filostrato*, Tatlock finds that Chaucer 'no more medievalizes than he humanizes his chief source; he complicates and intensifies it'. He thinks that it has been a 'fundamental modern error' to identify the romantic love expressed in the poem with what is habitually called 'courtly love', and he asks 'Why treat as peculiar to "courtly love" what everyone recognizes as belonging to any romantic and the higher modern love'?

Tatlock evidently considers that, in their interpretation of the characters, some critics have allowed their own imaginations to run away with them, and he stresses the necessity of keeping strictly to the text. One error which has arisen from not doing so is the frequent application of the adjective 'elderly' to Pandarus, though there is no support for it in the poem.

Tatlock's own views of the four chief characters, which are given in some detail, need to be read in his own words. In the course

of his analysis of Criseyde he notes that, in her, Chaucer has given us the 'earliest full figure Portrait of a Lady' in English literature—a remark which links up with his final statement about the characters. They all have, he observes, one thing in common—that they are aristocrats. There is, he thinks, hardly any other narrative in English which is so 'aristocratic' in outlook as *Troilus*.

The oft-discussed problem of the 'meaning or significance' of the *House of Fame* is once more considered by Paull F. Baum in *Chaucer's 'The House of Fame'* (*E.L.H.*, Dec.). He notes that the division into three books with which most readers are familiar was made by Caxton and Thynne, but is not to be found in the extant MSS. Actually the poem falls, not into three, but into four main parts—the Temple of Venus (Book I), the journey to Fame's dwelling (Book II), Fame's House and 'her ways with mankind' (Book III, ll. 1–777), the House of Rumour (Book III, 778–1068, plus the missing conclusion). Baum examines each of these parts in turn, pointing out the connexions between them but not ignoring the irrelevances, apparent or real, or the digressions. He observes that, apart from its emphasis on love, the summary of the *Aeneid* which forms the major part of Book I seems to have little relevance to the rest of the poem, and he holds that the first part of Book III (ll. 1–777) is 'devoted to matter not proper to' Chaucer's 'main theme'. In his view, Chaucer began with the idea of a lightly handled, even facetious, poem on Fame in the manner of the French love-vision, and he chose the story of the *Aeneid* to introduce it because a hero who is false to his love suited his 'humorous purpose'. When the dreamer emerges from the Temple of Venus, the 'apparent barrenness of the world' terrifies him, but his attention is soon drawn by the eagle who is to show him the House of Fame as a reward for his 'excessive devotion to love and lovers in books'. The journey to Fame's House then follows. So far, Baum remarks, 'everything is in order'; but Fame has two aspects, Renown and Rumour, and Chaucer was led away into describing Renown at great length in the first part of Book III. Not till l. 778 does he return to his subject and bring the dreamer to the House of Rumour. Here he finds what he came for (cf. ll. 1041–3) and busies himself 'for to

pleye and for to lere' and also to hear a piece of news from abroad which he does not intend to divulge to us (—this Baum calls 'mere humorous mystification'). Baum does not think that much of the poem can have been lost, nor, in view of the whole tenor of Books II and III, that the missing conclusion can have contained a serious piece of news. When the dreamer reaches 'the place where all the news of the world is concentrated', Baum writes, 'he finds all fame a travesty, renown fickle and rumor a mockery', and it therefore seems likely that the tidings of love from the man of authority would have been a 'similar disappointment and disillusion'. The 'moral' of the poem, according to Baum, is that 'in love, if not in all life, the poetic dream is preferable to the earthly reality'.

A second article on the *House of Fame*, by L. J. Henkin, bears the misleading title *The Apocrypha and Chaucer's 'House of Fame'* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.); it is actually written to show (to quote the author's own words) that 'the apocalyptic vision of St. John . . . offers a number of suggestive parallels [to the *House of Fame*] which cannot be dismissed as mere coincidence'. Though, as Henkin admits, instances of verbal similarity are few, there are resemblances in detail between passages in the *Apocalypse* and parts of the description of the palace of Fame which, taken together with the actual reference to the 'bestes foure That Goddes trone gunne honoure, As John writ in th' Apocalips' (*H.F.* 1384 ff.), do indeed suggest that Chaucer was writing with St. John's vision in his mind. Among the similarities mentioned, that between *H.F.* 1403–6 (telling of the song sung 'eternally' to Fame) and the *Apocalypse* v. 13 is one of the most striking.

In *Chaucer's Two-Mile Pilgrimage* (*M.L.N.*, Mar.) H. M. Smyser considers the significance of the phrase 'myles two' in the lines in the *House of Fame* (ll. 115–18) which run 'As he that wery was forgo On pilgrymage myles two To the corseynt Leonard'. He suggests that it may be an allusion (the purport of which would have been clear only to Chaucer's circle) to the distance between the poet's own residence above Aldgate and the nunnery of St. Leonard at Stratford-atte-Bowe, with which, judging from the *Gen. Prol.*, he seems to have been well acquainted.

K. E. Elmquist, in *An Observation on Chaucer's 'Astrolabe'*

(*M.L.N.*, Nov.), calls in question the usual assumption that Chaucer wrote his *Treatise on the Astrolabe* solely for the child whom he calls 'Lyte Lowys my sone'. The formal arrangement of the prologue to the *Treatise*, the poet's elaborate explanation of his use of the English language, and his 'careful forestalling of criticism' by his reference to the 'olde astrologiens' of whose work, he says, he is 'but a lewd compilator', all this surely indicates that Chaucer expected others besides Lewis to read it. The passage which begins 'Now wol I preie mekely every discret persone that redith or herith this litel tretys . . .' is even more clearly a direct address to a general reading public, and its similarity to the opening of Chaucer's *Retraccioun* is worth noting. Elmquist finds himself unable to decide whether the *Treatise* was originally intended for Lewis and later came to be thought of as a literary work suitable for general reading, or whether it was from the beginning intended as a literary translation 'cast into the conventional form of a piece of private instruction'.

Clair C. Olson's study *Chaucer and the Music of the Fourteenth Century* (*Speculum*, Jan.) ranges more widely over Chaucer's works than most of the publications mentioned so far. Miss Olson's aim is to give as complete an account as possible of Chaucer's knowledge of and interest in music and she observes that, to do this adequately, it is necessary to consider not only what he says but also those 'aspects' of the music of his time which he does not mention. After outlining what is known about fourteenth-century music, Miss Olson notes that Chaucer shows little familiarity with theoretical writers on the subject. Though we have no direct evidence that he himself composed music, she thinks it likely that he did; at least we know that Machaut, whom he followed in so much of his early poetry, insisted that the lyric poet should compose both the music and the words of his songs. Miss Olson observes that the list of musical instruments actually mentioned by Chaucer in his works, though not exhaustive, is representative of all the chief groups, and she stresses the point that, so far as can be judged from his descriptions, he was more interested in amateur than in professional music. 'Within the field of amateur performance', he refers to singing and playing by persons of varied social standing and, in the *Cook's Tale* and the *Pardoner's*, he

gives 'vivid pictures of amateur music at social gatherings of the common people'. Among his few references to professional music are those to the use of pipes, trumpets, clarions, &c., at tournaments and battles.

Miss Olson considers that, apart from specific references to musical activities, Chaucer's interest in music appears in his poetry in two main ways—in his use of lyric forms (such as the balade, the virelay, the roundel) the structure of which was 'closely allied to, if not determined by, that of the music', and in his use of figures of speech based on music.

Under the title '*Sixty*' *as a Conventional Number and Other Chauceriana* (*M.L.Q.*, Mar.), Sister Mary Immaculate has published four notes on various points in Chaucer's writings. In the first she discusses his use of the number 'sixty' and shows that, generally speaking, he employs it as other medieval English writers did, to indicate a large but indefinite number. Even in the reference to the 'sixty bokes olde and newe' which he tells us he possessed (*Legend of Good Women*, G. 273) the number was probably not meant to be taken literally.

In the second note, the author argues that the 'hooly sacrement' received by January and May (cf. *Merchant's Tale*, E. 1700 ff.) was not, as Tatlock thought, the Eucharist, but the sacrament of matrimony. (The 'stole' is mentioned in E. 1703 because it is the vestment proper to the marriage ceremony.) This interpretation fits in better with the earlier part of the *Tale*, where Chaucer ironically emphasizes the 'holiness' of marriage (cf. E. 1261) and even makes January say that 'Mariage is a ful greet sacrement'.

The third note questions Robinson's explanation that the 'first table', mentioned in *Cant. Tales*, C. 639, means the first five of the Ten Commandments. Chaucer, Sister Mary Immaculate observes, would have been familiar with a division of the Commandments, not into five and five, but into three and seven.

In the last note she suggests that the puzzling phrase 'She is the lyf of angeles', used in reference to a woman living in virginity (cf. *Parson's Tale*, I, 948), is a mistake for 'she is the lyk of angeles'. This would have its ultimate source in a passage in St. Mark's Gospel (xii. 25, '. . . sunt sicut angeli in coelis') which was often used in treatises on virginity.

In a long article entitled *Geoffrey Chaucer, J.P. and M.P.* (*M.L.R.*, Jan.) Margaret Galway discusses the poet's activities during the years 1384 to 1389. This period which, Miss Galway notes, is one of the most interesting in the life of Chaucer the poet, is also 'the most profusely documented and the least understood'. The extant documents tell us a number of facts about Chaucer, such as that, in 1385, Richard II allowed him to appoint a permanent deputy in the wool customs and commissioned him as justice of the peace for Kent, that in 1386 he was elected one of the knights of the shire of Kent and lost both the controllerships of customs which he had hitherto held, that in 1389 he became clerk of the king's works; but the documents do not in themselves provide any explanation of these facts. In order to understand the nature of Chaucer's activities and his exact position during these years, Miss Galway thinks it is necessary to discover what his 'qualifications were for the magistracy, for parliament, and for the chief clerkship of the king's works'.

She begins by collecting such information as is available on the duties and qualifications for office of resident or local justices in general, and on those of the justices for Kent just before and during the period when Chaucer was commissioned. It appears that, of the various classes of men who were eligible for appointment as justices, Chaucer can only have belonged to the group of esquires who were stewards or representatives of some magnate, and, in Miss Galway's opinion, his appointment is best explained by the hypothesis that he was employed in some capacity by the king on his estate in Kent, the royal manor of Eltham. This supposition would help to explain, too, his later appointment as clerk of the king's works, for it seems likely that such a responsible position would only have been given to one who had held a similar though subordinate post. Miss Galway argues that Chaucer was probably overseer at Sheen as well as Eltham and that the house which he is known to have inhabited at Greenwich (probably during the years 1385 to 1399) may have been the unoccupied house on the royal manor of West Greenwich which was midway between Sheen and Eltham.

Chaucer's election as knight of the shire Miss Galway explains as a move in the political struggle between Richard and his uncles. Foreseeing trouble in the Parliament summoned for

October 1386, Richard 'could not have failed . . . to pack it as far as possible with his own supporters'; in these circumstances 'the election of his favoured esquire Geoffrey Chaucer is hardly surprizing'.

The value of Miss Galway's article, of which this is the barest outline, is that it helps to fill in the social and political background of the life-records of the years 1384–9; but it must be admitted that her detailed reconstruction of Chaucer's non-poetic activities during this time rests on a sequence of more or less interconnected hypotheses rather than on anything more solid.

The claim of Joan de la Pole, wife of Thomas Stonor, to be considered a descendant of Alice Chaucer, daughter and heir of Thomas, the poet's son, is discussed by E. A. Greening Lamborn in *The Descendants of Chaucer* (*N. and Q.*, Sept. 20). Lamborn shows that though this Joan was a De la Pole, she was not the daughter of John, Duke of Suffolk, and therefore not descended from Geoffrey Chaucer, the poet. The discussion is continued by E. St. John Brooks in *N. and Q.* (Oct. 11). In the same periodical (*N. and Q.*, Feb. 22 and Mar. 29) reference is made to two works of fiction, dated 1843 and 1926, in which Chaucer figures as a character.

V

MIDDLE ENGLISH

II. BEFORE AND AFTER CHAUCER

By GLADYS DOIDGE WILLCOCK

As the war absorbs more and more of Anglo-American energies, the quantity and solidity of works to be considered here are inevitably curtailed. The Early English Text Society maintained its output in 1941 in spite of all difficulties; apart from its publications, the bulk of the strictly Middle English studies to be noted here consists of periodical material. The order of topics in this chapter remains as before: first will be considered works of general and comparative interest, then secular and religious verse, then prose and drama; last of all will come linguistic, bibliographical, and miscellaneous subjects.

Perhaps the most important of sustained works of general and comparative interest is Beryl Smalley's *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*.[1] In this field the spade-work was all to do. Appraisement of medieval achievement in biblical scholarship has conspicuously failed to keep pace with advance elsewhere. The would-be student finds, Miss Smalley tells us, not even an adequate reference-book; for a general view his principal source must still be the two *Histoires Critiques* of Richard Simon, published in 1678 and 1693. In the first place, therefore, this book is the attempt of a scholar to fill a gap in scholarship. But medieval biblical exegesis was itself a department of scholarship; the book is also an endeavour to map out the course of approach to a most strenuous activity of the medieval mind and to enable this activity to take its proper place in the intellectual and critical world of the Middle Ages.

The Bible was the most read (or heard) of all books, and its influence was omnipresent; most chapters in *The Study of the Bible* have, accordingly, something in them to attract or stimulate the student of literature and ideas. However much in the academic world we have reformed the now amusing complacency of Dean Farrar *vis-à-vis* the mere 'glimmerings and decays' of

[1] *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, by Beryl Smalley. O.U.P. pp. xvi + 295. 17*s*. 6*d*.

medieval biblical scholarship, old superiorities die very hard. It will probably be agreed that the ordinary student or general reader, who is given to finding 'classical scholarship' in much merely imitative Renaissance work and who easily distorts the significance of the later demand for, and establishment of, the vernacular scriptures, is still slow to recognize or acknowledge medieval brain-work, sheer scholarly activity. One reason is, of course, that this brain-work expressed itself in a language no longer generally read. Miss Smalley's study is exacting to read as it was exacting to prosecute, but she meets the weaker brother half-way by generous and often lively translation; her purpose is fundamentally humane and her exposition proportioned. From the point of view of this chapter, moreover, it is to be noted that her book should make better known the contribution of Englishmen from Alcuin to Roger Bacon to European scholarship. It should also help to prevent glib or superficial references to 'the allegorical habit' and the 'four-fold meanings'. One of the most interesting and significant clues to follow through the story of vicissitude and revival is the movement towards pleasure and satisfaction in the letter, in the concrete, historical and human.

It is pleasant to be able to welcome the enterprise represented by a new periodical in wartime. In the first number of *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* (Jan.), edited by Richard Hunt and Raymond Klibansky and published by the Warburg Institute, are some articles of cognate and comparative interest which fall to be mentioned here. R. W. Southern's account of *St. Anselm and his English Pupils* is, of course, mainly theological in scope, but it has its contribution to make to the fuller understanding of 'continuity' and contact between English and Norman culture and scholarship. A point of general interest is the further light it sheds on the difference in intellectual method and outlook between Anselm's day and tradition and that of a century later: 'in no way was the society in which he lived, either in a Norman monastery or as an English archbishop, so exclusive as that in which theological literature was produced a century later'. Hence, in his works and those deriving from them, there can be recognized a quality which may be called (comparatively) 'popular'.

There is also a long and well-documented account in French, by André Wilmart, O.S.B., of the Miscellany or *Florilège* owned by Thomas Bekynton in the fifteenth century. The MS. goes back to the early thirteenth century and was added to in Bekynton's own time. Its contents (all in Latin) mingle verse and prose (verse predominating) and range from a *Planctus* on the death of Richard Cœur de Lion, through *Carmina Burana* to scraps of Jerome, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, Peter of Blois, and various known and unknown satiric, moral, and religious writers. The greater part of the article (which is to be continued) consists of an Analysis of the Collection, item by item, giving first and last lines, tracing the source wherever possible and indicating where, in printed books, the material is accessible.

There has been in recent years increasing occasion to refer, among cognate studies, to the progress of Anglo-Norman researches. M. Dominica Legge's book, *Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions*[2] and her article, *Anglo-Norman and the Historian* (*History*, Dec.) are more directly addressed to the historian than to the student of English Language and Literature, but they have their relevance here. The article, written with authority and vigour, traces the rise and decline of Anglo-Norman in this country and its complex relations with Latin and English. The bearing of the evidence from legal documents, proclamations by monarchs, and references by writers is judiciously reviewed; in some cases they provide unsafe grounds for generalization. Subsidiary items discussed are the language spoken by the kings who ruled over (not necessarily in) England and the influence of Picard and Walloon (*via* the wool-trade) on Anglo-Norman vocabulary.

The book, begun in collaboration with the late Miss M. V. Clarke, prints, in the main for the first time, the Letters and Petitions contained in a MS. already known to historians as a source-book—All Souls MS. 182. Its very miscellaneous contents, including (in its French portion) dialogues, phrases for children, a vocabulary of adverbs, collections of proverbs, &c., as well as the Letters and Petitions, show it to have been a clerkly commonplace book owned and compiled (according to unusually

[2] *Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions*, by M. Dominica Legge. Blackwell, for the Anglo-Norman Society. pp. xxiii + 495. £3. 3*s*.

satisfactory evidence) by John Stevenes who had connexions with Norwich, Lincoln, and Exeter as well as several small benefices, who became a notary-public in 1406, made a will in 1457, and was dead by 1460. Two of the letters are addressed to him; the rest are copies of business letters such as would be found in registers and files of Royal and other public business. The printing thus makes accessible a body of Anglo-Norman work of the early fifteenth century; a study of the language is deferred to a later volume.

Arthurian romance seems to have lain almost fallow this year. The Celtic hinterland is explored once more *via* a series of phrase by phrase annotations of *Preiddeu Annwn* by R. S. Loomis in his article *The Spoils of Annwn* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.). Here this 'elaborately incomprehensible' poem (No. XXX in the 'Book of Taliessin') is printed in the Welsh, 'tentatively' translated and richly commented. The pursuit of the clues takes us, by sometimes devious routes, into the world of Celtic myth and folklore which Loomis has explored in numerous studies. The detail can, of course, only be assessed by Welsh scholars.

The Dialect of 'Sir Tristrem' makes the subject and title of an article by Bertram Vogel in *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.). The author writes in the conviction that dialect-studies of M.E. texts have been forced by scholars into 'unnecessarily complex and fantastic hypotheses'. He particularly distrusts, it seems, all series-of-scribes explanations. An analysis of the Phonology and Morphology of the language of *Sir Tristrem* is given to establish the thesis that the dialect, so far from being 'Northern with many puzzling features', is S.E. Midland, and that the text was almost certainly written in London. The indubitable mixture of forms is held to illustrate the eclecticism of which 'carpenters of Romance' were capable. Vogel postulates for this particular carpenter a cosmopolitan Londoner who may have spent some time in the North and who was familiar with Northern literary traditions. The gain in simplicity here is a matter of opinion; as to dialectal eclecticism, many Old English poems may be held to provide a precedent.

Lillian H. Hornstein has been continuing her studies of the *King of Tars*, more particularly of its analogues. In *P.Q.* (Jan.) she writes on *A Folklore Theme in the 'King of Tars'*—the

theme, that is, of the piebald, shapeless, or otherwise monstrous offspring of a heathen potentate married to a Christian princess.

An analysis of extant versions in various languages shows that the 'monstrosity' runs through the following gamut of variations: a child born all hairy, a child half-hairy and half-beautiful, half-animal and half-human, half-black and half-white and, finally, a shapeless lump. The last variant (the one represented in the English version, among others) naturally suggests the unlicked bear's cub. Miss Hornstein believes that the clue to both hairiness and shapelessness may be found in the well-known bestiary tradition of the bear's whelp and that the bifurcation may have been helped by some scribal confusion between *(h)irsus* or *(h)irsutus* and *ursus*. As to the half-and-half variations, there is an obvious symbolism, but Miss Hornstein is naturally not content with this. She recalls, but does not here follow up, the widely diffused fairy-tale motive of the half-animal and half-human child. The symbolism of black and white is even more obvious—it might, in our thinking, arise spontaneously out of the paynim-Christian parentage. However that may be, parallels are not prolific, though the article assembles some examples from fairy-tale metamorphoses and Indian marvels concerning children who turn from white to black.

English authors often display an itch to multiply incident. Perhaps it is a consequence of this national characteristic that Trivet, in the *King of Tars*, gives us two fittingly symbolic miracles: the child acquires human shape and the father turns colour.

In a second article, *New Analogues to the 'King of Tars'* (*M.L.R.*, Oct.), the versions are again classified by the monstrosity criterion. Analogues have been traced in seventeen texts never before associated with the *King of Tars*. A point of interest, not connected with the pursuit of the folklore theme, is the evidence provided of the rapidity of dissemination of popular motives in those times. If the tale of the conversion of a Tartar Khan contained in a letter of 1300 to the King of Aragon marks the entry of this theme into Christendom, it took less than ten years to work it up, diversify and embellish it, and disperse it as romance and chronicle material through Western Europe.

Three articles make up the list of *Piers Plowman* studies this

year. Bernard F. Huppé considers *The Date of the B-text of 'Piers Plowman'* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.) in the light of the topical references underlying the Fable of the Rats. He finds Skeat's dating '1377 or at very latest 1378', too precise. It is accepted that the Fable refers to the Good Parliament which assembled in 1376, but its irony would have been pointless before the failure of good intentions had become clear—that is, until the sitting of the Bad Parliament, Feb. 1377. The mouse's reference to killing the cat shadows forth the counsels of violence aimed at Gaunt ('Cat from the Court'). The B-text was therefore not begun before the early part of 1377. A *terminus ad quem* is indicated by two passages in Passus xix referring to the Pope in very critical vein. These are held inapplicable to Gregory XI, but suitable enough as expressing the English view of Clement VII, Anti-Pope. They must have been written therefore after Gregory's death in 1378, and the B-text could not have been complete before the autumn of that year. Further, the lack of any reference to the Peasants' Revolt suggests completion before 1381. Whatever the strength of individual clues, it seems wise to allow some latitude of time for the re-writing of a work as long and as knotty as the B-text.

The character 'Liberum Arbitrium' in the C-text provides the subject and title of an article by George Sanderlin (*M.L.N.*, June). Here we return for a brief space to the theological and philosophical line prominent in many recent studies of the poem. It is Sanderlin's view that the expansion of the role of 'Liberum Arbitrium' in the C-text has never been adequately explained. This, as well as Skeat's difficulty in recognizing the appropriateness of all the self-describing titles used by Free-will, is to be explained by the scope given to free-will in medieval psychology. It was equated by John Damascene with a universal power of the soul, identifiable with all other powers. Sanderlin defends the role of 'Liberum Arbitrium' against the strictures of Mabel Day (*R.E.S.*, Vol. III, 1927), and finds the handling of the character consistent with the theological subtleties of the C-text reviser.

A. G. Mitchell (*M.L.R.*, April) describes briefly *A Newly Discovered MS. of the C-text of 'Piers Plowman'*. The MS. is in the possession of Sir Louis Sterling and is closely related to the version (D.4.1) in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, and

may be a transcript of the same original. Nothing is known of the early history of the MS., which is henceforward to be known as 'A'.

The *Pearl* inspired this year only a somewhat slight note by Mary V. Hill, '*Pearl*': *Inlyche and Rewarde* (*M.L.N.*, June), where two lines from *Pearl* (603–4)

> for þer is vche mon payed inlyche,
> whe þer lyttel oþer much be hys rewarde

are explained by an idea from Dante, with support from a parallel in Walter Hilton. The idea is that of the two Rewards, Essential and Secondary. It is not clear how the analogues cited illumine the meaning of 'payed inlyche' or improve upon the line of discussion of this crux summarized and extended by Elizabeth Wright in *J.E.G.P.*, Jan. 1939 (*Some Further Notes on* '*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*').

Gardiner Stilwell has a brief article on '*Wynnoure and Wastoure*' *and the Hundred Years' War* in *E.L.H.* (Dec.). He sets himself to clear up some obscurities not elucidated by Gollancz and Steadman by postulating a close connexion between the poem and Edward III's habit and methods of extracting war-funds from the middle classes. The allegorical explanations of the goings and comings at the end of the poem seem a little wire-drawn.

The most important publication this year in the field of fifteenth-century secular verse is Robert Steele's edition[3] of the English poems of Charles of Orleans, printed from the unique MS. (Harl. 682) in such a way as to reproduce the state of the MS. before any of the three sets of corrections were made. These are supplied in footnotes.

The authorship problem here is one of those tiresome cases where the question must be argued because someone at some time has jibbed at the obvious or put forward a rival claimant. The point at issue is whether or no Charles is to be reckoned as the original composer in English of the sequences of ballades and roundels contained in this MS., a very large proportion of

[3] *The English Poems of Charles of Orleans*, ed. by Robert Steele. O.U.P. for E.E.T.S. pp. xliii + 256. £1. 11*s*. 6*d*.

which have opposite French numbers in Charles's 'private MS.'—indubitably his own work. There seems everything to be said for original composition by Charles in English and nothing weighty against it. It is not altogether irrelevant, in considering these love poems of a distinguished prisoner, to recall the *Kingis Quair*. Not only are the circumstances closely analogous to the legend which made of the *Quair* a prison-solace, but (though French differs more, of course, from Southern English than does Scots), Sir William Craigie's theory that the *Quair* was originally written in the language of the captors draws the parallel closer still. There is, too, in each work some connexion with *The Flower and the Leaf*.

The editor notes some interesting differences between French and English wit, sentiment, and traditions as expressed in the parallel poems. The ballades, indeed, illustrate excellently the easy-paced sensibility of much English fifteenth-century courtly verse. The trail of the 'facound' is, of course, over most of the serious writing of this period, but the 'haut' style of Lydgate is most agreeably absent. There is, however, a good deal of word-play almost Euphuistic in its deliberation. The roundels, as briefer forms, offer a cleaner-cut diction and strike us as more 'Gallic' in effect. Charles took liberties with his adopted language and coined and adapted freely, but he wielded a deft pen, could rely on his ear, and had a truly astonishing power of keeping it up. We have now a valuable addition to our material for the study of English art-lyric in the post-Chaucerian era.

The other Early English Text Society publication is in the field of fifteenth-century prose. In a bulky volume, which is a tribute to the staying-power of the E.E.T.S. in war-time, Curt F. Bühler[4] has printed, for the first time from the MSS., three English versions of Tignonville's once popular *Dits Moreaulx*. Yet a fourth version, translated by Earl Rivers, was printed in 1477 by Caxton as the *Dictes of the Philosophers*. The three translations now made accessible are those by Stephen Scrope, with revisions by William Worcester, another member of Sir John Fastolf's entourage; the anonymous Helmingham Hall MS., and an abbreviated version by Scrope. There is generous

[4] *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*, ed. by Curt F. Bühler. O.U.P. for E.E.T.S. pp. lxviii + 408. £1. 10*s*.

editorial apparatus—introduction, notes, a philologically most informative glossary, and an index of proper names.

The introduction is mainly bibliographical, basing its conclusions on patient searching of numerous French MSS. and the extant English MSS. It is very largely occupied with intricate comparisons in order to determine the inter-relation of all versions. The interest of the *Dicts*, in so far as it is not philological, is, indeed, as illustration of the conditions of the book-world of the latter fifteenth century, for the philosophers have their say in singularly unattractive, unorganized form. Yet clearly it was a book which the circles of men like Fastolf and Rivers thought it worth while to translate and copy, though it may strike us as no more than a piece of dreary hack-work. It emphasizes the dependence of the world of letters upon French, for it was not until the collected sayings reached French vernacular form that translations and adaptations began to burgeon.

Prose texts of this kind and date are not likely to set philological puzzles, but they have considerable linguistic interest—largely lexicographical. This was a hey-day of Gallicizing and of augmenting and aureating the language generally. The glossary is designed to show how frequently words and forms in the texts assembled here antedate the first entry in the *O.E.D.* by a considerable period. Moreover, William Worcester's revisions offer pointers to the way the language was moving—often in the direction of preferring two words to one.

In the field of drama there seems to be a growing conviction that liturgical origins and traditions call for renewed study. Three articles this year testify to this, but as two are comparative in scope and the third somewhat discursive, notice here must be rather dangerously brief.

R. Pascal, in *On the Origins of the Liturgical Drama of the Middle Ages* (*M.L.R.*, July), concentrates on the Visitation (Easter) plays. He believes that the common view of liturgical drama as springing from 'embellishments' of the canonical office and inspired by the desire to fortify the faith of the believer (a *post hoc* justification) still leaves unexplained why the drama should have begun and developed as it did.

Writing from the Germanic point of view, Pascal re-examines

Stumpfl's thesis that the root of liturgical drama is to be found in tribal rite and custom; this is the view that, for the origins of drama, the ecstatic ritual act was more important, more generative, than belief. If this is so, our notion of the priestly role in the dramatic elaborations of the trope is too modern—too far from the tribal root. We are not to think of the priests as consciously 'acting' while the people passively watch—all participate. Pascal is inclined to believe that under the liturgical mime there may lurk the ground-form (as in Greek tragedy) of an initiation-rite, a ritual coping with the theme of death and rebirth.

Mary H. Marshall, in her article *The Dramatic Tradition established by the Liturgical Plays* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.), is not concerned with ultimate ground-forms but with the need to re-define the specifically dramatic traditions which can legitimately be traced back to the liturgical play. The survey ranges over Christmas and Easter plays in Latin, French, German, and English, and seeks to establish criteria of evidence by which to test or demonstrate the linkage of later plays with liturgical origins—such as direct quotation or translation, or preservation of modifications of scripture material made in liturgical plays, &c.

Neither of these articles aims at radical criticism of the accepted evolution of medieval drama. Indeed, the chief basic attack of recent years (by O. Cargill in his *Drama and Liturgy*, 1930) is dismissed by Miss Marshall as 'insubstantial'. They are reminders of how much of the early processes of dramatic generation and growth take place beyond the light of history.

A concern with problems of origin, heritage, and nomenclature provides, also, the 'essential unity' of a paper, *The Miracle Play: Notes and Queries*, by George B. Coffman, included in *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig*.[5] The 'note' on origin revises the author's earlier 'more evolutionary' thesis in the light of Karl Young's researches. It has always been a weakness in 'evolutionary' views of a literary kind that they tend to make it too self-contained, self-moved. As Coffman now

[5] In *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig*, ed. by Baldwin Maxwell, W. D. Briggs, F. R. Johnson, E. N. S. Thompson. Stanford Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. viii + 339. These 'Studies' are also published in *P.Q.*, July 1941.

says, 'authors do not function in a vacuum'. In any hypothesis as to the connexion between the miracle play and the original hagiological material we must allow for the 'intrusion of outside humanistic [presumably, human, literary, and dramatic] influences'.

In considering 'heritage', Coffman reaffirms the faith of a believer in Continuity. For thirty years, he reminds us, he has been defending the thesis that 'the heritage of the medieval (the bizarre, spectacular, romantic) passed as dramatised narrative' into Tudor spectacle and drama.

The expression 'miracle play' is used here with strict reference to medieval drama deriving from Saints' Lives. When he comes to 'nomenclature', Coffman makes a plea which should receive general support—that our critical terminology should honour and not blur the medieval distinctions.

Though Anna J. Mill in *Noah's Wife Again* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) deals with a specific problem in the English Miracle Plays, she, too, approaches her explanation by a wide survey of comparative material in literature, legend, and art. Her object is to show that the shrewishness or obstinacy of the Wife is by no means limited to English tradition and is not a dramatist's invention. Mohammedan legends, Russian and German versions, illustrations in MSS. (notably in Junius XI and Queen Mary's Psalter), show a reluctant or argumentative Wife, in association with a devil-motive, which is, curiously perhaps, not used by English dramatists. The links between these apocryphal legends and English drama are particularly close in the Newcastle fragment. It is a point of some interest and a further justification of the search for parallels, that the obstinate Wife runs counter to the orthodox Christian handling, which treated Noah's Wife as a type of meekness and a symbol of Mary.

In the volume of *Renaissance Studies* mentioned above, Mendal G. Frampton considers *The York Play of 'Christ led up to Calvary'* as a possible member of the group of plays which have been held to show 'the stylistic qualities of the great York realist'. If this dramatist can be shown to have revised the *Christ led up to Calvary* (xxxiv) and the *Crucifixion* (xxxv), 'we may regard him as the Passion Playwright of York'. The article discusses

the evidence for extensive re-writing subsequent to Burton's list of 1415 and therefore within the period when 'the realist' was at work. An important part of the evidence is comparison with the 'identical' Towneley play, which is held to reflect the earlier or Burton version. Frampton is cautious in his conclusions; he does not assert revision by the York realist, but he does consider that York xxxiv shares in the 'great upsurge of play-writing at York between c. 1415 and c. 1420'. Is it captious to raise the question whether, in many recent writings on the later developments in the English mystery cycles, words like 'great', 'Master', even 'realist', are not being, on a wide and just literary view, a little easily or loosely applied?

Edward M. Clark in *M.L.N.* (May) contributes a textual note on *A Restored Reading in the Towneley Purification Play*. With the help of a photostat he claims to have read a rubric heretofore found 'illegible' in the MS. (see *Towneley Plays*, ed. by George England, p. 185). He has been able therefore to identify it with the *incipit* of the first Antiphon of Lauds for the Feast of the Purification.

There is not much to record this year in the purely linguistic field. C. T. Onions in *Med. Aev.* (Oct.) discusses *Middle English 'wrabbe', 'wrobbe'* as it occurs in combination with *wreye* in such a context as the MS. reading of *Havelok*, l. 39—*wreieres and wrobberes*. The meaning is 'inform(er)'; the word seems to be West Norse in origin and is cognate with Icel. and Norw. *rabba* (to babble, talk nonsense). Its older etymology remains obscure. *Wreieres and wrobberes*, therefore, becomes another example of the popular repetitive alliterative formula.

The *Middle English Dictionary*'s contemporary pre-occupation with L has evoked Harold Whitehall's *Interim Etymologies* (*P.Q.*, Jan.) dealing with a number of problems offered by Middle English words beginning with L. He stresses the need, felt at every turn in wrestling with Middle English vocabulary, for more comprehensive lexicographical work in Old French and medieval Latin. Some of the words in this article are out-of-the-way forms and ghost-words; others, such as *left* (*hand*), are well-worried problems where, in spite of long-established use and recurrent discussion, light on etymology is still to seek.

H. C. Wyld in *Some Aspects of Style and Idiom in Fifteenth-Century English* (*Essays and Studies*, Vol. XXVI) has sought to facilitate a readier and juster appreciation of fifteenth-century style by calling attention to its more particularly Middle English (as distinct from early modern) elements. Under Vocabulary he gives examples (from a group of selected texts) of words already in the fifteenth century becoming obsolete (e.g. Malory's *undern*), of words still in use to-day but semantically modified (e.g. Pecock's *wilful*) and of words whose stems are still current but differently compounded (e.g. *radyous* for 'radiant'). Under the heading 'Various Features of Style', he illustrates such features as the synonym habit and word-order. Finally, for good measure, he adds an appendix on Various Constructions—double negatives, substitutes for our group possessive, and various idiomatic usages. The essay is designed to interest and instruct the reader who likes to understand and appreciate the language-medium of his texts, but who has undergone no advanced philological discipline.

As a transition to bibliography, some interesting points and reminders about the medieval book-world in H. J. Chaytor's *The Medieval Reader and Textual Criticism* (*John Rylands Bull.*, Oct.–Nov.) may be mentioned here. Chaytor recalls that whispered reading or reading aloud to oneself was the prevailing habit in classical and early Christian times. To ancient and patristic testimony he adds further evidence of the same habit from medieval sources—the continual adjurations to *hearers* in Old French, Middle English, and medieval Latin, and the arrangements for keeping readers apart in medieval libraries. He rightly reminds us of the need to keep constantly in mind in approaching earlier literature this aural dependence, and stresses its relevance to problems of textual emendation.

C. F. Bühler has been particularly indefatigable this year in notes on bibliographical problems, which sometimes open interesting windows on late medieval bookmen and the conditions of their work. In *Sir John Paston's 'Grete Booke'—a Fifteenth-century Best-seller* (*M.L.N.*, May) he refers first of all to the bill presented by William Ebesham for books he had copied out for Sir John Paston. One such book was the 'Grete Booke'—a

collection of items of particular interest to the knightly class—the Coronation, War, Acts of Arms, &c. Since 1819 this 'Grete Booke' has been identified with a MS. in the Lansdowne Library, except by Gairdner, who pointed out that the Lansdowne MS. showed no signs of having been made to special order; it is merely a typical *Sammelbund* of frequently transcribed treatises. Bühler calls attention to a similar MS. miscellany in the Pierpont Morgan Library. Such MSS. he describes as early instances of a sort of mass-production.

In *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.) Bühler has a brief *Note on Stanza 24 of Lydgate's 'The Churl and the Bird'*. In this stanza, as printed by McCracken (E.E.T.S., *Minor Poems of Lydgate*), the order of the lines seems to be wrong—it breaks the rhyme-royal scheme. He prints the version in a Caxton copy in the Pierpont Morgan Library, where the lines are arranged to make the correct rhyme-pattern with no detriment to the sense. Bühler deals with the same poem in the *Library* (Dec.–Mar.) with the object of deciding the priority of the two surviving exemplars of Caxton's two editions. Only one perfect copy of each edition is extant—C (Cambridge) and M (Pierpont Morgan). Blades and subsequent bibliographers gave priority to C; Bühler indites his article to support (on the evidence of *variae lectiones*) the claims of M. Another Caxton publication—this time of Earl Rivers' *Dictes of the Philosophers*—has inspired a similar argument. Bühler has long been dissatisfied with the traditional order of the two extant editions. The discovery of a variant setting for one sheet of one extant copy initiates a brief but complicated bibliographical discussion, the upshot of which is to reverse the traditional order. This article (*The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*) makes the second half of a double Note in the number of the *Library* referred to above.

This chapter may be wound up with brief mention of two or three articles on lighter topics. H. J. R. Murray (the historian of Chess) has written in *Med. Aev.* (June) on *The Medieval Game of Tables*, describing the varieties of the game and tracing its influence on vocabulary in the English, Romance, and German vernaculars and in medieval Latin. A glossary is appended.

Clair C. Olson's *The Minstrels at the Court of Edward III* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) sheds some light on the status and degree of

complication of Court music in the fourteenth century. Eighteen names of musicians have come down, of which some illustrate the occupational surname (e.g. the delightfully springlike Lambekyn Taborer); more, however, show no professional connexion and illustrate the trend away from occupational names. If, indeed, as is here indicated, Edward's musicians accompanied the army because 'music' was still used to frighten the enemy, the generous treatment of his instrumentalists by a warrior-king cannot be interpreted as disinterested patronage of the arts.

Lastly, the still unwearied C. F. Bühler in *Astrological Prognostications in MS. 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library* (*M.L.N.*, May) prints an amusing example of the medieval 'thunder-book' of the zodiacal type, which takes us back to the ominous world of our forefathers: 'whenne it thundreth in *Tauro* . . . thynges in valeys shullen fayle . . . in *Cancero*, boterfleus shull distroye fruytus . . . in *Aquario* the wynd shall engendur the cou3 . . . in *Sagittario* . . . kynges shullen 3evenne batayllus.'

VI

THE RENAISSANCE

By Frederick S. Boas

The publications of 1941 which call for notice in this chapter include an unusually large proportion concerned with general aspects of the Renaissance period as compared with books or articles dealing with individual writers.

For several years the Committee on Renaissance Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies has had for one of its objectives a survey of the scholarship in this field. Louis B. Wright in *M.L.Q.* (Sept.) has in connexion with this written a short *Introduction to a Survey of Renaissance Studies*. He defines the movement as beginning in the fifteenth century, gathering momentum in the sixteenth, and continuing during the first half of the seventeenth. 'During these years of violent upheaval, the world was reshaped. If the changes were less sudden and complete than may be suggested by the implied metaphor of the word Renaissance, the conditions of life and thought in western Europe differed so radically by the mid-seventeenth century from those that had prevailed in the mid-fifteenth that every country seemed transformed if not indeed reborn.' The aim of the projected survey is a fresh interpretation in the light of the accumulation of facts unearthed by the diligence of recent generations of scholars. Wright proceeds to state that the 'basic principles' of this new synthesis are to be a fuller recognition of the inter-relationship of the various cultural phenomena, and an approach from the point of view of the period rather than from that of the present age. He develops this thesis and gives a number of illustrations of it. Thus legal and scientific works should be considered in connexion with the literary, historical, and social aspects of the Renaissance period.

Louis B. Wright also gave the introductory address at *The Renaissance Conference at the Huntington Library* held on 19–21 August, 1940, the proceedings of which are reported in *H.L.Q.* (Jan.). He announced that the project of a biographical dictionary of Elizabethan writers is being taken in hand. Among the subjects which later speakers urged as important for the fuller study of the period were (1) Renaissance religious litera-

ture, (2) the nature and growth of ideas, (3) the Latin writings of the time, (4) translations from other languages, 1475–1640, (5) Elizabethan scepticism, (6) the history of science in England, 1476–1660, (7) geographical discovery and travel-narratives, (8) the history of prices during the period, (9) architectural developments, (10) the medical history. A number of the speakers were already engaged in work on one or other of these subjects, for which it was emphasized that the Huntington Library, which is principally rich in the Renaissance field, provided special facilities.

Before noticing books or articles concerned with aspects of the Renaissance mention may be made of *The Fall of Icarus* by J. W. Ashton, contributed to *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig*. This paper reminds us that in opposition to the main intellectual current of the time 'there were voices raised to decry this consuming ambition of man for knowledge', and pointing out 'the practical dangers of too wide and free a spread of learning'. Ashton quotes from a *Discourse* by John Standish (1554) which claimed that countless evils had arisen from the desire of all men to read the Bible in English. He refers also to the translation of Agrippa's work on the *Vanity and Uncertainty of Arts and Sciences* (1569), and to Dr. John Dee's preface to Euclid's *Elements* (1570), in which he asked, 'ought any honest student, and Modest Christian Philosopher be counted and called a conjurer?' He discusses how far the idea is illustrated in the dramatization of the careers of Dr. Faustus, Friar Bacon, and Prospero.

A relevant monograph from overseas, whose arrival in this country has been delayed, may here find a necessarily belated notice. *The Renaissance and English Humanism*[1] by Douglas Bush includes four lectures delivered at the University of Toronto on the Alexander Lectureship foundation. Bush does not draw the limits of the period, in its earlier stage, as precisely as Wright. He does not recognize any abrupt break with the Middle Ages in 1453 or at any other fixed date. While not denying the importance of the individualist or rebellious side

[1] *The Renaissance and English Humanism*, by Douglas Bush. Univ. of Toronto Press. 1939 (reprinted 1941). pp. 139. $1.50.

of the Renaissance, he emphasizes 'the continued strength of medieval attitudes and ways of thought, in union with a richer and fuller appreciation of the classics than medieval men ordinarily possessed'. Hence for him classical humanism, a union of Christian values with the legacy of Greece and Rome, is its central aspect.

In his second lecture Bush traces the development of Christian humanism on the Continent from Petrarch onwards, and illustrates in particular the influence of Plato and Cicero. The third lecture deals with English humanism in particular and stresses its practical aims.

'Erasmus and More and their followers did not investigate the coinage or the grammar of the ancients, they sought to make the rational wisdom of antiquity supplement the teaching of Christ. *The Praise of Folly* and *Utopia*, *The Governour* and *The Scholemaster* remain living books. All the English humanists, like the majority of continental ones, regarded classical learning as a means, not an end, and their energies were given to education. They wished to produce citizens and statesmen, not scholars.'

Bush proceeds to discuss in some detail the disruptive forces which gathered strength in the seventeenth century and which broke up Christian humanism in its Renaissance aspect. To Milton, who is its last great exponent, he devoted the last lecture, which is noticed below (see chap. x, p. 163). The book, written in attractive style, is highly stimulating and suggestive, though some of its generalizations, in short space over so wide a field, will naturally give occasion for debate or dissent.

The article by Arnold Williams on *The Two Matters: Classical and Christian in the Renaissance* (*S. in Ph.*, April) might well serve as a pendant to Bush's volume. Though Williams does not use the term Christian humanism, his aim is to show how the two elements in it were inseparably combined.

'Theology and the classics are the two matters of Renaissance thought. Actually, it is something of an academic abstraction to call them *two* matters, for in practice they were not separated in the minds of many of the chief thinkers of the period. Theology was more literary and literature more theological than the modern mind can conveniently imagine. Theologians offered

Homer as authority on predestination, and literary critics brought David into court on questions of poetic practice.'

Both Catholic and Protestant divines quote from the classics. Pererius, in his Commentary on *Genesis*, has citations from nine Greek and Latin writers. Calvin alludes to Homer and acknowledges 'the admirable light of truth' in profane authors. Peter Martyr, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford under Edward IV, has passages that are almost pure literary criticism. On the other hand, humanists like Lyly, Sidney, and Lodge introduce theological matter and scriptural references into their works.

In the same number of *S. in Ph.* a very different aspect of the literature of the period is discussed by Mary C. Randolph in *The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: its Possible Relationships and Implications.* She emphasizes the fondness of the sixteenth- and earlier seventeenth-century satirists for the use of medical imagery. To them 'satire is a scourge, a whip, a surgeon's scalpel, a cauterizing iron, a strong cathartic—all in one; its mission is to flay, to cut, to burn, to blister, and to purge'. In the later seventeenth century, under the influence of rationalist philosophies, the mind is generally substituted for the body, and 'the vices and follies earlier characterized as ulcers, tetters, and pustules become "ruling passions" which temporarily divert Man's Reason', and which must be subdued by the Will under the direction of Ridicule.

The predilection of the Renaissance satirists for medical phraseology was, as Miss Randolph points out, fostered by various circumstances of the time. The plague was still rife in England. Discharged soldiers with festering wounds received in the wars frequented the highways and the taverns. The study of anatomy was making its way in spite of ecclesiastical opposition.

The imagery employed took different forms. In some cases satire was conceived as a lethal instrument, of which the most familiar example is the supposed fatal effect of rhyming in Ireland not only on rats but on men. Usually, however, the sanative effect was stressed in the metaphorical terms, though the processes of cure were purgative and painful. Miss Randolph illustrates the various types of these by well-chosen quotations. Her paper enters into a field that has not been much explored.

A supplementary sidelight on the subject is contributed by Miss Randolph in her article on *Thomas Drant's Definition of Satire, 1566* (*N. and Q.*, June 14). In thirty lines prefixed by Drant to *A Medicinable Moral*, as he calls his translation of the two Books of Horace's *Satires*, she finds 'the earliest separate, formal definition of satire in English literature'. After quoting a Latin definition of it, 'carmen acerbum instrumentum mordax', Drant begins,

> A Satyre is a tarte and carpyng kynd of verse,
> An instrument to pynche the prankes of men.

He proceeds to suggest alternative etymologies (1) from Arabic, where satire means a glaive or sword, (2) from the woodland 'uncivile god', satyr, (3) from the 'writhled waspyshe' planet, Saturn, (4) from the Latin word *satur*, because 'th' authors must be full of fostred arte'.

Ignoring the Greeks, Drant singles out Lucilius as 'parent of this nypping ryme', followed by Horace, Persius, and Juvenal, and he sums up in the couplet,

> The Satyrist loves Truthe, none more than he,
> An utter foe to fraude, in eache degree.

Felix Gilbert's article on *Political Thought of the Renaissance and the Reformation* (*H.L.Q.*, July) comes only indirectly within the scope of *Y.W.* It is 'a report on recent scholarship' dealing with its theme, and indicates that therein 'the hard-and-fast demarcation' previously drawn between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance seems hardly to exist. Gilbert shows how this shifting of perspective has modified the views hitherto taken of the political attitude and influence of Machiavelli, Luther, and Calvin. There are only brief references to More and Erasmus. The general conclusion is that 'there is no open conflict between the natural-law tradition of the Middle Ages and the modern idea of the sovereign state' and that 'the roots of modern political ideas must be sought far back in the Middle Ages'.

In contrast with the various studies noticed above R. Weiss's *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*[2] deals almost

[2] *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*, by R. Weiss. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. xxiii + 190. 12*s.* 6*d.*

entirely with the classical aspect of the Renaissance. Published as No. IV of the Medium Ævum Monographs, it treats of the beginnings of the movement from 1418 when the Florentine scholar Poggio arrived in England till 1485, when with the accession of Henry VII humanism in this country took on some new characteristics. Weiss ascribes the origin of English humanism to the influence of Italian visitors, partly on Papal official business, partly in quest of MSS. in monastic libraries. They included Poggio, Simone da Teramo, Caesarini, and in particular Piero del Monte, Papal Collector in England, 1435–40. Among those who came into contact with del Monte was John Whethamstede, Abbot of St. Albans, 1420–65. He was remarkable for his wide acquaintance with Latin literature, classical and neo-classical, and his extensive library. He was himself the author of numerous Latin works of a cyclopaedic character which, as they show 'a love for pigeon-holing knowledge, and an estimation of classics chiefly as warehouses of information', Weiss designates as medieval rather than humanist.

More fruitful was del Monte's influence on Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, whose enlightened patronage of learning first firmly established the humanist movement in England. It was through del Monte that Humphrey engaged the Italian schoolmaster and dramatist, Frulovisi, as his secretary in 1436. While in his employ he wrote the two first Latin comedies composed in this country, and the Latin life of King Henry V, 'combining national feeling with foreign culture', which furnished a pattern for later historiographers. He was succeeded as secretary by the Veronese Beccaria, who translated for Humphrey various Greek works into Latin. The Duke was also in relation with leading humanists in Italy. He was so attracted by Leonardo Bruni's new Latin version of Aristotle's *Ethics* that he incited him to translate the *Politics*. His fame as a patron led the Milanese Decembrio to offer him the dedication of his Latin version of Plato's *Republic*. He also collected books for the Duke's library of which, especially his donations to Oxford, Weiss gives interesting details.

Another leading bibliophile and patron was William Grey, of Balliol, afterwards Chancellor of the University and Bishop of Ely. An account is given of his visits to Italian towns, including Ferrara, where he attended lectures by Guarino, and of his

purchase of classical MSS., including a number of Latin translations of Greek authors. He is an ecclesiastical counterpart to Duke Humphrey. Sharing their bibliophile tastes and munificence is Robert Flemmyng, of University College, Oxford, afterwards Dean of Lincoln. Like Grey he visited the Continent, and at Ferrara listened to Guarino, by whom he was initiated into the study of Greek. As the first Englishman to learn that language and to own Greek texts he marks an important stage in the development of humanism in this country. His example was followed and bettered by John Free of Balliol, who was sent by Grey in 1456 to Ferrara where, under Guarino, he acquired a thorough knowledge of Greek, and also learnt to write in elegant Ciceronian Latin. Weiss ranks him 'above every fifteenth-century English humanist before the time of Grocin and Linacre'. He had another patron in John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, who on his visits to Italy from 1458 onwards acquired an extensive library including Latin translations from the Greek and recently discovered Latin authors, among them Lucretius. 'His general attitude towards humane learning suggests his acceptance of the Italian notion of humanism as the only begetter of glory.'

Limits of space allow only reference to the later chapters in which Weiss traces the growth of the neo-classical movement at Canterbury, Oxford, and Cambridge, which lagged behind the sister university. A contrast, perhaps rather overstressed, between the scholastic and utilitarian aims of fifteenth-century humanism in England and its cultural aspects in Italy, closes a volume which is to be welcomed both for its learning and its lucid style.

A pendant to the above book is supplied by Weiss in an article on *Leonardo Bruni Aretino and Early English Humanism* (*M.L.R.*, Oct.). Weiss gives further illustrations of the popularity of Bruni's writings with Whethamstede, Humphrey of Gloucester, and later scholars and patrons. His translations from the Greek progressively displaced the medieval ones, and his Latin text of the *Ethics* was printed at Oxford in 1479. It was as a translator and a moralist that he was chiefly appreciated rather than as a humanist in the wider sense.

A little-known figure who flourished just before the earliest of

the humanists discussed by Weiss has light thrown upon him by V. H. Galbraith in an article on *John Seward and his Circle* in the Warburg Institute *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, vol. i, no. 1. Seward was born in 1364 and died in 1435. Though there is a tradition connecting his earlier life with Norwich, the documentary evidence presents him as a schoolmaster in Cornhill, London. A MS. of his writings used by Bale is in Merton College, Oxford, but a considerably more extensive MS., which has been neglected by his biographers, is preserved in the Edinburgh University library, and has furnished Galbraith with materials for his study. He gives reasons for the belief that this Edinburgh MS. was an 'author's copy', and that it was put together by Seward as a collected edition of separate works written over a period of years. It includes ten tracts, of which the majority are concerned with metrical questions. The most interesting group consists of the *Ludicra*, the *Invectives*, and the *Epigrams*. 'These taken together form a unique, if fragmentary, record of a literary circle in London at this date, the very existence of which has hardly been suspected. The composition of Latin verses and the rules of prosody are the common interest of the members of this circle.' In the *Ludicra* and *Invectives* Seward contends in Latin verse against another schoolmaster, William Relyk, of the Cardinal's Hat in Lombard Street, and a William Sheffeld, on metrical problems. Relyk and Sheffeld are also subjects of some of the epigrams, while others are inscribed to various friends in this prosodic circle. Each of the tracts has a dedication to some notable person, including three bishops, the Duke of York, and King Henry V. These help to date the contents of the volume, which appear to have been chiefly written in the later years of Henry IV's reign and collected between 1418 and 1422. Galbraith's article opens avenues for further research into Seward's circle.

A much debated subject is discussed anew by Robert P. Adams in *The Philosophic Unity of More's 'Utopia'* (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.). His aim is 'to discover a unified interpretation of *Utopia* in terms of the philosophic ideas underlying the satire as a whole'. He maintains that no such interpretation can be derived from a comparison of *Utopia* with its usually accepted sources, Plato's *Republic*, St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, and Amerigo Vespucci's

travel-narratives. Similarities are counterbalanced by incongruities. Adams takes as his starting-point the view set forth by R. W. Chambers that More was showing how he thought that 'enlightened and righteous heathen . . . guided solely by the light of reason' ought to behave. But Adams insists that by 'reason' must be understood *uncorrupted* 'reason'. By the light of this they venerate one divine universal 'nature' or God. Further, they believe in the immortality of the soul and in rewards and penalties in the after-life. Anyone who denies these principles is going against right reason and forfeits his citizenship.

The divine nature has implanted in man the faculty of reason by which he can comprehend 'the marvellous and gorgeous frame of the world', and study the secrets of the physical universe. Uncorrupted reason also urges him to live joyfully and help all others in a harmonious family and communal social life. Hence while Utopians make felicity their object they distinguish sharply between the pleasure that is 'good and honest' and its counterfeit which is socially injurious. 'The criteria', as Adams sums up, 'in accepting or rejecting pleasures . . . are derived from the Utopian conception of the purposes of the divine "nature" or God, as intending men to create for themselves a good life in which "reason" would be the guide to social co-operation in the interests, not of the individual alone, but most of all of the common welfare.' The article, of which the closely knit argument needs to be studied in detail, deserves the attention of all readers of the *Utopia*.

More's *History of the Passion* was written during his imprisonment in the Tower from 17 April 1534 to 6 July 1535. It was begun in English, and this part was printed in the 1557 edition of More's *English Works*. The Latin continuation, which is shorter, but which deals with the central theme from the leaving of the upper room and the journey to Gethsemane, was included in More's *Latin Works* printed at Louvain in 1566. An English version of the Latin part of the *History of the Passion* followed the English portion in the 1557 volume, and the publisher, William Rastell, stated that it was from the pen of Mistress Mary Basset, daughter of William and Margaret Roper, and granddaughter of Sir Thomas. Mary Basset's translation has

now for the first time been separately printed and edited by Monsignor Hallett.[3]

In his introduction Hallett gives an account of James Basset, who was Mary Roper's second husband and who was in the personal service of Queen Mary, and also of the careers of their two sons. She died on 20 March 1572. 'Well experted in the Latin and Greek tongues', she was fully qualified for her task of translation. Rastell was justified in claiming that her version 'goeth so near Sir Thomas More's own English phrase that the gentlewoman . . . is no nearer to him in kindred virtue and literature, than in his English tongue, so that it might seem to have been by his own pen indited first, and not at all translated'. Hallett, however, points out that her range of vocabulary is less wide than More's and that she does not carry alliteration so far.

Mary Basset's version is always accurate and her style is smooth and idiomatic. Hallett, in his footnotes, has explained obsolete words and has added references for More's scriptural and classical allusions. This reprint, with modernized spelling and punctuation, of a work so significant for an insight into More's deepest spiritual nature will be welcomed.

More's controversy with Tyndale concerning his version of the Scriptures in the vernacular gives special interest to F. E. Hutchinson's account of *Sir Thomas More as a Translator of the Bible* (*R.E.S.*, Jan.). More's English renderings of passages from the Latin Vulgate are to be found incidentally in his devotional writings, *The Four Last Things* (*c.* 1522) and the three treatises concerning Comfort against tribulation, the Sacrament, and the Passion, composed during his imprisonment in the Tower. Hutchinson points out that the versions in *The Four Last Things* 'are the more interesting because they precede Tyndale's New Testament by three years and probably owe nothing to any previous translator'. Most of the quotations are from the Psalms, and illustrations are given of the likeness between More's renderings and Coverdale's in the Great Bible.

The three treatises written in the Tower (including apparently

[3] *St. Thomas More's History of the Passion, Translated from the Latin by his granddaughter, Mistress Mary Bassett*, ed. by Mgr. P. E. Hallett. Burns, Oates, and Washbourne. pp. xxii + 134. 6*s*.

Mary Basset's part of the *History of the Passion*) contain more than 200 scriptural citations, especially from the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. A number of More's translations are compared with those in the Rheims New Testament (1582), where Sir Thomas usually shows to the greater advantage in his instinct for rhythm and idiomatic expression. While he has 'a reverent affection for the Church Latin', he is not afraid to use homely phrases. The wicked in Job 'at a poppe down they descende into hell'; the rich young man in the Gospel 'clawed his hed & went his way heuily'. Hutchinson finally points out that in these treatises his differences from Tyndale tend to disappear. In connexion with the institution of the Sacrament he uses *cup* and *chalice* indifferently, and he renders *apostolus* both by *apostle* and by Tyndale's word, *messenger*.

In *Sir Thomas Elyot against Poetry* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) George B. Pace discusses the apparent contradiction between Elyot's defence of poets in *The Governour* (1531) and his attack on them through the mouth of Candidus in the dialogue, *The Defence of Good Women* (1540). Pace holds that it is not necessary to infer that Elyot was 'a sort of Tudor Jekyll-and-Hyde, a combination of Sidney and Gosson', but that in both books he was using conventional arguments, and that his attitude towards poets in the 1540 work was due to the fact that they had said bad things about women.

A reprint of *The Defence of Good Women* from the only known copy of the first edition in the Huntington Library, dedicated to Anne of Cleves, has been edited by E. J. Howard,[4] with an introduction, textual notes, and a glossary.

Samuel K. Workman compares *Versions by Skelton, Caxton, and Berners of a Prologue by Diodorus Siculus* (*M.L.N.*, April). Caxton, for three-fourths of his prologue to the *Polycronicon* (1482), and Lord Berners, for two-thirds of his prologue to Froissart's *Chronicles* (1523), translated from the general *Preface* to the *Library of History*, by Diodorus Siculus, without acknowledgement. Skelton made an avowed translation of the first five books of *The Library*, including the complete *Preface*, *c.* 1490.

[4] *The Defence of Good Women, By Sir Thomas Elyot*, ed. by Edwin Johnston Howard. Oxford, Ohio: Anchor Press. $1.25.

Skelton and Berners, and less certainly Caxton, used Poggio's Latin version. Workman gives some details illustrating the respective fidelity of the three translators to the original and the varying quality of their English style. Berners was the plainest, Caxton was more redundant, Skelton the most expansive and aureate.

Herbert G. Wright discusses *The Elizabethan Translation of the Questioni d'Amore in the 'Filocolo'* (*M.L.R.*, July). In 1567 *A pleasant disport of diuers noble personages* was published and was reprinted in 1571 and 1587 with the more significant title of *Thirtene most plesant and delectable questions*. It was an English translation of an episode in Boccaccio's *Filocolo* in which thirteen members of a festive company propound to Fiammetta problems bearing on love. A French version of the episode had first appeared in 1541, and a Spanish in 1546. Wright shows that the English translator was not dependent on either of these, but that his claim in the dedication that he had turned it 'out of his natiue attyre into this our English habite' is justified. He owed, however, something to Adrien Sevin's translation of the whole *Filocolo* (1542) in his marginal notes and the headings of the questions. Wright illustrates the merits of this English version, in spite of occasional misunderstanding of the Italian original by 'H. G.', to whom the prologue assigns the translation. A note in the Bodleian copy of the 1571 edition names him as Henry Grantham, and Wright gives reasons for accepting this identification.

Henry J. Webb calls attention to *The Elizabethan Translation* of Vegetius' *De Re Militari* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.). In 1572 John Sadler brought out *The Foure bookes of Flauius Vegetius Renatus*. Webb gives reasons for the publication of a fourth-century military manual at this date. Vegetius dealt with evils in the armies of his own day akin to those in the armies in the Tudor period. He condemned muster-masters who were careless in their choice of recruits; the neglect of discipline and the cultivation of the arts of war; the promotion of officers through interest and favour. These were rampant, as State papers and plays bear witness, in Elizabethan England, and Vegetius therefore had a message for Sadler's contemporaries.

Beatrice Hamilton Thompson gives an account of *Anthony Munday's Journey to Rome, 1578–9* (*D.U.J.*, Dec.). The record of this is contained in his work, *The English Romayne Life, Discovering the lives of the Englishmen at Rome*, first published in 1582. Munday, aged twenty-four, in or about the spring of 1578 set out with a companion, Thomas Nowell, for Rome. His object, as stated by Miss Thompson, was to make 'literary capital in the Protestant interest out of what he could see of English Catholic life on the continent'. They arrived in Rome on 1 February 1579, and were given quarters in the Hospice which was in process of transformation into the English College of Rome. It was in a disturbed state because the Rector, Morrice Clenock, was unduly favouring the small body of his compatriots among the students. The English majority were eager for Jesuit rule, which eventually was established, and Munday openly allied himself with them. Alike from vanity and from his journalistic instinct for working up a good story, Munday exaggerated the part played by him, and his narrative is not entirely trustworthy in other ways. But his vivid description of the details of the daily life of the students is of permanent interest. The place of *The English Romayne Life* in the pamphleteering controversy concerning the trial and execution of Edmund Campion belongs to history rather than letters.

There have been few books or articles dealing with individual poets before 1579, but a comprehensive study of the more formal aspects of sixteenth-century poetry from Skelton, Hawes, and Barclay to Sidney, Warner, and Spenser has been made by Veré L. Rubel in *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance*.[5] The aim of the work is to 'enable the modern reader to discern the structural timber which underlies sixteenth-century poetry', and also to 'make evident the continuity ... of an ideal throughout the period of a special diction for poetry'. In this connexion Rubel stresses, perhaps to an even undue degree, the influence of Chaucer, to whom successive versifiers could appeal as a model for the use either of foreign words or of 'English undefiled'. With the early Tudor Court poets, Skelton (in his

[5] *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance from Skelton through Spenser*, by Veré L. Rubel. Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America and O.U.P. pp. xiv + 312. $3.00 or 18*s*. 6*d*.

dignified works) and Hawes, the aureate, outlandish diction predominated. With Wyatt and Surrey, in spite of the Romance or Classical influences to which their verse was subject, there was a reaction to native idioms, often of an archaic type, as is more apparent in the MSS. of their works than in Tottel's edited versions. In this respect Sackville and Gascoigne followed in the steps of Wyatt and Surrey, and the trend towards archaism was promoted by the growth of the pastoral, whether translated, as in Turbervile's version of Mantuan's *Eclogues*, or original, in *The Shepheardes Calender*, with E. K.'s glosses. Sidney, on the other hand, in his sonnets was at the head of the poets whose diction was drawn from more contemporary sources. All these generalizations are illustrated by Rubel with a wealth of verbal material which will make his book at least as valuable to linguistic as to literary students.

But the most distinctive sections of Rubel's work are those devoted to the analysis of the conscious use of rhetoric in verse which became more prominent as the century progressed, and which he designates ' an essential and increasing element of the poetic art of the English Renaissance '. Here he draws for his nomenclature from *The Arte of English Poesie* (1585), of which, though the claim has been queried, he accepts George Puttenham as the author. In this handbook for poetic aspirants the largest part was concerned with the enumeration and explanation of the ornamental figures or flowers of rhetoric. Thus there are introduced to the novice *inter alia* such singular tropes as *merismus*, or the ' distributer '—presenting an idea in piecemeal; *anadiplosis*, or the ' redouble '—repeating the last word of a verse at the beginning of the next; *erotema*, or the ' questioner '—use of rhetorical questions. A complete glossary of these figures with illustrations is appended to Rubel's volume. In his view the efforts at classical versifying in English by Harvey, Fraunce, Stanyhurst, and others intensified the use of figures, because only through this means did that type of poetry become at all acceptable. But they are deliberately used by all sixteenth-century poets till the practice culminates in the ' highly complex combinations, variations, and mutations of rhetorical figures ' found in the work of Sidney and Spenser.

One may, like the present writer, have a high opinion of the

value and interest of Sir Thomas Wyatt's poetry, and yet be surprised that it has been thought necessary to compile a *Concordance* to it.[6] This task has been undertaken by Miss Eva C. Hangen, and has been carried out with an industry resulting in a volume of over 500 pages. She has based her work on Amy Foxwell's 1914 edition, and may fairly claim that it will be helpful for the study of mid-sixteenth-century native English. But when she states that it will be of worth for Shakespeare study there seems little justification for this except in the most general way.

William Peery calls attention to *A Metrical Puzzle in 'The Mirror for Magistrates'* (*M.L.N.*, April). The tragedy of Thomas of Gloucester in the 1578 edition of the *Mirror* introduces twenty variants into the two hundred and three lines. All but one of these are, in effect, substitutions of a five-stress line, usually iambic, for an earlier four-stress line. Peery quotes these lines in their previous and later forms. The puzzle is why the 1578 editor rewrote nineteen lines as iambic and allowed the great majority to stand. Moreover, the tragedy of Thomas of Gloucester is the only one of the nineteen in the 1578 edition of the *Mirror* which exhibits this peculiarity.

The few publications concerning the drama which fall within the scope of this chapter deal almost exclusively with the early Tudor group of playwrights of whom John Heywood is the head. After a brief account of the source and main plot of the play, James K. Lowers draws up a suggestive but somewhat too imposing list of *The High Comedy Elements in Medwall's 'Fulgens and Lucres'* (*E.L.H.*, June). (1) The author has chosen a new source for materials, (2) his play is peopled with men and women above the citizen level of society, (3) the language spoken by these characters is artificial and refined, (4) the appeal is intellectual, as is evidenced by the promise of disputation upon a favourable topic, (5) men and a woman associate upon a footing of equality.

K. W. Cameron has published three related studies in early

[6] *A Concordance to the Complete Poetical Works of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, compiled by Eva Catherine Hangen. Univ. of Chicago Press and C.U.P. pp. xviii + 527. 30*s*.

Tudor drama.[7] The chief of these is a reprint from the copy in the British Museum of *Gentleness and Nobility*, with minor emendations, modern punctuation, and line numbers, together with a detailed introduction discussing its background and sources, authorship and date. With regard to the background of the debate between a knight, a merchant, and a ploughman, he quotes at length from contemporary literature with the aim of showing that the interlude contains little to distinguish it from what he terms 'the Vulgate doctrine of the Renaissance' concerning true gentility. Hence he concludes that the dialogue does not help to identify its sources, though somewhat inconsistently he finds an 'indisputable' one in Henry Parker's devotional work *Dives and Pauper* (1493), from which he prints a number of doubtfully close parallels.

In his discussion of the authorship of *Gentleness and Nobility*, Cameron's object is to disprove the attribution of the piece to John Rastell, which has been generally accepted since the publication of A. W. Reed's *Early Tudor Drama* (1926). He points out that the epilogue spoken by the philosopher contains several of the parallels with Rastell's writings which support Reed's case, and that this is separated from the body of the interlude, and is written not in couplets but in rhyme-royal stanzas. He claims that Heywood wrote the dialogue which he dates before 1523, and that Rastell edited it for his printing-press and added the epilogue. For further details students may be referred to Cameron's introduction, but his arguments, though amply documented, involve various doubtful assumptions and are unconvincing to the present writer.

The other two studies do not contain texts of the interludes but deal with sources and interpretation. In the scholarly discussion of the sources of *Wether* Cameron, while pointing to others that are possible, lays stress upon what he takes to be the special influence of Lucian's *Dialogues*, as translated by More and Erasmus. In addition to *Icaromenippus*, from which Jupiter, Merry-Report, and the contradictory petitions about

[7] I. *Authorship and Sources of 'Gentleness and Nobility'. Together with a Text of the Play based on the Black-Letter Original.* pp. 132. $2.75. II. *John Heywood's 'Play of the Wether'.* pp. 65. $1.75. III. *The Background of John Heywood's 'Witty and Witless'.* pp. 46. $1.25. By Kenneth Walter Cameron. Thistle Press, Raleigh, N. Carolina.

the weather could be derived, Cameron suggests that further hints may have been suggested by *Bis Accusatus*. But once more he fails to carry conviction when he proceeds to argue that *Wether* has a propagandist motive: 'Heywood's didacticism has a purpose beside that of amusement. *Wether* is first of all a compliment to Henry VIII [represented by Jupiter], a strong argument for Henry's complete control of the government, and a plea for social solidarity under his direction on the part of the entire nation'.

In dealing with the sources of *Witty and Witless* Cameron would add the *Colloquia* of Erasmus to the *Encomium Moriae*, and he would also suggest the influence of More's *The Four Last Things*. He makes a valuable point in drawing attention to St. Augustine's *Expositio in Evangelium secundum Johannem* as the source of various ideas and allusions in the dialogue. It is to this that Heywood refers in l. 571 as 'thexposytyon of saynt Awstyne'. Owing to the theological colour of *Witty and Witless*, Cameron suggests that it may be 'an interlude written for a court still admiring Henry VIII's *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum adversus M. Lutherum*, published in 1621'. A useful bibliography of 'scholarship on John Heywood' is appended to this study.

An account of the library of Mr. E. N. Adler (*T.L.S.*, Nov. 1) disclosed that it contains a MS. of *Sapientia Salomonis* performed before Queen Elizabeth and Princess Cecilia of Sweden on 17 January 1565/6. Lawrence E. Tanner (*ibid.*, Nov. 22) pointed out that the play was acted by the Queen's scholars of Westminster School in the college hall, and not, as stated in the article, by the St. Paul's School boys.

VII

SHAKESPEARE

By Tucker Brooke

The War appears to have checked the issue and distribution in 1941 of the *Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles*,[1] of which the first three came out in 1939, and two others in 1940. Prefaced with bibliographical notes by W. W. Greg and well executed in collotype, they fill a primary need of Shakespeare scholars everywhere. Promotion of the series will speed the happy day when no one need be further annoyed or misled by Griggs and Pretorius.

The Shakespeare Documents[2] by B. Roland Lewis is a more ambitious, and more expensive, work, aiming to present all the biographical data in authentic form and with authoritative commentary. It contains 276 documents from twenty-five repositories on both sides of the Atlantic, arranged in chronological order and transcribed from the originals or from full-size photographs. The more important are reproduced in facsimile, and to those in legal Latin translations are appended. It is a handsome and useful reference work, but one that needs to be handled with discretion. Lewis is more at home in the technical field than in some of his critical dicta.

Certainly one of the best Shakespeare books of the year, and quite the best on its subject, is *Shakespeare's Audience*[3] by Alfred Harbage. The author's purpose is 'to interpret justly the evidence on the size, social composition, behaviour, and the aesthetic and intellectual capacity of Shakespeare's audience'. In two hundred pages he marshals a great deal of evidence, much of which has been hitherto overlooked or misunderstood. His conclusion, which seems to be soundly derived, is that the Elizabethan audiences at playhouses were larger (*c.* 2,500 a day

[1] *Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles*. Sidgwick & Jackson, for Shakespeare Association. 10*s.* 6*d.* each.

[2] *The Shakespeare Documents: Facsimiles, Transliterations, Translations and Commentary*, by B. Roland Lewis. 2 vol. Stanford Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xxxvi + 631. $35.00 and £12. 12*s.*

[3] *Shakespeare's Audience*, by Alfred Harbage. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. ix + 201. 15*s.* 6*d.*

in 1595), more representative, better behaved, and in general more intelligent than modern historians have allowed.

Of lasting value also is Frederic W. Ness's analytical study of Shakespeare's employment of rhyme,[4] which, in addition to full statistical tables in the appendices, has a capital critical chapter on the function of rhyme in the various plays, and another on 'Shakespeare's couplet rhetoric'.

The nearest thing to a formal biography of the poet that the year produced is *Mr. Shakespeare of the Globe*[5] by Frayne Williams, which is not a novel but often reads like one. Williams, who has had theatrical experience and writes in an attractive style, has gathered into twenty-one chapters the ideas and information that he has accumulated over many years. It is broad rather than deep and will not much please specialists; but it is certainly entertaining, and is full of details (right or wrong) for which the general reader will be grateful.

Further data of interest to biographers include a note on *The Spelling of Shakespeare's Name* by St. V. Troubridge (*N. and Q.*, May 5); an inquiry by Alfred Hart, *Did Shakespeare produce his own Plays?* (*M.L.R.*, April), which finds that the evidence favours the negative; and a lecture by the late David Brown, *What Shakspere learned at School* (*Bucknell Univ. Studies*, Jan.), an admirable summary by a specialist on education in Shakespeare's youth.

An old dispute is revived with fresh learning in Leslie Hotson's *Not of an Age* (*Sewanee Rev.*, Apr.–June), which was the address delivered at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington on 23 April 1940. Shakespeare *was* of his age, says Hotson, and can be best interpreted by those who realize that the Elizabethans were, as a class, superior in intellect to ourselves. He illustrates the value of a scrutiny of the circumstances of Elizabethan life for the understanding of Shakespeare by revealing some new details about the family of Christopher Mountjoy, the tire-maker, with whom, as we know, the poet at one time lodged.

[4] *The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays*, by Frederic W. Ness. Yale Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. 168. $3.00.

[5] *Mr. Shakespeare of the Globe*, by Frayne Williams. New York: Dutton. pp. 396.

On the other side, in a very notable essay, *Shakespeare as a Critic* (*P.Q.*, July), Hereward T. Price finds good reason for asserting that 'Shakespeare was the least Elizabethan of the Elizabethans'. His purposeful criticism of his contemporaries is evident, Price says, in (1) attacks on their excess in language, (2) parody of their insincerities of style, (3) scorn of the unworthy noblemen and the unstable mob. Particularly, he goes on, 'from *Henry VI* to *The Tempest*', and especially in *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Measure for Measure*, Shakespeare criticizes the Elizabethans' delight in revenge plays; while in another group (*Love's Labour's Lost*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Taming of the Shrew*, and *As You Like It*) he devotes himself to exploding literary conventions as Mr. Shaw has done in our time. Shakespeare's critical purpose in these plays justifies passages (e.g. the conclusion of the *Two Gentlemen*) which modern critics censure.

In somewhat similar vein, Benjamin T. Spencer, reviewing four recent American books on the poet, is impelled in *This Elizabethan Shakespeare* (*Sewanee Rev.*, Oct.–Dec.) to protest against the 'neo-Elizabethans', who seem to believe in an absolute and immutable Elizabethan Shakespeare, mainly revealed in terms of politics and social conditions. The author soundly reminds us that there is no such thing as *the* Elizabethan mind, and that the historical approach to Shakespeare may be at least as deceptive as the aesthetic.

Warren Taylor, in *The Uses of Shakespeare* (*College English*, Feb.), takes a sober middle ground and attempts to show how Shakespeare was both of his age and for all time. He reviews the attitudes of the various centuries toward Shakespeare's poetry and attacks the problem, how far the modern realistic critics, who return Shakespeare to his age, have advanced or hindered appreciation.

M. Ellwood Smith, in *The Lunatic, the Lover, and the Poet* (*S.A.B.*, April), has an excellent statement of the clarity of vision with which Shakespeare viewed his characters 'and apparently himself'. He analyses the manner in which the effect of truth is secured, e.g. in Falstaff, Shylock, and Malvolio, asserting that Shakespeare is the least sentimental of poets (though here he must mean the mature, not the youthful, Shakespeare), and that

he suffers from the sentimentality of critics. His characters, Smith concedes, are not in the round, 'but they seem so in comparison with slab-sided figures of less conscientious workers'.

Leaving questions of Shakespeare's personality for other general, but necessarily heterogeneous, matters, one may add briefly to the notice above of the Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy by F. P. Wilson.[6] Speakers on this distinguished lectureship, who now number nearly thirty, must be rather pressed to find subjects at once important enough for the occasion and simple enough for an hour's discourse. Wilson's theme is soundly chosen and soundly handled. He takes his title from the Preface to Johnson's Dictionary and develops it mainly through Shakespeare's use of word-quibbles and proverbs.

McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered (*R.E.S.*, April) by W. W. Greg, opening with a fine tribute to the *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*, attempts to correct defects of over-simplification in McKerrow's rules of editorial procedure. The points are made with Greg's customary clarity and judgement. What they mainly illustrate is that the textual welter in which Shakespeare's plays survive is so complicated that few general principles can be safely set up for treating them; when the clear evidence disappears, the twentieth-century editor must, like his predecessors, fall back on taste and common sense.

Bibliography, in its strictest and most modern application, is also illustrated by Giles E. Dawson in *A Bibliographical Problem in the First Folio of Shakespeare* (*Library*, June). Examination of seventy-four copies of the First Folio in the Folger Library enables Dawson to explain what really happened in the printing of the 'gg' gathering, which was originally intended to contain the last five pages of *Romeo and Juliet* and the first seven of *Troilus and Cressida*. Two pairs of conjugate leaves (gg1–gg2, gg3–gg4) were printed, gg3 being later destroyed.

Paul V. Kreider's ambitious book, *Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays*,[7] is not fully described by its title. In the first part Kreider deals with the disguise motive in the plots and with

[6] See Chapter II, p. 29.

[7] *Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays*, by Paul V. Kreider. Princeton Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. lx + 306.

the treatment of villains and villainy. Part II, 'The Aesthetics of Repetition', concerns various recurring poetic images (sleep in *Macbeth*, blindness in *King Lear*, &c.). The subjects are handled fully and in pleasant style, but with no great acumen. An appendix provides a long catalogue of 'Recurrent Situations in Shakespeare's Plays'.

Another sound and well laboured work is Sister Mary Bonaventure Mroz's *Divine Vengeance*,[8] a learned discussion of the concept and of its implications in human life (the human agent, abuse of legal justice, the blood-feud, revenge for tyranny, &c.). The definitely Shakespearian portion is limited to one chapter (pp. 117–37) and to a valuable appendix giving a full analysis of revenge themes in Shakespeare. A useful bibliography is added.

Virgil K. Whittaker, in *Shakespeare's Use of his Sources* (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) makes a plea for more study of source relationships. The thesis is set up that in general Shakespeare 'simply dramatized the material before him, following it as closely as its nature would permit'. Hence it is said to follow that 'any deviation from theme is likely to be deliberate and to reflect Shakespeare's methods as a dramatic artist or his aims in writing the particular play'. Well chosen instances are given to illustrate deviations from the source for the sake of (1) condensing the story, (2) raising the stage effectiveness of his actors, (3) complicating the plot, and (4) enriching or purifying the psychology.

Carroll Camden, in the same volume, writes on *The Mind's Construction in the Face*, giving a lucid account of the pseudo-sciences of physiognomy and metaposcopy in their relation to Shakespeare and his contemporaries. The couplet quoted by Camden on p. 407 from Thomas Walkington as by 'an unnamed English poet' is *Love's Labour's Lost*, I. i. 26 f., slightly varied.

In *A Prose Period in Shakespeare's Career?* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.), L. M. Buell makes a compact and telling contribution to a subject that has been touched several times in the past years (see *Y.W.* xxi. 105). Buell points out that eleven of the twelve plays

[8] *Divine Vengeance: A study in the philosophical backgrounds of the revenge motif as it appears in Shakespeare's chronicle history plays*, by Sister Mary Bonaventure Mroz. Washington: Catholic Univ. of America Press. pp. 166.

usually ascribed to the period, 1596–1604, show each over a thousand lines of prose. The twelfth play in this group, *Julius Caesar*, has only 176 prose lines, and 'perhaps its dating ought to be re-scrutinized'. The only play outside the group mentioned that has over a thousand lines of prose is *Love's Labour's Lost*, which in its extant form, in Buell's view, should be given a relatively late date, 'certainly not much earlier than 1596'.

This group of interesting if divergent papers on Shakespeare in general may be concluded by a piece in lighter vein, *The Shakspere-Bacon-Oxford-Whoozis Mixup* by Mark Holstein (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), an amusing and informative review of the movement to replace Shakespeare as author of the plays.

Turning now to articles on particular plays, and beginning with the comedies, one may mention first a little flurry of notes on *All's Well that Ends Well* in *N. and Q.*, growing out of H. W. Crundell's *The Episode of the King's Ring* (Jan. 11). Observing that Thomas Davies, on the occasion of Garrick's revival of the play, connected v. iii. 81–7 with the story of the ring given to Essex by Queen Elizabeth, Crundell pointed out other resemblances between the King of France in *All's Well* and the English queen, which would suggest a date of acting subsequent to Elizabeth's death. Further correspondence in *N. and Q.* (Aug. 23, 30) by St. V. Troubridge, A. R. Bayley, and William Jaggard produced a list of *Actresses as Helena in 'All's Well'*.

In *Shakespeare's Orlando Innamorato* (*Mod. Lang. Quarterly*, June), J. W. Draper psychoanalyses the hero of *As You Like It* in Elizabethan terms as 'fortune's minion', sanguine in humour and astrologically under the dominance of Jupiter. Hence, he thinks, Orlando prospers throughout the play by little effort of his own. Charles the wrestler and the lioness might not have shared this view.

In *Putting Jaques into 'As You Like It'* (*M.L.R.*, July), John Wilcox remarks that, in spite of the great care Shakespeare has taken to give him importance, Jaques is curiously irrelevant to the general action of the play: he could be removed without affecting its structure. Wilcox suggests that the part of Jaques was inserted for Burbage after the latter became too old, or too fat, to play Orlando.

Following up earlier suggestions for the source of Jaques'

most famous speech (see *Y.W.* xx. 82, xxi. 109), D. C. Allen, in *Jaques' Seven Ages and Pedro Mexia* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) cites a very apposite passage in chapter 40 of Mexia's *Silva de varia lecion* (1572), quoted by Allen in the French translation, 'which would be best known to Englishmen'. However, there were two issues of an English translation (1571, 1576), 'done out of French by T. Fortescue'. The chapter corresponding to the French which Allen quotes is in ed. 1576, the seventeenth of Part I, and is found on folios 37–40 with the heading: 'Of the distinction of the age of man according to the opinion of moste Astrologians'.

In *The Textual Evidence for 'The School of Night'* (*M.L.N.*, March), Ernest A. Strathmann judiciously and with much detail opposes the newly popular interpretation of 'the Schoole of night' in *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV. iii. 255 as an allusion to the Ralegh-Chapman-Marlowe group.

In *Authority, Truth, and Justice in 'Measure for Measure'* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.), M. C. Bradbrook deals with this play as a galaxy of ethical problems. In it, she says, Shakespeare 'adapts a technique as analytic as that of Donne to something resembling the late medieval Morality. It might be named The Contention between Justice and Mercy, or False Authority unmasked by Truth and Humility.' She goes on to tell what moral qualities the different characters 'stand for', and to say some good words for the Duke. Further evidence of interest at Cambridge in the morality of the play appears in a pair of controversial articles published in *Scrutiny*, Jan. 1942: *The Ambiguity of 'Measure for Measure'* by L. C. Knights and *The Greatness of 'Measure for Measure'* by F. R. Leavis.

In Defence of Bassanio by J. M. Ariail (*S.A.B.*, Jan.) essays a correction of Mrs. Pettigrew's *Bassanio, the Elizabethan Lover* (*P.Q.*, July 1937), reverting to the favourable estimate of that hero in the late C. R. Baskervill's article, *Bassanio as an Ideal Lover* in the *Manly Anniversary Studies* of 1923. Answering a note on 'A Daniel come to judgment' (*Merchant of Venice*, IV. i. 223) in *S.A.B.* for October 1940, John E. Hannigan inquired, *Which Daniel?* (*S.A.B.*, Jan.). Further discussion between him and Robert Withington followed (*S.A.B.*, April, July, Oct.).

The Relation between 'The Merry Wives of Windsor' and Jonson's

'*Every Man in his Humour*' by Sallie Sewall (*S.A.B.*, July) is a careful comparison of the two plays, based on the author's unpublished M.A. thesis (Univ. North Carolina). She argues that Shakespeare followed Jonson's method in *The Merry Wives*, and that Jonson's revision of *E.M.I.H.* was carried out under Shakespearian influence.

C. T. Prouty, whose recent work on Gascoigne is well known, turns his light in a Shakespearian direction in *George Whetstone, Peter Beverly, and the Sources of 'Much Ado about Nothing'* (*S. in Ph.*, April). Since eleven instances are known of the stratagem by which Claudio is deceived, we should be cautious, he warns, in maintaining Shakespeare's indebtedness to any one source. One of these, Peter Beverly's *Historie of Ariodanto and Ieneura*, exists in a unique copy in the Huntington Library, and will be reprinted by Prouty, along with the similar narrative in Whetstone's *Rock of Regard*.

Henry David Gray, in '*The Taming of a Shrew*' (*P.Q.*, July) modifies P. Alexander's argument that *A Shrew* is a 'bad quarto' version of *The Shrew*. As Gray sees it, *The Shrew* was an early work, *A Shrew* was derived from it, and when the original play was revised Shakespeare rewrote those portions which evidently are not early. The pirate actor, who, on Gray's assumption, produced the *A Shrew* text, had played the parts of the Tailor and of one of Petruchio's servants. He had also acted the part of Usumcasane in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*. The revising poet in *A Shrew*, who introduced the Marlowe echoes, cannot (as Sykes supposed) be identified with either Birde or Samuel Rowley.

On the other hand, G. C. Taylor, in the same number of *P.Q.* in *Two Notes on Shakespeare*, shows that the version of Katharine's long speech at the end of *A Shrew* (replaced by a quite different speech in *The Shrew*) is directly borrowed from Du Bartas' *First Week*, Sylvester's translation of which was entered on the S.R. in 1591. This connexion, Taylor thinks, strengthens the case made by Sykes for Samuel Rowley as author of *A Shrew*.

Taylor's other 'Note' in this contribution deals with the contrasted speeches of Gloster and Edmund in *King Lear*, I. ii, which are to be read in the light of Elizabethan writings for and against prognostication.

J. W. Draper, under the title of *Et in Illyria Feste* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), relates the dramatic character of Feste in *Twelfth Night* to the history of the court fool.

Little appeared during the year 1941 on the history plays, if one omits the handsome 'New Variorum' edition of *2 Henry IV* by M. A. Shaaber,[9] which is dated 1940, but escaped mention in last year's *Y.W.*

Mattie Swayne discusses *Shakespeare's King Henry IV as a Pacifist* (*College English*, Nov.); and Samuel A. Small, in *Hotspur and Falstaff* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), lays rather heavy hands upon Hotspur, who is said to represent, like Falstaff, 'a decayed form of chivalry', and is further accused of using Falstaffian language, of being illiterate, and of possessing a humour that is 'external', whereas Falstaff's is 'internal': all charges which the present writer is inclined to resent.

Disillusion is also the tone of D. A. Traversi's long essay on the character of the king in *Henry the Fifth* (*Scrutiny*, March), where the play is interpreted as a discouraging example of the politician's progress, and its superficial optimism is seen to be underlaid by anticipations of the cynical philosophy of *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus and Cressida*.

A hazardously early date of composition for the quarto text of *Henry V* is ventured by T. W. Baldwin in *Perseus Purloins Pegasus* (*P.Q.*, July). He points out that three passages (*1 Henry IV*, IV. i. 104–10; *Henry V*, III. vii. 13–25; and *Troilus and Cressida*, I. iii. 38–42) indicate that Shakespeare thought of Perseus, rather than Bellerophon, as the rider of Pegasus. The error had a long and complicated history, but reached the dramatist by way of illustrated editions of the *Metamorphoses*. Comparison of the three passages leads Baldwin to deduce that the quarto text of *Henry V*, in which the Perseus-Pegasus allusion is represented by something else, antedated *1 Henry IV*.

Shakespeare's view of spiritual tragedy is the subject of a thoughtful monograph by Kenneth O. Myrick, *The Theme of Damnation in Shakespearean Tragedy* (*S. in Ph.*, April), which deals with the handling of guilt, repentance, and damnation in

[9] *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth*, ed. by Matthias A. Shaaber. Philadelphia and London: Lippincott, 1940. pp. xx + 715. 42*s*.

Hamlet, *Macbeth*, and *Othello*. The poet's belief in general human fallibility needs to be stressed, we are told, more than modern critics stress it. The mood he stirs is essentially religious and Christian. Moderns, following the romantic dogma that man is 'naturally good', fail to see Shakespeare's tragic figures as the Elizabethans did.

A yet more philosophically ambitious essay by Madeleine Doran, *That Undiscovered Country* (*P.Q.*, July), examines the three levels on which the marvellous may be accepted, and arrives at the conclusion that our response to the supernatural element in such plays as *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* is probably of a poorer quality than that of the Elizabethans, and certainly different.

The freshest *Hamlet* criticism of the year is found in J. E. Hankins's volume.[10] The eight essays in this soundly conceived book all deal with *Hamlet*, and they contain much valuable matter; for example, on the political, the demonological and religious atmosphere of the play. The initial monograph on Hamlet's character is a detailed commentary, tending to free the hero from the charge of weakness by stressing (among other considerations) the difficulty in his attitude to his mother and the embarrassment in which he was placed by contemporary conceptions of honour. Hankins brings some new ideas and a thorough scholarship to his task.

George I. Duthie's elaborate study of the 1603 *Hamlet*[11] has the merits and faults of 'detective' bibliography, save in the hands of its ripest practitioners. The chief merits are audacity and imagination; the chief defect is that no reader will ever know just how the conclusions have been reached. The bad quarto of 1603 is explained as a memorial reconstruction 'made for provincial performance by an actor who had taken the part of Marcellus and perhaps another part or parts in the full play, and who was able, when his memory failed, to write blank verse of his own'. The analysis is laborious and follows the well-

[10] *The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays*, by John Erskine Hankins. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. ix + 264. $3.00.

[11] *The 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet': A Critical Study*, by George Ian Duthie. Foreword by W. W. Greg. C.U.P. pp. xi + 279. 10*s*.

known lines of Dover Wilson, P. Alexander, and H. D. Gray, though seldom agreeing with them in detail.

Once More the Mouse-Trap by A. Hart (*R.E.S.*, Jan.; see *Y.W.* xxi. 107) argues further against recent explanations that the dumb-show in *Hamlet* was not seen by King Claudius. The dumb-show, Hart thinks, would not have been acted on the rear stage, and in any case must have been visible to the king.

N. B. Allen, in *A Note on Wilson's 'Hamlet'* (*S.A.B.*, July), devotes a dozen pages to alleged inconsistencies in Dover Wilson's selection of readings from Q2 and F. In the same number, S. A. Tannenbaum, under title of *'Hamlet' and the Gonzago Murders*, interprets the mouse-trap scene in the light of two historical murders in the Gonzaga family.

John C. McCloskey, in *Hamlet's Quest of Certainty* (*College English*, Feb.), begs for a more plain and trustful reading of the text. In accomplishing his revenge we are to believe that Hamlet acts as quickly as circumstances allow, and his rational purposefulness is contrasted with 'the petulant impatience of the Ghost'. Nowhere in all Shakespeare's plays is motive more unequivocally explained than in the sixth soliloquy ('Now might I do it pat'), which the critics misunderstand in refusing to believe 'that Hamlet really means what his words plainly say'.

John Corbin, returning to an old interest in *Ophelia against her Critics* (*Saturday Rev. of Lit.*, Aug. 16), argues that dispraise of Ophelia is primarily based on her lie to Hamlet concerning Polonius ('At home, my lord'). Corbin will have it that this is no lie, because Polonius resides on the royal premises, and finds the fault to arise from the too definite scene-locations of modern editions. To which S. A. Tannenbaum effectively, if impolitely, replies in *Ophelia lies* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.).

A number of minor points concerning *Hamlet* have been ventilated. M. M. Shudofsky, in *Sarah Bernhardt on Hamlet* (*College English*, Dec.) cites Mme Bernhardt's letter to a London newspaper of 16 June 1899, defending her current interpretation of Hamlet, as one of the earliest statements of the modern anti-romantic view of his character.

Howard Schultz, in *An Early 'Hamlet' Allusion* (*S.A.B.*, Jan.), notes that lines 53–7 of I. v are quoted in a prose context in

and James Hutton devotes a long and learned study to *Analogues of Shakespeare's Sonnets 153–154: Contributions to the History of a Theme* (*Mod. Phil.*, May). He offers much information on this final pair of sonnets, recognized as unconnected with the others, but, as he says, 'the immediate source still eludes us'.

Rufus Putney, in *'Venus and Adonis': Amour with Humor* (*P.Q.*, Oct.) cleverly rescues *Venus and Adonis* from the neglect into which it has fallen by showing that Shakespeare was here following an established humorous tradition in treatment of such themes. He regards the poem as 'a sparkling and sophisticated comedy'.

In *Shakespeare's 'Rape of Lucrece'* (*P.Q.*, July), E. P. Kuhl argues that the story of the later poem was a popular political *exemplum*, employed by Shakespeare to denounce governmental absolutism. Gabriel Harvey's remark that *Lucrece* appeals to the 'wiser sort' is thus justified. 'While the plot had a vital connexion', Kuhl says, 'to England's national life', that is, till the end of the Stuart dynasty, 'the poem was valued for its meaning'.

The main suggestions in Henry David Gray's *Shakespeare, Southampton, and Avisa* (*Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*) are that the prose section of *Willobie his Avisa* relating to 'H.W.' and 'W.S.' was added by Willobie after the appearance of Shakespeare's *Lucrece* (May 1594); that Willobie was also the 'Peter Colse' who wrote *Penelope's Complaint* (1596); and that the George Inn celebrated in the earlier poem was somewhere near London. What this adds up to is not quite clear, but Acheson's theory of Matthew Roydon's authorship of *Willobie his Avisa* is justly enough condemned.

This survey may conclude with studies of a more or less ancillary character, several of which have much interest. The most fundamental, certainly, is R. A. Law's *Shakespeare in the Garden of Eden* (*Univ. Texas Studies in English*), which gives a very careful analysis of Shakespeare's references to the doctrines of the Fall of Man and Original Sin.

R. C. Bald, in *Shakespeare on the Stage in Restoration Dublin* (*P.M.L.A.*, June), changes the venue to a considerable distance. He gives a very informing report on nine Shakespearian play

texts, now in possession of the Folger Library, being part of a larger collection which once belonged to Halliwell-Phillipps. Bald shows that the texts are from a copy of the Third Shakespeare Folio, and were prepared for use on the Dublin stage about 1680. The manuscript memoranda they contain throw light on the actors concerned and on the scenery employed, as well as on the textual cuts and alterations. (See also p. 171.)

Scottish Shakspere, by R. Morrell Schmitz (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), deals with the Reverend Hugh Blair's text of Shakespeare, first printed at Edinburgh, 1753, and long popular as the 'Scots Editor's' edition. It was the sixth modern edition and was mainly dependent on Warburton's.

Cyril Bryner, in *Shakespeare among the Slavs* (*E.L.H.*, June), shows in historical summary how Shakespeare, and particularly *Hamlet*, have been re-estimated 'to suit the prejudices and needs of the nine different points of view of the nine Slavic peoples'. The common characteristic of all these is to regard Shakespeare primarily as a moralist and political thinker.

Shakespeare's relations with certain persons of quality form the subject of three articles. In *Horace Walpole on Shakespeare* (*S. in Ph.*, July), Clyde S. Kilby praises Walpole's critical power as shown in the comments on Shakespeare in his unpublished notebooks in the Folger Library. The Shakespearian material here discussed has been privately printed in W. S. Lewis's *Walpole on Several Characters of Shakespeare* (100 copies).

How Much of Shakspere did Voltaire Know? (*S.A.B.*, April), is discussed by Percy G. Adams; while Robert P. Falk, in *Emerson and Shakespeare* (*P.M.L.A.*, June), finds that the depreciatory attitude to Shakespeare in *Representative Men* is not thoroughly characteristic, and must be understood in connexion with the dualistic dilemma which Emerson's criticism faced and 'his inbred distrust of the playhouse'.

Shakespeare's Dukes, by Curtis B. Watson (*S.A.B.*, Jan.), is a rather slight review of the structural functions of the dukes in eight comedies and two tragedies. Ernest H. Cox, in *Another Medieval Convention in Shakspere* (*S.A.B.*, Oct.), deals with variations of the *ubi sunt* formula; and James A. S. McPeek, on *Shakspere's Chameleons and Salamanders* in the same number,

points out borrowings by Shakespeare from a poem in Turberville's *Epitaphes*, &c. (1567).

Alfred Harbage raises a dangerous and intriguing question in *A Contemporary Attack upon Shakespeare?* (*S.A.B.*, Jan.). He points out that *The Tragical History of Guy Earl of Warwick*, preserved in an edition of 1661, is shown by its style to be Elizabethan. Harbage ascribes it to *c.* 1593 and to the authorship of Dekker. He suggests that the rustic clown Sparrow (who says he was born in Stratford-on-Avon) is intended as a lampoon on Shakespeare.

VIII

ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

By FREDERICK S. BOAS

THE year 1941, though war conditions have affected the output of books and articles coming within the scope of this chapter, has been distinguished by two publications of major importance in the Elizabethan dramatic field, G. E. Bentley's *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, and Percy and Evelyn Simpson's edition of *Jonson's Masques and Entertainments*.

Bentley's two volumes[1] are designed to carry on the history of the English stage from 1616, the terminal date of Sir Edmund Chambers's survey, to the closing of the theatres in 1642. They are an instalment of his full scheme. They deal with the dramatic companies and the actors of the period; further volumes will treat of the plays and playwrights and of the theatres and conditions of play production. Volume I traces the history of eleven companies, appending in each case lists of the actors, of plays performed at Court, of provincial notices, and of the company's repertory. All this is supported by a mass of documentary evidence from very varied sources, which is set forth, with the aid of the typographical facilities of the Clarendon Press, in remarkably lucid detail.

The King's Company stands in the forefront of Bentley's picture as the only theatrical organization that had a continuous existence throughout the period, due largely to the fact that its playhouses, the Globe and the Blackfriars, were held in joint tenancy by the actors themselves. They profited too by royal benevolence when King Charles helped them over difficulties, when theatres were closed owing to the plague, by gratuities or special command performances. A list of the latter from 30 September 1630 to 21 February 1630/1 is printed for the first time by Bentley from a document now in the Folger Shakespeare library. Four at Hampton Court are followed by seventeen, according to the Lord Chamberlain's payments, at the Cockpit in Whitehall. At the head of the Cockpit pieces, together

[1] *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Dramatic Companies and Players*, by Gerald Eades Bentley. O.U.P. 2 vols. pp. xx + 342: 343–748. 42*s*.

with Fletcher's *Mad Lover*, stands an *Induction for the Howse*, dated 5 November. Bentley is evidently right in concluding that the renovated Cockpit was opened on this day in 1630, and not in 1632 or 1633, because Heywood's prologue was supposed to have been spoken about the same time as his prologue to the revived *Jew of Malta*. Further, to the present writer it seems probable, with a different interpretation of the terms of the warrant, that this *Induction* was Heywood's prologue and not 'some sort of house-warming piece'.

Very different are the associations with another list of fourteen plays licensed by Herbert to the Palsgrave's company between 27 July 1623 and 3 November 1624. They had suffered grievous blows by the death of their previous patron, Prince Henry, in 1612, and the burning of their theatre, the Fortune, on 9 December 1621, with all their playbooks. In what Bentley terms 'the desperate need to replenish their repertory' for their rebuilt house in 1623, they commissioned the fourteen plays, of which only one, *The Life of the Duchess of Suffolk*, by Thomas Drew, 'much reformed by Herbert, being full of dangerous matter', has survived. But the closure of theatres owing to the plague in 1625 and the death of Edward Alleyn in the following year gave these successors of the Admiral's men the death blow. Some prominent members of the cast, together with some of the Lady Elizabeth's men, became merged in a new company known as the King and Queen of Bohemia's, probably in the early months of 1626. One of the novel features of Bentley's stage-history is his emphasis on the existence of this company, which has not been hitherto recognized, and of which he gives documentary evidence. Others of the Lady Elizabeth's men and some of Queen Anne's men passed into the company of which Queen Henrietta became patron soon after her arrival in England in June 1625, and whose successful activities under the astute management of Christopher Beeston are discussed by Bentley in considerable detail.

It is impossible in brief space to do more than indicate his methods and some of his conclusions in Volume I on matters that have been debatable or obscure. Volume II is devoted to biographies of the players with some important appendices, including wills of theatrical interest and the closing of the theatres because of the plague, with relevant tables. It is, of

course, impossible for even the most industrious of scholars to glean everything in his chosen field. C. J. Sisson, in a review of Bentley's work (*M.L.R.*, Jan. 1942), has indicated some sources that are still far from exhausted. But the welcome so deservedly extended to these two volumes gives every promise that when Bentley's full scheme is completed it will become the standard authority on the subject with which it deals.

In *Richard Tarlton and the Earthquake of 1580* (*H.L.Q.*, April) Lily B. Campbell presents the famous Elizabethan clown in the role of a moralist. The Huntington Library possesses a unique copy of a small work occasioned by the earthquake of 6 April 1580 and published two days later. It was entitled *A warning for the wise* and bore on its title-page the name of Thomas Churchyard, who contributed three pieces in prose and one in verse. These were followed by parallel pieces with the signature of Richard Tarlton. The first is an exhortation to his fellow-men to take 'this fearful wonder' as a signal to repent of their sins; the second gives some details of the effects of the earthquake in London, though it is curious that not Tarlton but Churchyard, in the third of his prose pieces, relates how 'a number being at the Theatre and the Curtaine at Holywell, beholding the playes', especially those in the highest rooms, were so dismayed that some of them hazarded their lives or limbs by leaping to the ground. Tarlton's third piece is a prayer, which is followed by a moralizing poem in eleven six-lined stanzas.

In *Y.W.* xx. 92–3 the present writer noticed in some detail the important work by Gustav Fredén, which made a strong case for Friedrich Menius as the editor of the collection of *Engelische Comedien* anonymously published in 1620. In *T.L.S.* (April 26), with a few correcting notes on May 3, he contributed an unsigned article, *Elizabethan Plays in Germany*, drawing attention to some of the main points in Fredén's argument, which, owing to its publication in German in Stockholm during 1939, did not receive the attention that it deserved as opening a new phase in the discussion of its subject.

In an article on *Elizabethan Acting* (see *Y.W.* xx. 91) Alfred Harbage argued that it was formal as opposed to natural.

Support is given to this view by Waldo F. McNeir in *Gayton on Elizabethan Acting* (*P.M.L.A.*, June). In his *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixote* (1654) Edmund Gayton introduced many references to 'our late stage'. Among the actors whom he had seen were Joseph Taylor as Arbaces and Elliard Swanston as Bussy d'Ambois, and he says that they were 'shadows' compared with a university scholar in the part of a mock-emperor; 'his look, his voice, and all his garb [bearing] was alter'd'. McNeir finds here 'a suggestion that the technique was largely a matter of conventionalized deportment'. He also gathers from Gayton's account of the effects of their impersonations upon the players themselves that 'an exaggerated gesture and a heightened delivery' are implied. Above all, from Gayton's description of a dumb-show, he infers that Elizabethan acting was to a large degree formalized. Gayton's testimony is of real historical interest but, like Harbage in the earlier article, McNeir is inclined to press the evidence beyond what it will bear.

The first suggestion that some of the Shakespearian and other Elizabethan printed plays may have been 'assembled' from actors' parts has been ascribed to Malone in 1778. H. W. Crundell in *Actors' Parts and Elizabethan Play-Texts* (*N. and Q.*, May 17) has pointed out that Pope, in the preface to his edition of Shakespeare (1725), declared that the folio and quartos were printed in part from 'the prompter's book or piecemeal parts written out for the use of the actors'. The transposition of some of the scenes could happen only 'by their being taken from separate and piecemeal written parts'. Colman, in the preface to his edition of Beaumont and Fletcher in 1778, takes a similar view, due probably, in Crundell's opinion, to the influence of Pope.

Lawrence Babb discusses *The Physiological Conception of Love in the Elizabethan and Early Stuart Drama* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.). He contends that many passages in the drama of the period cannot be fully understood unless it is realized that emotion, as then viewed, is a physiological as well as a psychological phenomenon. 'A passion provokes muscular activity in the heart and movements of humors to or from the heart. It is accompanied, moreover, by intensification of two of the four primary physical qualities: heat, cold, moisture, and dryness. . . . Erotic love,

since it is a species of desire, is a hot and moist (a sanguine) passion.' Babb quotes in support of these dicta numerous passages from contemporary treatises, e.g. from Cogan's *Haven of Health* (1589), the statement that the sanguine complexion is 'most enclined to *Venus* by reason of abundance of bloud, hoat and moyst'. Even if a person is not naturally sanguine he may become amorous through diet or idleness, while on the other hand cures for erotic passion may be found in blood-letting, fasting, water-drinking, or hard labour and study.

Babb proceeds to give illustrations of this conception of love from dramatists ranging in time from Lyly to Middleton and Massinger. It is useful to be reminded that phraseology which we tend to regard as merely metaphorical, regarding 'blood', 'fire', 'liver', and so forth, had a more literal and scientific significance for the playwrights and their audience. But it is unsafe to draw, as Babb suggests, the further conclusion that 'erotic passion did not, in the time of Shakespeare and Jonson, have the romantic sanction which it has since acquired'. Side by side with the physiological conception of love there flourished the Platonic ideal of the spiritual unity of two souls.

In *The Caroline Audience* (*M.L.R.*, July) Clifford Leech examines in detail the influence of the theatrical public in Charles I's reign on the tone of the drama. He maintains that the audience in 1625–42 has to be differentiated both from the popular one of Shakespeare's time and the aristocratic one of the Restoration. 'It was a society that delighted in a new-won gentility, that played a little clumsily with its new toys. Masques and plays were for these people a way of escape from the unpleasantness of political circumstance and a means of cultivating the graces.' The reign constitutes a theatrical period because the new refinement of the Court affected the drama, and a new school of playwrights arose, including Massinger, Ford, Shirley, Brome, and Davenant.

Leech finds the chief evidence for the character of the Caroline audience in the prologues and epilogues in the play-books from which he quotes extensively. The authors often rebuke the fine gentlemen among the spectators for their arrogant censure of plays, and contrast them with the 'good easy judging souls' of an earlier day. What this sophisticated gentry asked

from the drama was a means of escape from the harsh political realities of the time in romantic spectacle and make-believe. It delighted too in personal satire and in a tempered bawdry which had 'neither Elizabethan orotundity nor Restoration sharpness'. But even when the dramatists sought to cater for these tastes they had to complain of the fickleness of the audience's praise or blame.

Leech has also contributed to *D.U.J.* (June) an article on *Catholic and Protestant Drama*, which is a comparison of the plays of the Elizabethans with those of their chief Spanish contemporaries, Lope de Vega, Calderón, and Tirso de Molina. Examples are given of the chief groups of Spanish dramas, the religious *autos*, the 'honour' plays, and the cloak-and-sword comedies, with translated quotations. The main conclusion is that while an Englishman was rarely content to represent life from a single viewpoint throughout a play, a Spaniard 'almost inevitably took up his orthodox position and sketched life as he saw it from the viewpoint thus imposed on him'.

H. W. Crundell in *The Authorship of 'The Spanish Tragedy' Additions* (*N. and Q.*, Jan. 4) seeks to give support to his view, first set forth in 1933 (see *Y. W.*, xiv. 209–10), which has not found much acceptance, that Dekker was responsible for these 'Additions'. He draws attention to a passage in Dekker's pamphlet, *Newes from Hell* (1606), renamed *A Knight's Coniuring* in the 1607 edition, where, in his opinion, 'the horrors of the plague year and a journey to the Inferno seemed to Dekker to require Hieronymo's manner of treatment.'

In an article in *T.L.S.*, May 31, noticed below (see chap. ix, p. 147), another query relating to Dekker was revived, whether he and not Lyly was the writer of the songs which were first printed in the 1632 'Six Court Comedies'. This produced a letter from M. Hope Dodds on *Songs in Lyly's Plays* (June 28). She pointed out that in one of the MS. plays, by William Percy, *Arabia Sitiens* (1601), in the library at Alnwick Castle, there is a song invoking Mahomet closely akin to a song addressed to Apollo in *Midas*. If Percy was imitating the Apollo song, this must have been written before 1601, which makes it more probable that it was from Lyly's own pen. Another letter arising out of the

T.L.S. article was from Harold Jenkins on *Chettle and Dekker* (Oct. 25). Jenkins pointed out that in his edition of Chettle (1934) he had claimed him as the more probable author of the songs in *Patient Grissell* than Dekker (see *Y.W.*, xv. 197).

In *Gil Polo, Desportes, and Lyly's 'Cupid and my Campaspe'*, (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) E. G. Mathews suggests that the source of the song may have been found, not in a sonnet in Desportes' *Diane*, but in one in Gil Polo's *La Diana enamorada*, either in the Spanish original or in Bartholomew Yong's English version, which he quotes in full.

In *Y.W.* xxi. 123 there was a notice of Paul H. Kocher's article, *Marlowe's Atheist Lecture*, in which he argued that the statements made by Richard Baines about Marlowe's alleged opinions, if slightly transposed, form a consecutive whole and might have been spoken in a single conversation. In a further article, *Backgrounds for Marlowe's Atheist Lecture* (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*, pp. 112–32), he amplifies the theme and places the 'lecture' in a setting of extracts from contemporary religious and irreligious treatises. He takes the clauses one by one and seeks to show that in a number of them ingenious use is made of scriptural texts. Herein Kocher finds evidence of the fidelity of the report. 'The inference is unmistakable that Baines is really transmitting the words of Marlowe, if not with absolute accuracy, then at least with substantial accuracy.' There is much that is suggestive in his article, even if one does not accept all his deductions or subscribe fully to his view of the Baines note that 'for revolutionary impact and scope it stands alone, an extraordinary document in the history of English free-thought'.

In *A Line in Gabriel Harvey* (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 18) T. W. Baldwin gives a novel interpretation of the reference in Harvey's *New Letter of Notable Contents*, dated 16 September 1593. When 'Powles' is bidden weep for the 'Tamberlaine', who has died of the plague, there has seemed to be a curiously mistaken allusion to Marlowe's death. But Baldwin points out that a clue is given by Harvey's two references to 'the second Shakerley of Powles', who was Thomas Nashe. The first Shakerley was a frequenter of Paul's, Peter Shakerley by name, and was a notorious swaggerer, who might be designated 'Tamberlaine'.

It was he apparently who had been carried off by the plague. On February 18 the present writer accepted Baldwin's identification as the most satisfactory that has been proposed.

Don Cameron Allen, in *Renaissance Remedies for Fortune: Marlowe and the Fortunati* (*S. in Ph.*, April), seeks to connect Tamburlaine, as portrayed by the dramatist, with the doctrine of the *fortunati*, as set forth by Giovanni Pontano in 1518–19. Among the numerous Renaissance writers who speculated on the part played by fortune in human affairs, Pontano is distinguished by his theory that certain men are born fortunate and are inevitably carried to success. 'They follow their appetites, their impulses, and their inclinations and grasp every occasion that is presented to them. . . . They violate all the dictates of reason and prudence, and yet they never fail.' When Egidio da Viterbo objected that this doctrine left no place for providence, Pontano answered that fortune was governed by the stars.

While Allen thinks it possible that Marlowe may have read Pontano's astrological treatises, he does not consider it necessary to assume that the dramatist had first-hand knowledge of his writings. The Italian's theories had become diffused into the atmosphere of the time and had influenced some of Marlowe's sources for the play, e.g. Perondinus and Fulgosius. Allen notes that fortune is mentioned no less than twenty-nine times in the two Parts of *Tamburlaine*, and that it is often brought into relation with the stars. Moreover, the hero is a typical representative of Pontano's *fortunati*. He is 'confident, impetuous, and impulsive. He is never prudent, never thoughtful, and seldom virtuous; in all that he does he follows his impulses in complete scorn of advice and admonition.' This conception, according to Allen, accounts for the structural defect of the absence of climaxes in the play. The lives of the *fortunati* compared with those of ordinary men were all climaxes.

A very different view of Marlowe's first hero is presented by Roy W. Battenhouse in *Tamburlaine, the 'Scourge of God'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June). In Renaissance literature the concept of the 'scourge of God' is employed in accounting for 'wars and tyrannies, which are interpreted as social punishments inflicted

under God's providence by wicked men whom God later destroys'. Illustrations are given from Calvin, Mornay, Du Bartas, and others whose writings Marlowe may well have known when he was a divinity student in Cambridge. It is under this aspect, in Battenhouse's view, that Marlowe represents Tamburlaine's career. He is a rod for the chastisement of Persians, Turks, and Babylonians. The destruction and slaughter which he perpetuates are 'a scandal permitted under God's providential justice'. With the overthrow of Babylon, the epitome of wickedness, his usefulness as a scourge is at an end, and he is stricken down by the God whom he has blasphemed. The article is suggestive, but to the present writer it seems very unlikely that Marlowe's presentation of Tamburlaine was governed by any such moralizing concept. And it is still more hazardous to make use of any inference from 'patterns of sin and tragedy' in his plays as a counterblast to 'the libels of Kyd and Baines'.

In *François Hotman and Marlowe's 'The Massacre at Paris'* (*P.M.L.A.*, June) P. H. Kocher has made an important contribution to the discussion of the Marlovian play which has usually received least comment. Since H. S. Bennett's edition of *The Massacre* in 1931 it has been increasingly recognized that the main source of its earlier half is to be found in Book X of *the three Partes of Commentaries . . . of the Ciuill Warres of France . . . with an Addition of the cruell Murther of the Admiral Chastillion and diuers other Nobles* (1574). Books I–IX of the *Commentaries*, and also XI–XII, constituting *The Fourth Part* (1576), are by Jean de Serres. But Book X, with a separate heading and pagination, is a reprint of *A true and plaine report of the Furious outrages of France* (1573), by 'Ernest Varamund of Freseland', believed to be a pseudonym for the Huguenot lawyer, François Hotman. The twelve Books were issued in one binding, with the name of the translator, Thomas Timme. *A true and plaine report* was an English version of Hotman's Latin *De Fuoribus Gallicis*, and as Timme annexed it as an 'Addition' to the narrative of de Serres, he may well have been the translator.

In any case, Kocher stresses the fact that it is Hotman, not de Serres, who provides Marlowe with his chief material for the first six scenes of *The Massacre* and part of the eighth. In illustration he quotes, in parallel columns, a full table of corre-

spondences between the *report* and the play, adding to those that have been previously noted. In footnotes he refers to other contemporary treatises, and herein he minimizes unduly, in the present writer's opinion, the dramatist's debt to de Serres' *Lyfe of . . . Iasper Colignie.*

Finally, Kocher discusses Marlowe's treatment of his material, wherein he was concerned less with historical accuracy than with dramatic effect. For this purpose he rearranges the sequence of events. He also largely modifies Hotman's characterization. Guise is elevated into the central figure, the chief begetter of the atrocities. Anjou is also painted in darker colours than by Hotman. Coligny, on the other hand, is reduced in scale from the noblest of Huguenot leaders to a 'querulous and naïve' figure. Kocher has done genuine service to the interpretation of the play, even if one does not fully concur in some of his deductions.

Seymour M. Pitcher contributes *Some Observations on the 1663 edition of 'Faustus'* to *M.L.N.* (Dec.). He aims at showing that the phrase on the title-page, 'with New Additions as it is now Act'd', refers not, as Tucker Brooke has suggested, to performances by strolling companies during the Commonwealth, but to the production in 1662 of the play at the Cockpit in Drury Lane and at the Red Bull. The actors at the Cockpit were George Jolly's players. In granting a warrant to Jolly, Charles II (of all men!) had stipulated that he was not to present 'any Play, Enterlude or Opera, containing any matter of prophanity, scurrility or obscenity'. Pitcher thinks that this may account for the excision of all phrases that might give offence on moral grounds. He also suggests that 'Charles' known proclivity towards Rome' was responsible for the removal of 'the slapstick scenes at the Vatican', and he indicates other passages that may have been expunged as incompatible with Roman Catholic doctrine.

Pitcher further sees the hand of Jolly in the 'new scene' at the Inn near Wittenberg, where the hostess sings three times. He points out that in 1654 Jolly, while touring on the Continent, had promised the Council of Basle, among other theatrical attractions, 'beautiful English music and skilful women'. He had anticipated Davenant in the introduction of actresses.

Finally, in relation to Marlowe, account has to be taken of the comprehensive work by Eleanor G. Clark, *Ralegh and Marlowe*,[2] which covers a wider ground than this title indicates. The sub-title is *A Study of Elizabethan Fustian*, a term originally denoting a coarse cloth, and thence applied to 'the trick of saying one thing and meaning another, of using an historical or mythological episode as a cloak to cover some personal or political allusion'. Part II, dealing with Marlowe's plays from this angle, was written first. But Miss Clark was advised before publishing it to make a study of the topical element in Elizabethan drama as a whole. The fruits of this investigation, now forming Part I of the complete 1941 volume, appeared separately in 1937, under the title *Elizabethan Fustian: A Study in the Social and Political Backgrounds of the Elizabethan Drama*. In this Part Miss Clark has taken a wide sweep and has brought together a large amount of material. She passes from more general questions, such as the working of the censorship, to plays relating to Elizabeth and her suitors, the Essex imbroglio, the Somerset divorce, and veiled attacks upon King James and his government. Most of this will be familiar to scholars, and the presentation is, in places, unduly prolix. But Miss Clark makes careful and scrupulous use of her authorities, and her survey will doubtless be found serviceable.

But, as has been seen, its main object was to lead up to and support her thesis in Part II that Marlowe's plays contain an amount of 'fustian' relating to the scientific and imperialist interests of Ralegh and his circle. Here again in what may be called the preliminary chapters of this Part, dealing with Sir Walter's sceptical friends, Lord Cobham and the Earl of Northumberland, his 'little Academe', the Virginian enterprise, and the 'school of night', Miss Clark sets forth lucidly the general conclusions of Elizabethan scholarship. But when she comes to the core of her undertaking the present writer, for one, cannot accept her findings. Whatever may have been later the degree of Marlowe's intimacy with Ralegh, he cannot have been one of his circle when he wrote *Tamburlaine*, just after leaving Cambridge. Yet Miss Clark holds that in staging the conquests of the Scythian warrior in the East, Marlowe was symbolizing

[2] *Ralegh and Marlowe: A Study of Elizabethan Fustian*, by Eleanor G. Clark. Fordham Univ. Press. pp. x + 488. $4.00.

Ralegh's ambitious enterprises in the West, of which Thomas Harriot was the reporter. In *The Jew of Malta* she sees in the character of Barabas 'the Protestant idea of the character of Philip' of Spain, and in Abigail a parallel to Philip's daughter, Isabelle of Valois. *Doctor Faustus* is interpreted as an answer to charges of both atheism and popery, and gains realism from the fate of Giordano Bruno in the background. But however baseless one may consider such conclusions, Miss Clark's ingenious speculations have a suggestive quality.

An important stage in the stately progress of the Oxford *Ben Jonson* was marked in 1941 by the publication of volume vii[3] containing the whole body of the Masques and Entertainments, preceded by the uncompleted pastoral, *The Sad Shepherd*, and the fragment of the tragedy, *Mortimer his Fall*. It is unnecessary here to repeat the general terms of the tributes which have already been paid in *Y.W.* to the previous instalments of this great achievement of scholarship. But it is of special note that this volume, containing the lighter products of Jonson's dramatic muse, has imposed upon its editors, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, an even weightier burden of collation and research than any of its predecessors. For no part of Jonson's work has hitherto received so little critical attention as his masques, and it can thus be claimed in the preface that for the first time in their history they appear in a scholarly text.

The Entertainments between 1603 and 1607, with the textual introductions and notes, occupy nearly one hundred pages. They include Jonson's *Part of the King's Entertainment in passing to his Coronation*, on 15 March 1604, with the *Panegyric* on his opening of Parliament on 19 March; and the *Entertainment of the Queen and Prince at Althorp* on 25 June 1603; the *Entertainment of the King and Queen at Highgate*, May-day, 1604; the *Entertainment of the Kings of Great Britain and Denmark at Theobalds*, 24 July 1606; and the *Entertainment of the King and Queen at Theobalds*, 22 May 1607. The first three are based on the text of the 1616 folio, with a collation of the 1640 folio and of the 1604 quarto, of which a dozen copies have been examined, revealing a large number of minor variants of which the full

[3] *Ben Jonson*, ed. by C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Vol. vii. O.U.P. pp. xxvii + 814. 35*s*.

list is given in the introduction. The three later pieces were printed only in the folios, but of the Theobalds show, 22 May 1607, two MSS., containing 125 of the 141 lines, have afforded some variant readings.

The *Masques of Blackness and Beauty* were first printed in the 1608 quarto, together with the *Masque at Lord Haddington's Wedding*. In addition to this and the folio texts there is, among the B.M. Royal MSS., a copy of the *Masque of Blackness* presented to the Queen in which, *inter alia*, the descriptions of the scenery and dresses are much less detailed. This MS. is printed in an appendix. A yet more notable Royal MS. of the *Masque of Queens*, made for Prince Henry in Jonson's own hand, has been reproduced *verbatim* as the text, with variants from the 1609 quarto and the 1616 folio. Another unique MS. is that of *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, acted on 6 January 1618, with Prince Charles among the performers. This MS., in the Chatsworth Collection, 'uses the present tense in the descriptions and stage-directions, picturing the scene as it passes before the eye of the spectator'. As it has valuable corrections of the 1640 folio readings it has been taken as the textual basis.

The editions of *Hymenaei* present variants from a different point of view. The masque was performed on 5 and 6 January 1606, in honour of the marriage of the Earl of Essex and Lady Francis Howard, and it bore their names on the title-page of the 1606 quarto. But after the divorce of the Countess in 1613 Jonson in the 1616 folio omitted the personal references and also deleted the names of the performers and of his collaborators, Inigo Jones, the architect, Ferraboses, the musician, and Thomas Giles, the dancing master, to whom he had made complimentary references.

The most complex problem with which the Oxford editors have had to deal is the text of *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*, which was performed three times in 1621, at Burley-on-the-Hill, August 3, at Belvoir, August 5, and at Windsor probably early in September, in revised form. Among the changes the Windsor version substituted for the fortunes told by the gypsies of the Court ladies (ll. 410–556) those of the great officers of state (ll. 565–697). A blessing of the King's five senses was added, and a new prologue and an epilogue. A duodecimo printed in 1640 by John Okes for John Benson, including miscellaneous

'works' by Jonson, reproduced in the first state of its text the Burley version. This is preserved, with the loss of eight pages, in an imperfect copy in the Cambridge University Library. 'The second state of the text—the form in which it was published—had a substantial resetting to include the Windsor version.' The masque was badly reprinted in the 1640 folio from an independent MS. giving a fuller text than that of the duodecimo. While the Oxford editors have taken the above printed versions into consideration, they have based their text mainly on a MS. of the masque now in the Huntington Library. In opposition to the views of Gifford and S. A. Tannenbaum they give reasons, based on the script, spelling, and punctuation, for not regarding the MS. as autograph. It also has some omissions. But it provides the best text and the editors have adopted it, supplying the necessary punctuation and inserting the omitted passages.

After the twenty-seven Masques, four later Entertainments between 1620 and 1634 close the volume. Its attraction is heightened by the numerous facsimiles of title-pages and MS. folios, and by the illustrations, among which special mention may be made of the lifelike portrait of Inigo Jones, and the charming picture of a lady masquer in *Hymenaei*, who is probably Lady Rutland. Finally, attention may be called to the articles concerning this volume by W. W. Greg, *Jonson's Masques—Points of Editorial Principle and Practice* (*R.E.S.*, April 1942), and by Evelyn Simpson, *Jonson's Masques: A Rejoinder* (*R.E.S.*, July 1942). In a review-article in *T.L.S.* (15 November 1941) some aspects of Jonson as a writer of masques were discussed.

The scribe of the Chatsworth MS. of *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* has been identified by F. P. Wilson in *Ben Jonson and Ralph Crane* (*T.L.S.*, Nov. 8). Wilson has found that the two pages of the Masque reproduced in the Oxford volume show the same characteristics of script as the facsimiles of other MSS. of Ralph Crane, who is known to have been the scrivener of the King's company.

In *Comedy in the Court Masque: A Study of Ben Jonson's Contribution* (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) T. M. Parrott sketches the developments in Jonson's series of masques from *The Masque of*

Blackness in 1605 to *Chloridia* in 1631. He emphasizes Jonson's achievements in plot-construction, in the elaboration of the anti-masque, and in the introduction of lively comic dialogue. He finds here the reason for the breach between the two great collaborators, 'Jonson, writer of comedies, who was attempting with considerable success to dramatise the masque, and Jones, costumer, scene-painter, and mechanist, whose ideal of the masque was a succession of splendid spectacles'.

Arthur Sale's edition of *Every Man in his Humour*[4] will serve a useful purpose. It has a lively, if at times rather too colloquial, introduction, in which he maintains that the critics in their estimate of Jonson have made too much both of the Humours and of the neo-classic doctrine. The result, in Sale's view, is a popular misconception which has been prejudicial to the reading, and still more the acting, of Jonson's plays. The notes are scholarly, and include discussions of the relevant passages on Jonson's views of dramatic art. The text is based on the folio version of the play, but the defence of 'the state of poesy' near the close of Act V is reproduced from the quarto in the notes.

G. E. Bentley contributes a notable list of *Seventeenth-Century Allusions to Ben Jonson* to *P.M.L.A.* (Oct.). They number 152, and are additional to those in the *Jonson Allusion-Book* of Bradley and Adams (1921). They begin with a reference to Mrs. Otter in *The Silent Woman*, by Beaumont and Fletcher in *The Scornful Lady* (1616), and end with Wright's quotation of the closing couplet of Jonson's epigram on Edward Alleyn in *Historia Histrionica* (1699). They range from the mere mention of the title of a play, as in extracts from Sir H. Mildmay's Diary, to poems of some length in commemoration of Ben by Sir T. Salusbury, Sir W. Davenant, Samuel Sheppard, Robert Gould, and others. They include a reply by Thomas Beedome (1641) to Jonson's poem, *That Women are But Mens Shaddows*, and the references by Dryden to his plays in the treatise *Of Dramatick Poesie* and in prefaces and epilogues.

C. B. Graham's note on *The Jonsonian Tradition in the Comedies*

[4] ***Every Man in his Humour***, **by Benjamin Jonson, ed. by Arthur Sale. Univ. Tutorial Press. pp. xxiv + 128. 3s. 6d.**

of John Dennis (*M.L.N.*, May) serves as a pendant to Bentley's article. In *A Plot and No Plot* (1697) one of the characters complains that he has been 'used like a Bartholomew Cokes' in *Bartholomew Fair*. In *The Comical Gallant* (1702), an adaptation of *The Merry Wives*, he refers to Jonson as having little love in his plays, and yet 'being one of the best Comick poets that ever was in the world'. He has further praise of Jonson in his prologue to *Gibraltar* (1705).

In '*The Two Angry Women of Abington*' and '*Wily Beguiled*' (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) Baldwin Maxwell points out similarities in style, situation, phraseology, and technique between the two plays, though the former is so much superior, especially in characterization, that a common authorship is improbable.

G. F. Reynolds in *Aims of a Popular Elizabethan Dramatist* (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*, pp. 148–50) quotes the prologue to Dekker's *If It Be Not Good the Devil Is in It*. Dekker's first demand is that the ear of the hearer in the audience shall be tied 'with golden chaines to his Melody'; then that he shall respond with 'raptures' to the dramatic incitement; thirdly, he shall give the actor opportunity to display varied emotions, 'Sorrow, Rage, Ioy, Passion'. Reynolds contrasts these requirements with those of the neo-classic school as represented by Jonson.

W. L. Halstead in *New Source Influence on* '*The Shoemaker's Holiday*' (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) points to a number of parallels in the impressment scenes of Dekker's comedy and *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* and argues that the comedy owes a debt to *The Famous Victories*.

Halstead also discusses *Dating and Holograph Evidence in* '*The Whore of Babylon*' (*N. and Q.*, Jan. 18). This play was published in 1607, but Fleay sought to identify it with *Truth's Supplication to Candlelight*, for which Henslowe paid Dekker on 18 January 1600, and which included Truth (though not Candlelight) among its characters. Fleay's view has received some support, but Halstead opposes it on various grounds. Dekker states in his address to the reader of the printed 1607 play that he had not heard it acted, and Halstead holds that this points to a production later than 1604 when Dekker had deserted

Henslowe for the Paul's boys. Moreover, *The Whore of Babylon* contains references to the Earl of Essex, the accession of James I, and the play *The Isle of Gulls* (1605) which, if the play was originally written in 1600, could only have been added later. But Dekker implies that the piece is given to the reading public in its original form, and from various indications Halstead concludes that it was printed from a holograph, and that it is to be dated about 1605–6.

The article on *Cyril Tourneur*, by Harold Jenkins (*R.E.S.*, Jan.), is based on the twofold assumption, which is open to query, that *The Revenger's Tragedy*, published anonymously, and *The Atheist's Tragedy*, bearing his name, are both by him, and that the order of their publication in 1607 and 1611 was also that of their composition. Jenkins aims at solving 'the difficulty of reconciling the views they give of the personality behind them', and at showing that between the composition of the two plays Tourneur's mind had progressed enormously. While Jenkins counts *The Revenger's Tragedy* as his masterpiece, he finds in *The Atheist's Tragedy* 'a calmer and more balanced view of life', wherein the dramatist is strenuously attempting to resolve his conflict with the world. The article gives an illuminating interpretation of the two plays which is of value, apart from the questions of authorship and priority.

Clifford Leech, in *A Speech-Heading in 'The Revenger's Tragœdie'* (*R.E.S.*, July), argues convincingly that in the passage in Act v. iii, after the entry of a 'Maske of intended murderers', *Spur*[*io*] prefixed to the line, 'Then I proclaime my self, now I am Duke', is an error for *Super*[*vacuo*]. This would further permit the retention of the original speech-headings and stage-directions at the end of v. i, which Nicoll has altered in his edition of Tourneur.

In *Middleton's 'No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's' and Della Porta's 'La Sorella'* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.) D. J. Gordon shows in detail the debt of the English play to the Italian comedy, which had escaped the notice of R. C. Bald in his article on *The Sources of Middleton's City Companies* (see *Y.W.*, xv. 282). Middleton's complicated main plot dealing with Sir Oliver Twilight and his family is a clear adaptation of the action in *La Sorella*, though

there are modifications in some of the *dramatis personae* and parts of the source are omitted in order to make room for the underplot of which Lady Goldenfleece is the centre.

William C. Powell has *A Note on the Stage History of Beaumont and Fletcher's 'Love's Pilgrimage' and 'The Chances'* (*M.L.N.*, Feb.). In the first folio in the stage-directions of *Love's Pilgrimage* 'Rowl:' twice enters as a servant, and also once in *The Chances*, 'with wine'. F. G. Fleay expanded this into Rowley, and as William Rowley is known to have been a member of the King's Company between 1623 and 1625, he concluded that the two plays were revived within those dates. This view has been accepted by later stage-historians. Powell, however, points out that the first record of *Love's Pilgrimage* is in Herbert's office-book for 16 September 1635, which also mentions a performance of *The Chances* at the Cockpit on 22 November 1638. Moreover, in another play in the first folio, *The Coxcomb*, revived at Hampton Court on 17 November 1636, Rowland appears in a stage-direction as Andrugio's 'man'; and in the MS. of Massinger's *Believe as You List*, licensed for production on 7 May 1631, Rowl, or Rowland occurs eleven times in the stage-directions.

These four plays were thus performed during the decade 1630–40, and Powell rightly concludes that there is no need to assume an earlier revival of *Love's Pilgrimage* and *The Chances* if Rowl: is identified as Rowland Dowle, one of the eleven King's Men to whom a ticket of privilege was issued on 12 January 1636. The list also includes John Bacon, once mentioned in a stage-direction of *Love's Pilgrimage* as Joh Bacon. The Ashton twice mentioned with Rowl: in this play has not yet been identified.

In *John Ford and Elizabethan Tragedy* (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) G. F. Sensabaugh gives a sharper edge to views which he has set forth in articles noticed in previous volumes of *Y.W.* (xvii. 160–1, xix. 147–8, xx. 103). He justifies the attitude to Ford as the 'decadent high priest' of Caroline drama. Ford combines in his plays the effects of two corrupting tendencies. Under the influence of Burton he 'afflicts his characters with melancholic diseases curable or incurable according to medical

formula'. In compliance with the platonic love cult fostered by Henrietta Maria, he presents his characters defying convention and arguing in defence of adultery and even incest. Sensabaugh illustrates his thesis from *The Broken Heart*, *Love's Sacrifice*, and *'Tis Pity She's A Whore*. 'All Ford's heroes and heroines struggle in a world of physical forces crossing swords with the laws of society.' This is a different and lower form of tragic suffering than that portrayed in both Greek and Shakespearian drama, where man's free will is unfettered and moral values are not confused. Yet exception may be fairly taken to Sensabaugh's summing up as too uncompromising when he declares that in 'Ford's hands tragedy neither elevates nor enlightens but . . . bludgeons man's spirit numb with despair'.

IX

THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE

I. THE LATER TUDOR PERIOD

By L. C. Martin

A few articles of general interest are here noticed first, and attention is then given to editions and studies of particular authors, poets, and prose-writers in that order. In each category the sequence is roughly chronological.

Writing on *Melancholy and the Elizabethan Man of Letters* in *H.L.Q.* (April) Lawrence Babb explains this association of ideas in the Elizabethan mind and illustrates it by drawing instances of intellectual melancholy from the drama and by describing the behaviour of some of the Elizabethan writers. It is shown that the condition was not uniformly regarded as a disadvantage, since writers could be thought to owe to it their achievements as well as their quasi-Byronic dejections; and it is maintained that although '*melancholy* did not mean merely "despondent", there was certainly a connexion between the vogue of melancholy and the progressively deepening pessimism of Elizabethan and early-Stuart England'.

In order to understand *The Elizabethan Idea of Melancholy* in its average conception it is suggested by Sidney Thomas in *M.L.N.* (April) that we should turn rather to such works as the sermons and treatises of popular preachers than to would-be scientific accounts like that of Timothy Bright (see *Y.W.* xxi. 148–9). A delineation by William Perkins is cited which is close to Bright's but is 'shorn of all subtle distinctions and technical verbiage'.

As noticed in more detail above, in relation to Elizabethan drama (p. 87), Mary C. Randolph [*S. in Ph.* (April)] writes on *The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: Its Possible Relationships and Implications*, and shows that some features of metaphorical usage in Renaissance satire are paralleled in Celtic magical and satiric verse, while others, representing

satire as having cathartic and healing effects, appear to anticipate the more philosophical conception of satire which is developed in the eighteenth century.

R. E. Bennett in *M.L.N.* (June) contests the statement in *O.E.D.* that *Puritan* 'appears in early use always as a term of reproach used by opponents', and quotes King James in support of Stowe's assertion that some congregations themselves assumed the title.

Thomas Hugh Jameson writes in *P.M.L.A.* (Sept.) on *The 'Machiavellianism' of Gabriel Harvey* with special reference to the *Gratulationes Valdinienses*, arguing that additions were made to this work between the time of its first presentation to the Queen and its publication in September, 1578, and that the additions represent not, as it might seem, authentic anti-Machiavellian satire of the popular kind but veiled ironical warnings against the Duc d'Alençon's emissaries who had recently visited the Queen at Audley End. It is suggested that Harvey's method was too subtle to be appreciated even at the time; at any rate his shafts appear to have been completely ineffective.

Some Pre-Armada Propagandist Poetry in England (1585–1586) refers to William Gager's Latin odes, *In Catilinarias Proditiones, ac Proditores Domesticos*, of which Tucker Brooke gives an account in *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, pp. 71–83.

Josephine W. Bennett gives in *H.L.Q.* (July) *Early Texts of Two of Ralegh's Poems* from MS. H.M. 198 in the Huntington Library. The poems in question are 'The Lie' and 'As you came from the holy land of Walsingham', and some of the readings certainly appear to be improvements upon those recorded elsewhere.

Considering *Some Spenser Problems* in *N. and Q.* (Jan. 25 and often subsequently) W. H. Welply assembles a large number of particulars actually or conjecturally associable with the poet and his contemporaries. Other contributors, notably Douglas Hamer, enlarge and comment upon Welply's views, e.g. the belief that Spenser's first wife was Machabyas Childe, Hamer giving his reasons for not favouring this belief. Hamer also contests Welply's opinion concerning the identity of 'E.K.' The argu-

ments cannot conveniently be summarized here. Welply also (*ibid.*, Aug. 16) gives an account of *John, Baron Lumley, 1534?–1609* in view of that person's possible association with Spenser's family.

In a substantial article headed '*The Faerie Queene*': *Alterations and Structure* (*M.L.R.*, Jan.) J. H. Walter points out a large array of inconsistencies (*a*) between the first three books and the letter to Ralegh and (*b*) within the poem itself, drawing the conclusion that Spenser changed his plan while engaged upon the work (cf. the views of Janet Spens noticed in *Y.W.* xv. 214–15). Each book, it is argued, had its original prefatory matter removed with the intention of using it in Book XII, this entailing difficulties which resulted in changing the stories, with the resultant discrepancies observed. In Part II of the article the opinion is advanced that the twelve books were connected in Spenser's mind with the twelve months of the year, an association which recalls *The Shepheardes Calender*, and that in the design of *The Faerie Queene* the notion wherein a man's life is symbolically completed within a year was replaced by the symbolism of moral perfection attained by a gradual process which has some reference to popular conceptions of the months. The possibility that Spenser was influenced by the *Zodiacum Vitae* of Palingenius (see *Y.W.* xvi. 236) is explored further and resemblances between *The Faerie Queene* and the *Roman de la Rose* which make for the understanding of Spenser's poem are also elicited.

The traditions underlying Spenser's account of *The Ladder of Lechery*, '*The Faerie Queene*', *III*, *1*, *45* are examined in *M.L.N.* (Dec.) by Allan H. Gilbert, who cites cognate passages from Lucian, Chaucer, and others.

Seabury M. Blair writes in *M.L.Q.* (March) on *The Succession of Lives in Spenser's Three Sons of Agape*, finding in the story an illustration of the doctrine that friendship outlives death and imparts its peculiar 'virtue' to the survivor. Cicero and Ficino are quoted in support of this interpretation.

Besides completing in *S.A.B.* (April and July) her listing of *Images in* '*The Faerie Queene*' *drawn from Flora and Fauna*, Grace W. Landrum discusses *Imagery of Water in* '*The Faerie Queene*' in *E.L.H.* (Sept.).

Under heading *Spenser and the Serpent of Division* William R. Orwen in *S. in Ph.* (April) interprets *The Ruines of Time* largely as an expression of political hopes and anxieties occasioned by the uncertainties of succession to the throne and the consequent dangers of civil war.

In *H.L.Q.* (Jan.) Brice Harris sets forth at length his reasons for believing that *The Ape in 'Mother Hubberds Tale'* (second part) represents Sir Robert Cecil, son of Burghley (the Fox).

In *P.Q.* (July) Edwin Casady writes on *The Neo-Platonic Ladder in Spenser's 'Amoretti'*, seeking to show that the doctrine of the soul's graded re-ascent to the One (chiefly as expounded by Bembo in *Il Cortegiano*) is distinctly traceable in Spenser's sequence, especially in Sonnets 60–76.

Following up the investigations of Greenlaw concerning the possible influence of Alanus de Insulis upon Spenser (see *Y.W.* iv. 119–20) Helen Andrews Kahin seeks in *E.L.H.* (Dec.) to modify Greenlaw's conclusions in the sense indicated by the title of her article, *Spenser and the School of Alanus*, the 'school' being a group of writers who with Alanus and partly at his instigation exaggerated and made popular certain traditions of style and subject-matter adopted by them. It is shown that many features of Nature as described by Spencer occur elsewhere than in the *De Planctu Naturae*, e.g. in Lydgate's *Reson and Sensualyte*, and that the correspondences with writers of the 'school' are generally fuller and more salient than those which the *De Planctu Naturae* itself provides.

Vernam Hull contributes to *P.M.L.A.* (June) a note on *Edmund Spenser's 'Mona-shul'*, a word occurring twice in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and assuming various forms in MSS. and printed editions.

The different meanings in *Spenser's Use of 'Stour'*, a word of frequent occurrence in his poetry, are examined in *M.L.Q.* (Sept.), as noted on p. 29, by F. M. Padelford, who also discusses (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) *Aspects of Spenser's Vocabulary.* These have to do with the poet's contribution 'to the language of words derived from the classical or Romanic languages, and words devised by adding classical or Romanic prefixes or suffixes to existing words'; the investigation suggests that Spenser coined or gave his sanction to new words more frequently, and that

generally he employed a more varied vocabulary, in his earlier than in his later work.

In *M.L.Q.* (Sept.) John L. Lievsay considers *Braggadocio: Spenser's Legacy to the Character-writers*, examining the origins as well as the influences of Spenser's conception.

A Borrowing from Spenser by Phineas Fletcher occurring in the *Piscatorie Eclogues* and apparently not hitherto recorded is pointed out in *M.L.N.* (April) by Bain T. Stewart.

The long-awaited completion of the Shakespeare Head *Drayton*[1] will be gratefully welcomed by students of Elizabethan poetry. Eight years have gone by since the concluding volume of the text was published (see *Y.W.* xiv. 233) under the care of J. W. Hebel, who died early in 1934; and Drayton scholars have thus had ample time in which to appreciate the merits of the first four volumes. They could not, however, assess the full value of this sumptuous edition until they had before them the introduction, the annotations, the list of variants, and the other benefits now available. Hebel had himself collected much of the material, notably the very full textual apparatus and the foundations of the life and bibliography. It was his intention to include a biography in vol. v; but the prolegomena and commentary assumed proportions unfavourable to this design, and the biography, by B. H. Newdigate, is published separately from the edition.[2] Newdigate has also contributed the introduction and notes to *Polyolbion*, of which the text occupies vol. iv; Kathleen Tillotson has done the same for the first three volumes, an immense and faithfully executed task for which praise could hardly be too high; and Geoffrey Tillotson has expertly completed the bibliography.

Vol. v will help those who wish to see Elizabethan literature more clearly as a whole and not in arbitrarily selected portions, for in it, and chiefly in the introductions to the separate poems, the drift of Drayton's poetic career is related not merely to his personal circumstances but to the poetic taste of the time, the

[1] *The Works of Michael Drayton*, ed. by the late J. William Hebel. Vol. v, *Introductions; Notes: Variant Readings*, ed. by Kathleen Tillotson and Bernard H. Newdigate. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head Press. pp. xxx + 316. £8. 18*s*. 6*d*. the set of five volumes.

[2] *Michael Drayton and his Circle*, by Bernard H. Newdigate. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head Press. pp. xv + 239. 15*s*.

background of thought and tradition, falsely called 'medieval' if this implies any lack of persisting vitality, and the intermingling currents of literary history during years of specially significant change. As Mrs. Tillotson observes, the progress of poesy in the period 1590–1630 has yet to be fully set forth, but it must be added that she herself and her chief collaborator have contributed considerably towards a final understanding. Impressive in scope and relevance as is the information they provide, its value is much enhanced by the critical guidance also afforded.

The textual notes, gathered by Hebel with astonishing care and patience, bulk large in the volume because of the many revisions to which Drayton subjected his work, and in this way a great deal which was formerly not easily accessible is laid open to general inspection.

Among other forms of convenient assistance vol. v contains a glossary, an index to the introductions and notes, and a chronology of Drayton's life and writings. In the separate volume devoted to biography, or 'biographical comment' upon the poems, Drayton's family and early years, his career and numerous friendships, &c., are carefully reconsidered and a good deal of additional lore is supplied. It would be rash to say that nothing remains to be discovered about Drayton, but what twenty years of interest and zeal can give will here be found.

These volumes, the edition and the biography, are similarly and very attractively produced, the whole undertaking carrying with it a suitable Elizabethan flavour of opulence and dignity as well as consistent evidence of a modern respect for scholarly precision. Nothing, however, is perfect. Because of war-conditions the notes are printed in smaller type than was originally intended, and until the war is over we must remain unsatisfied about certain commas which may or may not occur in the 1595 edition of *Peirs Gaveston*.

George Chapman's collected poems (apart from the *Homer*) have also found a competent editor in Phyllis B. Bartlett, whose one predecessor, R. H. Shepherd, published his volume in 1875. The text of the new edition[3] conveys an impression of scrupulous

[3] *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed. by Phyllis Brooks Bartlett. New York: M.L.A.A. and O.U.P. pp. xii + 488. 30*s*.

accuracy, wise conservatism, and bibliographical thoroughness, and if Miss Bartlett had done no more than produce a comprehensive and reliable text she would have performed an important service for students of Elizabethan poetry. But to this she has added an introduction which successfully, though compendiously, carries out the intention 'to relate the sequence of his poems and their most characteristic qualities of style to his own theory of poetry', and a commentary which will greatly assist the understanding of Chapman's work in connexion with his reading and with contemporary linguistic usage. She also throws light upon some of his more individual concepts and terms. It would be unhandsome to ask for more. A full account of Chapman's intellectual 'milieu' would call for another volume, and a full exegesis yet a third, probably not much less extensive than the text, which here occupies 400 pages. Furthermore Chapman's own warnings that poetry should not be made too easy may well seem also to disparage officious explanation: 'that Poesie should be as peruiall as Oratorie, and plainnes her speciall ornament, were the plaine way to barbarisme: and to make the Asse runne proude of his eares; to take away strength from Lyons, and give Cammels hornes'. Miss Bartlett has commendably refrained from such tamperings with nature and helps us to appreciate her lion without ignominiously taming him or seeking to dispel all the darkness with which he would 'still labour to be shadowed'. Indeed, nothing is to be more admired than her judgement and 'learned discretion', shown for instance in her non-committal attitude to recent theories about 'the school of night'.

There are points of detail on which it is possible to doubt the rightness of her procedure. Notably it is to be regretted that the Commentary carries no page-references to the text; and although there are very few emendations those that are made are not all above suspicion, especially the change of 'yas' to 'yasty' (in *Hero and Leander*, iv. 117) which apparently takes no account of the fact that 'yas' was a recognized spelling of 'eyas'. Such a blemish, however, can detract but little from the signal and pervasive merit of the text as a whole, and it is likely that this volume will long preserve its claim to be considered the definitive edition of Chapman's poems.

With one exception Miss Bartlett includes all of *Some Additional Poems by George Chapman* mentioned and set forth by Jean Robertson in *The Library* (Sept.–Dec.). The exception is of six lines occurring, with Chapman's signature, at the foot of a portrait dated 1620 which is reproduced by Colvin in his *Early Engravings and Engravers in England*. This represents a mathematician with a rod and abacus hitherto identified as John Napier of Merchiston. Colvin observed that the features do not bear out this identification but that they correspond 'curiously well' with those of an anonymous painted portrait at Trinity College, Oxford. Miss Robertson, noticing that this portrait is of someone who was 'aetatis 42' in 1602, suggests that both portraits represent Thomas Harriot, born in 1560, pointing out in confirmation the close friendship which existed between Harriot and Chapman and the fact that there is no reason to associate Chapman and Napier. No other portrait of Harriot is known to be extant and the suggestion will therefore be of great interest to Elizabethan scholars. Reproductions of the two portraits are given at the end of the article.

Parthenia, from which Miss Robertson reprints Chapman's commendatory verses, and to which the date '?1611' has been assigned, is here shown to belong, in its earlier issue represented by the Huntington copy, to the months between May 1612 and March 1613.

Under heading *Chapman's The Shadow of Night: An Interpretation* Roy W. Battenhouse in *S. in Ph.* (Oct.) offers a fuller account of the *Hymnus in Noctem* and the *Hymnus in Cynthiam* than has hitherto been attempted, analysing and explaining these poems in the light of the Platonic and mystical traditions. From these Chapman gained his favourable conception of darkness as opposed to the specious attractions of day; and accordingly in the one hymn night redeems the evil of the world by encouraging the contemplation of essential moral verities, and in the other Cynthia's sway represents 'the promotion of intellectual virtue and the quenching of sensual desires'.

In *R.E.S.* (July) Miss Bartlett considers *The Heroes of Chapman's Homer* with special reference to Chapman's conception of their characters. His additions to the original text and his

notes are drawn upon to show that although not much interested in allegorical interpretations of Homer he was greatly interested in the Homeric heroes as types of particular virtues and vices. This appears sporadically from his treatment of the characters in the *Iliad*, but in translating the *Odyssey* Chapman went further, portraying Ulysses, with set and consistent purpose, as the almost flawless stoical hero. Thus was Homer, not without violence, pressed into the service of Chapman's own philosophy.

Miss Bartlett also argues, under heading *Chapman and Phaer* in *M.L.N.* (Dec.), that the later poet knew Phaer's translation of the *Aeneid* and was influenced, when writing the Prefaces to his own *Iliads*, by the line of thought in Phaer's critical Conclusion.

As noted more fully above, p. 28, G. G. Loane on *Chapman's Compounds in N.E.D.* (*N. and Q.*, Sept. 6) observes that, although the dictionary includes a good number of compounds apparently first employed by Chapman, there are many articles in which the earliest quotation of these usages is later, sometimes much later, than the actual occurrence in Chapman's works.

A valuable approach to an edition of Sir John Davies's poetry is made in a volume[4] containing facsimile reprints of the *Epigrammes and Elegies*, the *Ignoto* sonnets, *Orchestra*, *Nosce Teipsum*, and the *Hymnes of Astraea*, together with the *Gulling Sonnets* printed again from the Chetham MS. Some of the early editions used were in small and not always very legible type, and this makes it the more regrettable that a full edition was not attempted. It is, however, a benefit 'to have brought together the best of Davies in a form which may present him as he appeared to the Elizabethans', and the future editor will be spared a visit to California to see the Huntington copies here utilized; there is a competent Introduction on the life of Davies and the nature of his poetry, and a collection of informative notes.

Arguments tending to prove *Nicholas Breton's Authorship of 'Marie Magdalens Loue' and 'The Passion of a Discontented Minde'* are put forward in *M.L.R.* (Oct.) by Jean Robertson,

[4] *The Poems of Sir John Davies reproduced from the first editions in the Henry E. Huntington Library*, ed. by Clare Howard. New York: Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. $3.00 or 20*s*.

who points out how closely, in style and sentiment, these works resemble others acknowledged as Breton's. Moreover, from her examination of the unique copy of the 1595 edition in the Huntington Library, she is able to state that the prose *Marie Magdalens Loue* was printed, and not, as Grosart alleged, merely bound up, with *A Solemne Passion of the Soules Loue* (in verse), to which Breton appended his name, the page-signatures being continuous throughout. Miss Robertson also clears up a confusion in the *Short-Title Catalogue* about the entry of *Marie Magdalens Loue* in the *Stationers' Register*.

The rarity of *Nicholas Breton's Pasquil Books* prevented Grosart from including in his edition of Breton's works the two entitled respectively *Pasquils Mistresse* and *Olde Mad-cappes new Gallymawfrey*; and of these Miss Robertson gives an account in *R.E.S.* (Jan.), as the result of her investigations in the Huntington Library, which has the one recorded copy of *Pasquils Mistresse*. She adds a note on the differences between the Huntington and the Bodleian copies of *Pasquils Fooles-Cap*, observing that the Huntington copy probably represents an earlier issue.

Miss Robertson also writes on *Nicholas Breton and 'The Vncasing of Machivils Instructions to his Sonne'* (1613) in *H.L.Q.* (July) with a view to establishing Breton's authorship of this satire, which is shown to be both closely allied with *Machivells Dogge* (already claimed for the Breton canon) and also similar to the Pasquil satires in style and thought.

Finally there are two contributions by Miss Robertson to *N. and Q.* She gives (April 5) a brief account of *Nicholas Breton's 'Honest Counsaile'*, noting correspondences with other writings by Breton (Grosart in his edition recorded only a few lines of this rare work); and she prints (*ibid.*, Aug. 16) *A Poem by Nicholas Breton* not included by Grosart, being six lines from an engraving of Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford, by Simon Van Der Passe.

James Hutton, giving in *P.M.L.A.* (Dec.) a full account of the tradition concerning *Cupid and the Bee* from the Greek bucolic poets to the late nineteenth century in America, pays due attention to the form taken by the story in Spenser's *Amoretti* and in poems by other Elizabethan writers.

In *E.L.H.* (Dec.) Clay Hunt investigates *The Elizabethan Back-*

ground of Neo-classic Polite Verse, both the informal, 'familiar' kind and the more consciously sophisticated and finished *vers de société*. Ben Jonson's part in anticipating later developments is made clear, but the main intention is to discover how far the way was prepared for him by Wyatt and subsequent writers, and it is convincingly demonstrated that not a little pioneering was done. It remained, however, for Jonson alone, within the period surveyed, to show any degree of consistent achievement in the making of polite verse analogous to that of the Augustans.

In *T.L.S.* (Dec. 20) James Craigie argues that *Sidney's 'King James of Scotland'* mentioned in the *Apologie for Poetrie* is James VI and not James I, and that in consequence the *Apologie* should probably be dated as late as 1584–5.

Sidney's *Metaphor of the Ulcer* employed in connexion with Tragedy in the *Apologie* is examined in *M.L.N.* (Jan.) by D. W. Robertson, who challenges Gregory Smith's association of the metaphor with the doctrine of κάθαρσις and holds that in accordance with current Elizabethan conceptions of Tragedy Sidney had rather in mind the exposure of previously unknown crimes committed by tragic personages. The metaphor thus 'refers to the content of tragedy, not to its effect'.

Under heading *Mourners at Sir Philip Sidney's Funeral* B. H. Newdigate in *N. and Q.* (June 7) refers to the plates showing the order of the funeral procession (*S.T.C.* 15224) and to a MS. description in the Bodleian Library (Ashm. 181); and gives biographical notes on some of the persons concerned. These are supplemented by W. Gurney Benham (*N. and Q.*, June 21) and M. Hope Dodds (*ibid.*, June 28).

Further comment on the finding that Greene's quasi-scientific allusions to natural history depend more often upon invented than upon traditional lore (see *Y.W.* xix. 164–5) is provided in *P.Q.* (July) (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) by John Lievsay, who writes on *Greene's Panther*. By his numerous references Greene shows that his mind was much panther-ridden, but Lievsay is struck by his willingness to repeat the relatively colourless items in the traditional material and by the tameness of the additions for which Greene himself was apparently responsible.

T.L.S. (May 31) contains an extensive anonymous essay

entitled *Thomas Dekker and the Underdog* in which Dekker's career and characteristics are surveyed and emphasis is laid upon his realism, his compassion for the poor, and his contempt for oppressors. The writer of the article deals most with the pamphlets and with Dekker's lyrical vein, and it is suggested that he may have been responsible for the lyrics in Lyly's *Six Court Comedies* (1632). As mentioned above (p. 122), M. Hope Dodds (ibid., June 28) gives reasons for supposing that at least the song to Apollo in *Midas* had been written before 1601, and this strengthens Lyly's claim to have been its author.

Allusions to Don Quixote before 1660 are detailed in *P.Q.* (Oct.) by Edwin B. Knowles, Jr., who adds forty-nine (chiefly from non-dramatic writings) to those already recorded. The numbers gradually increase until there are seven in 1659, but little understanding of the work is shown at first and the advance towards right appreciation was much slower than in France. It is suggested therefore that statements about the 'instantaneous popularity' in England of *Don Quixote* require modification.

Considering *Richard Hooker among the Controversialists* (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) Elbert N. S. Thompson points out the relative breadth and the philosophical foundations of Hooker's thought, concluding that although he 'shared in the controversy of his day, he rose well above it, and was 'really himself when he handled the questions under debate from solidly grounded general principles'.

Leonard F. Dean examines in *E.L.H.* (Sept.) *Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History-writing* as this appears in his scattered remarks and from his practice in *The History of Henry VII*; and finds that Bacon 'was clearly one of the most important English advocates of what may be called the Polybian or Florentine theory', which connects history primarily with the discovery of what is politically sound and expedient.

In an article by Robert R. Cawley in *M.L.N.* (April) with heading *Burton, Bacon, and Sandys* it is shown that the passage on coffee inserted in the fourth edition (1632) of the *Anatomy* and the cognate passage in Bacon's *Natural History* are both derived from George Sandys's *Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610.*

Under heading *Plot as an Essential in Poetry* in *R.E.S.* (April) C. M. Dowlin considers with reference to Aristotle and the Renaissance traditions the limitation of poetry by Bacon and Hobbes to the non-lyrical kinds, and suggests that this limitation has a bearing of some importance upon the development of neo-classical theory in the seventeenth century.

Bacon's Inventors listed in the disquisition of the Father in *The New Atlantis* are considered in *P.Q.* (Oct.) by Don Cameron Allen with reference to other works in which the same topic is treated prior to 1624.

To *H.L.Q.* (Oct.) Godfrey Davies contributes a fresh assessment of *The Character of James VI and I*, attempting no complete biography but stressing the traits which are made prominent in contemporary writings. The article includes material which should be conducive to a precise estimate of James's attitude and services to literature.

The 'prolegomena to the study of the English Bible of 1611' offered in a volume by David Daiches are particularly valuable because of the special approach to the subject indicated in the full title of the work[5]; for the extent to which the translators were guided by a first-hand or a mediate knowledge of the Hebrew originals and of Hebraic exegesis appears not to have been so thoroughly considered before. The first chapter contains an account of the English versions anterior to the 'Authorized'. The second is devoted to the 'Hebrew Tradition', describing the development of Hebrew scholarship in Europe and the importance it came to assume in humanistic culture and in Renaissance Biblical studies. A third chapter estimates the varying ability of the English translators to bring a knowledge of Hebrew to bear upon their tasks, and in the final chapter, although it appears impossible to give precisely the provenance of individual renderings, a comparative examination of the 1611 version of Isaiah is used to indicate what were the most likely sources, the Version of 1611 being finally characterized as 'a critical revision of the Genevan and Bishops' Bible with

[5] *The King James Version of the English Bible: An Account of the Development and Sources of the English Bible of 1611, with Special Reference to the Hebrew Tradition*, by David Daiches. Univ. of Chicago Press and C.U.P. pp. vii + 228. $2.50.

reference to the original Hebrew text and with the help of Kimchi's commentary'.

The author has in mind the possibility of a more extended study in which he might, among other things, inquire how far the style of the 1611 Bible is based upon a deliberate imitation of the original rhythms, and might also compare the work done by the different groups of translators with a view to discovering any varieties of sources or methods employed. There is more than enough in the present work to make such a continuation appear desirable.

Lambert Ennis in *P.M.L.A.* (March) examines *Margaret Bellasys*' '*Characterismes of Vices*' contained in Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 10, 309, and finds them largely transcribed not from Joseph Hall's work with the same title but from Thomas Adams's *Diseases of the Soule* (1616).

A very attractive volume, noticed at this point because it forms a suitable link between this chapter and the next, has been added to G. B. Harrison's series of *Elizabethan Journals*, which covered the last twelve years of Elizabeth's reign. The continuation[6] records the 'things most talked of during the years 1603–1606' and provides the contemporary view of such matters as the funeral of the Queen, the accession of James, the plague of 1603, the trial of Ralegh and others, the Gunpowder Plot, the translation of the Bible, new plays and books, and many minor incidents of current interest. The now familiar method is adopted again, the source of each entry being given, often with valuable notes, at the end of the book. Like its predecessors, this *Journal* deserves the praise appropriate to a work of learning which is also a work of art.

A few articles, contained in periodicals or other serial publications which owing to war conditions have not come to hand, must remain unnoticed. The following books have also not been obtained: *Studies in the Humanities in Honor of John Calvin Metcalf*, in which Fredson T. Bowers writes on *Thomas Nashe and the Picaresque Novel* and Karl R. Wallace on *Bacon's Contribu-*

[6] *A Jacobean Journal*, by G. B. Harrison. Routledge. pp. xii + 406. 16*s*. 6*d*.

tion to the Theory of Rhetoric and Public Address; *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340–1611* by Charles C. Butterworth (Philadelphia Univ. Press); *The 12 Moneths*, by Nicholas Breton (? facsimile) (Westport, Conn., U.S.A); *The Poems of James Shirley*, ed. by Ray L. Armstrong (New York: Columbia Univ. Press).

X

THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD: POETRY AND PROSE

II. THE EARLIER STUART AGE AND THE COMMONWEALTH

By L. C. MARTIN

THE usual order is followed, the notices of work on Milton succeeding those concerned with studies of the other poets and prose-writers. In each category the sequence is roughly chronological. First, however, mention may be made of three studies pertaining to the 'background'.

In Douglas Bush's lecture printed in *E.L.H.* (June) on *Two Roads to Truth: Science and Religion in the Early Seventeenth Century* some familiar ground, as the lecturer himself points out, is re-examined; but no apology is needed for so fresh and perceptive a treatment of issues important not only for the understanding of the period in question but also of our present perplexities. Indeed attention can hardly be too often directed to the unequal exploitation of these two paths and to the disadvantages which this inequality has entailed. The lecture, like the same author's *The Renaissance and English Humanism* (see above, p. 85, and below, p. 163), is pervaded by a respect for the traditions of humanistic Christianity, traditions to which in their own different ways Cambridge Platonists and Regency poets bore devoted but somewhat unavailing witness. In the seventeenth century the established road of religion was of course frequently forsaken in the interests of sectarian inspirations, and in *Studies in English* published by the University of Texas, Truman Guy Steffan analyses into several strands *The Social Argument against Enthusiasm (1650–1660)* as this argument is represented in writings of that decade by Hobbes, Jeremy Taylor, Ross, Henry More, and Meric Casaubon.

Of all the 'enthusiasms' which were rife or emergent at that time none perhaps was more rationally and socially defensible than Quakerism; for the Light Within, according to a penetrat-

ing analysis by Rachel H. King,[1] was essentially 'that which shows a man evil' and 'that in which is unity'. As Rufus Jones says in his Preface, 'the book is in the main the interpretation of these two principles and a skilful reduction of the confusions to this simplicity of interpretation'; and it is a real service both to have clarified the nature and meaning of Fox's doctrines in themselves and to have drawn out the differences and similarities between these doctrines and others of a more traditional or more experimental order. Particularly valuable are such things as the precise discrimination of Quakerism and Calvinism in spite of the 'Calvinistic overtones' in the Quaker harmony, and the discussion of Quakerism in its mystical aspects and relationships. It is shown too, in an initial chapter, how, while Fox's system allowed the validity of individual inspirations, it took account also of the need for authority which should govern and stabilize the perceptions of all adherents. The system was in fact not only 'optimistic enough to cheer those who had been oppressed by the fore-ordination of Calvinism, but carefully guarded against the dangers of pantheism, antinomianism, and the vagaries of individual interpretation'.

Allen R. Benham (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) challenges *The Myth of John Donne the Rake*, suggesting that the poems held to justify this characterization are perhaps not reflections of Donne's own personality and early life, but rather imaginative projections born of his desire to depart in as many respects as possible from the poetic modes favoured by the more orthodox of his contemporaries. With this general intention Donne might adopt a rakish or 'realistic' pose without closely representing his own experience.

Phillips D. Carleton in *M.L.N.* (May) compares *John Donne's 'Bracelet of bright hair about the bone'* with passages in Giraldus Cambrensis' *Speculum Ecclesiae* and *De Principis Instructione* concerning 'trica muliebris, flava et formosa, miroque artificio conserta et contricata', discovered among bones believed to be those of Arthur and Guinevere. It is pointed out that the MSS. containing these passages were in the library of Robert Cotton, to which Donne apparently had access.

[1] *George Fox and the Light Within: 1650–1660*, by Rachel Hadley King. Philadelphia: Friends Book Store. (1940). pp. 177. $1.

The Text of Donne's 'Divine Poems' is discussed in *Essays and Studies* by Evelyn Simpson in the light of a MS. acquired by Harvard College in 1932 and formerly in the possession of Bertram Dobell. This MS. is of importance in that (*a*) it contains poems which are not in the edition of 1633 and which were first published in the less trustworthy edition of 1635; (*b*) some of its readings are manifest improvements upon that edition; and (*c*) with regard to the poems common to the MS. and to the edition, the MS. resembles certain others in appearing to preserve an earlier draft than that represented by the edition of 1633. It is clear from this article that the readings of this MS. must be treated with respect.

Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* is published in facsimile[2] with an Introduction by C. M. Coffin, who dwells upon the place of this satire in the religious-political controversies of the time and upon the references made in it to ideas and persons connected with the rise of the 'new philosophy'.

Donne's Suicides is the heading of an article in *M.L.N.* (Feb.) by Don Cameron Allen, who investigates the sources of the classical examples given in *Bianthanatos* and the *Devotions*, and shows that Donne was apt to derive his stories indiscriminately from classical and Renaissance accounts, without testing the later by the earlier. 'Our final conclusion is that Donne was not so great a classical student as some modern scholars would have him be.' Allen also writes in *M.L.N.* (Dec.) on *Donne and the Bezoar* attributing to this medical term as employed in the *Devotions* the meaning of a panacea.

In *P.M.L.A.* (March) R. E. Bennett closely examines *Donne's Letters to Severall Persons of Honour* and concludes that the editor, John Donne junior, fabricated the headings to some of the letters with a view to creating a false impression of the number and importance of the people concerned. Letters, for instance, appropriated by the edition to Sir Henry Wotton bear signs of having been addressed to Sir Henry Goodere, the real recipient, according to Bennett, of 67 letters out of the whole

[2] *Ignatius His Conclave or His Inthronisation in a Late Election in Hell. Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1611*, with Introduction by Charles M. Coffin. New York: Columbia Univ. Press for the Facsimile Text Society, and O.U.P. pp. xxiii + A 1–5 + 149. 10*s.* 6*d.*

series of 129. Moreover, for 120 of the letters Bennett finds no more than four recipients and for 115 only three, these restrictions being taken to indicate that the editor had access to letters which the recipients had preserved and not to his father's own copies of his general correspondence. Future biographers of Donne senior will have to take account of Bennett's arguments, which are summarized by B. H. Newdigate in *N. and Q.* (June 21).

John Donne's 'Little Rag', sc. fragment of Montemayor (*Letters*, 1651, p. 299), is shown by Ernest G. Mathews in *M.L.N.* (Dec.) to refer not, as has been supposed, to a passage in the *Diana*, but to the quatrain by El Comendador Escrivá, 'Ven muerte tan escondida', &c., on which Montemayor wrote a *glosa*.

The study of such matters as Donne's vocabulary, imagery, and influence will be much facilitated by the publication (in 1940) of a concordance[3] to his English poems. This is based upon Grierson's one-volume edition of the *Poetical Works*, and follows the lines of Lane Cooper's Concordance to Wordsworth; and it carries every sign of accuracy and completeness.

Few volumes of poetry were as frequently republished in the seventeenth century as *The Temple*, and few poets of the period received so much attention from editors in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Yet for all Herbert's importance there has been wanting a modern edition of his complete works which should satisfy the present-day requirements of English scholarship. The deficiency has been handsomely met by F. E. Hutchinson.[4] The best previous edition of the works in English, that of George Herbert Palmer, will retain its own values, but it is marred by an arrangement of *The Temple* poems in chronological categories which was hardly justifiable on the data submitted. Earlier attempts to present the English and Latin works together were insufficiently comprehensive and precise. Hutchinson has very carefully scrutinized the early printed and MS. versions of all that Herbert can be thought to have written and has discriminatingly dealt with the problems which these versions

[3] *A Concordance to the English Poems of John Donne*, by H. C. Combs and Z. R. Sullens. Chicago: Packard & Co. pp. ix + 418. $7.50.

[4] *The Works of George Herbert*, ed. by F. E. Hutchinson. O.U.P. pp. lxxvii + 619. 30*s*.

create. It has thus been possible to put the text upon foundations not likely in essentials to be disturbed. Hutchinson has been extremely thorough in his recording of variant readings, and no one can complain that the evidence for and against his decisions is not generously set forth. The authenticity of doubtful writings is also fully canvassed, and Hutchinson prints some material which has not been collected before.

The introductory matter begins with a biography in which the editor reveals not only his acquaintance with the historical facts, but a sympathetic insight into Herbert's mind and spirit, of much avail for the right understanding of the writings. In the Commentary this understanding is further assisted and most of the difficulties created by Herbert's ingenuity, by his employment of words in obsolete senses, and by the more recondite of his allusions, are satisfactorily explained. The editor's biblical knowledge has served him well with a poet 'who owes little to any other literary source except the Bible'. The Clarendon Press have given of their best, and on all counts the volume must take a very high place in the series, Oxford English Texts, to which it belongs.

George Herbert and the Emblem Books is a subject deserving attention because the combination in Herbert's poetry of imagery clearly visualized with intricacy of meaning and simplicity of style may often recall the intention and method of the emblem-makers with their threefold devices of the 'picture', the 'word' or motto, and the 'explanation'. In *R.E.S.* (April) Rosemary Freeman gives a helpful account of the poems and passages in *The Temple* which justify this comparison, noticing that although Herbert's connexions with specific emblem-books are only occasional, the emblem form can be thought to have helped him to acquire his habit of expounding ideas in images, 'each brief and completed yet fully investigated'. An unpublished thesis by Mary Lucas (Univ. of Liverpool) on *Imagery in George Herbert's Poetry* also contains material relevant to this subject.

Merritt Y. Hughes writes (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) on *The Theme of Pre-existence and Infancy in 'The Retreate'*, seeking to show that Vaughan was not philosophically committed to the doctrine of pre-existence and that his thought in 'The Retreate' and elsewhere is firmly enough rooted in classical and Christian

traditions to 'set our fears of his mystical unorthodoxy at rest'. Hughes is also inclined to think that Vaughan's dependence upon 'esoteric' influences has been exaggerated. The article may perhaps underestimate the extent to which Vaughan found intellectual satisfaction, besides an imaginative opportunity, in the doctrine of pre-existence, and the degree of his reliance upon 'Hermes Trismegistus' (detailed in a subsequent article by the present writer to be noticed next year); nevertheless Vaughan scholars must be grateful for the help here given them in their efforts to arrive at a precise understanding of Vaughan's poem in all its possible relationships.

Thomas Carew, Thomas Carey and 'The Sovereign of the Seas' is the heading of an article in *M.L.N.* (April) by Rhodes Dunlap, who cogently attributes the poem not to the most famous Thomas Carew, nor to Thomas Carey, son of the Earl of Monmouth, but to Thomas Carey of Tower Hill, translator of Puget de la Serre's *The Mirrour which Flatters Not* (1639).

A Misdating of 'A Ballade upon a Wedding' in O.E.D. art. 'Course-a-park' is pointed out in *M.L.N.* (May) by Carl Niemeyer. The expression is attributed in the dictionary to *Wits Recreations* 1640, but the poem appears not to have been published until it was included in Suckling's *Fragmenta Aurea* in 1646.

In *R.E.S.* (Jan.) M. C. Bradbrook writes on *Marvell and the Poetry of Rural Solitude*, or rather the particular sentiments characteristic of that poetry in Marvell's own century, not the earlier and the later manifestations. Incidentally attention is called to the possibility that Marvell was influenced, in 'The Garden' and elsewhere, by Mildmay Fane's *Otia Sacra*. Comparison is also made with the poetry of the French '*Libertins*'.

It is a service to have made Traherne's *Serious and Pathetical Contemplation* generally accessible, seeing that but two or three copies of the original edition (1699) are known to exist. The text, which R. Daniells has conservatively edited,[5] is from the

[5] *A Serious and Pathetical Contemplation of the Mercies of God, in Several Most Devout and Sublime Thanksgivings for the same*, by Thomas Traherne, ed. by R. Daniells. Univ. of Toronto Press and O.U.P. pp. 127. $1.50.

British Museum copy and is preceded by a short account of Traherne's outlook and spirit, and of the circumstances in which the *Contemplation* was published twenty-five years after Traherne's death. Bertram Dobell quoted some typical passages in his edition of the *Poetical Works* (1906), but the whole work alone can show Traherne's remarkable, and in the end somewhat fatiguing, power of maintaining the pitch of ecstasy which those passages represent. He writes here in a sort of 'free verse' or numerous prose which perhaps suits his rapturous temperament better than the more regular forms to which he elsewhere subdued his inspiration.

George R. Potter (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) makes *A Protest against the Term 'Conceit'*, deprecating its common use as a critical term until some precision of meaning for it can be agreed upon.

Joan Bennett in *R.E.S.* (July) examines *An Aspect of the Evolution of Seventeenth-Century Prose*, viz. the effects attending the growing distrust of rhetoric and the imagination considered as hindrances to right knowledge and right judgement. This development has been described before, but is here expounded and illustrated with much freshness and resource.

R. I. Aaron writes in *M.L.R.* (April) on *The 'Autobiography' of Edward, First Lord Herbert of Cherbury: the Manuscript Material*, pointing out that although this material has been supposed lost since Horace Walpole used it for his edition of 1764 there are extant two MS. drafts belonging to the Earl of Powis, these presumably being the two which Walpole himself mentioned, and the fuller one that on which Walpole's edition was based. The other, although fragmentary, is of interest in that it appears to be in Herbert's own hand, is possibly his first draft, and contains two passages not found in the published editions. One of these is an account of Herbert's religious opinions and the other records a story connected with the Gunpowder Plot. These two passages are given in an Appendix to the article.

Izaak Walton a Stationer?, a query put in *M.L.N.* (May) by Arthur M. Coon, arises from litigation instituted in 1652 against a certain 'Walton' who was carrying on a stationer's or bookseller's business 'near the west end of Paul's'. That this was in

fact Izaak Walton is possible but not yet proved, and the question can only be settled in the light of further investigation.

Those who have found themselves daunted by the Carlyle-Lomas volumes of Cromwell's life and writings or by the even more extensive though still incomplete collection by Wilbur C. Abbott (see *Y.W.* xxi. 165–6) may now take heart and satisfaction from an anthology prepared by L. C. Bennett[6] on the basis of the Lomas text. The material is arranged under nine subject-headings corresponding to different aspects of Cromwell's career and thought; there is a sympathetic introduction and a short biography. At the end a brief list is given of modern books on Cromwell and a useful index. Miss Bennett appears to meet very competently what she describes as 'a definite need for a wider knowledge and understanding of Cromwell', combating ignorance 'among those who can hardly be expected to know better, and those who certainly should do so'.

John Milton, Scrivener, the Temples of Stowe, and Sir John Lenthall is the heading of an article in *H.L.Q.* (April) by J. Milton French, who introduces and prints documents from the Huntington Library throwing further light (see *Y.W.* xx. 112–13) upon the business activities of the poet's father.

Arthur Barker, in *U.T.Q.* (Jan.), examines *The Pattern of Milton's Nativity Ode*, describing both the pattern itself and also its implication of a recent experience, at once aesthetic and religious, which gave Milton his conviction of a special calling. This, unlike the more normal type of Puritan conversion, involved 'a recognition, not only of the personal significance of the Incarnation, but also of its relationship to the classical and humanistic doctrine of harmonious perfection symbolized by the music of the spheres. Of this perfection divinely inspired poetry seemed to him the supreme expression.'

In the same journal (Oct.) A. S. P. Woodhouse writes on *The Argument of Milton's 'Comus'*, distinguishing between the doctrines therein set forth of temperance, continence, chastity, and virginity. Of these the first two belong to the level of nature;

[6] *A Selection from the Letters & Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, ed. by L. C. Bennett, with foreword by the Rt. Hon. Isaac Foot. Nelson. pp. xii + 355. 7*s*. 6*d*.

the third, 'the central virtue of the poem, moves in an area common to nature and grace'; the fourth 'belongs exclusively to the order of grace, which in the poem it is used to illustrate and even symbolize'. The Epilogue, a key to the understanding of *Comus*, tells of the spiritual benefits attending these virtues and culminating on a level 'higher than the sphery chime'.

In *A Note on 'Comus', Lines 75–77* contributed to *P.Q.* (Oct.) John S. Diekhoff favours the punctuation of these lines in the editions of 1637 and 1645, according to which 'all their friends' can be taken as the object rather of 'boast' than of 'forget'.

Writing on *Lycidas: 'the two-handed engine'* in *N. and Q.* (Sept. 15) Maurice Kelley seeks to strengthen the argument that the allusion is, at least in part, to the sword of Michael and not simply to some aspect of contemporary English politics. George G. Loane (*ibid.*, Dec. 6) adduces evidence to show that 'at the door' could mean 'ready for use'.

In *M.L.N.* (Jan.) Donald C. Dorian examines the references in *Milton's Sonnet On the New Forcers of Conscience, Line 17* to 'Phylacteries' and 'eares' with a view to elucidating the precise implications of these words in this context.

Warner G. Rice contributes to *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.) *A Note on 'Areopagitica'* in which it is argued that in spite of Milton's enthusiasm for liberty of utterance in speech or in the written word he was not opposed to a judicious censorship placed in the hands of the wise or the regenerate and directed against palpably harmful works. On the whole it is suggested that Milton was less liberally inclined in this respect than his nineteenth-century admirers.

In *M.L.Q.* (Dec.) there is a substantial and detailed article by Samuel L. Wolff on *Milton's 'Advocatum nescio quem': Milton, Salmasius, and John Clark*, to the effect that Cook's pamphlet, *King Charles his Case* (1649), which Salmasius tried to refute, must be taken into account in any attempts to explain the controversy between Salmasius and Milton, and indeed that there are passages by both which remain obscure until help is found in Cook's original arguments. The main purpose of the article is 'to furnish Milton's First *Defence* with a series of elucidative annotations which may add to its interest, clarify its meaning,

and perhaps suggest a change in recent estimates of its importance'.

References to *The Burning of Milton's 'Defensio' in France* in the *Defensio Secunda* and in *Mercurius Politicus* are supplemented in *M.L.N.* (April) by J. Milton French, who gives a detailed account derived directly from official French records.

G. L. Hendrickson contributes a note to *P.Q.* (Oct.) on *Milton, Salmasius—and Synezesis*, combating the exception taken by W. A. Oldfather on metrical grounds to two lines in the epigram *Pro Ioanne Miltono, &c.* (see *Y.W.* xxi. 174), and adding a comment on the meaning of the epigram, especially of the words 'scriniis et capulis' in the concluding lines.

Lilburne's Note on Milton in *As You Were* (1652) is quoted by Don M. Wolfe in *M.L.N.* (May) and taken as evidence of the esteem in which Milton was held by the Levellers, in spite of his official connexion with their Independent antagonists. It is pointed out that Milton himself never wrote anything against the Levellers and that his strong championship of religious toleration may well account for Lilburne's attitude of respect.

Harris F. Fletcher contributes (*In Honor of Hardin Craig*) *A Note on Two Words in Milton's History of Moscovia* which may be stumbling-blocks since the standard reference works do not help very much. They are *Cursemay*, a tavern, and *Rossomakka*, the animal otherwise known as the glutton or wolverine (*gulo borealis* or *gulo luscus*).

The background of Milton's thought in *Paradise Lost* continues to engage attention. Grant McColley, whose study of Milton's place in the hexameral tradition was noticed last year (*Y.W.* xxi. 168–70), now in *S. in Ph.* (April) associates *Milton and Moses Bar-Cepha*, pointing to certain rare conceptions and certain salient groups of ideas which are common to *Paradise Lost* and the *Commentarius De Paradiso*. The question how far Milton was actually indebted to the Commentary is left open for the present. A similar doubt is felt on the subject of *Milton's Battle in Heaven and Rupert of Saint Heribert*, about which McColley writes in *Speculum* (April). When allowance, however, has been made for the dissimilarities and for the relative commonplaceness of some of the shared conceptions, there is still found in both writers an extended sequence of more peculiar

ideas, which may justify a belief that Milton drew directly or indirectly upon this twelfth-century theologian.

With a like intent Arnold Williams discusses in *P.M.L.A.* (March) *Renaissance Commentaries on 'Genesis' and some Elements of the Theology of 'Paradise Lost'*. Here the 'elements' chosen have to do with the questions 'when the world was created and whether from pre-existing matter or *ex nihilo*, when time itself first came into being, and when the angels were created'; and it is suggested that although Milton's opinions on these subjects were apt to be unconventional and out of harmony with the commentaries as a whole, he may well have relied to some extent upon those which do support his views.

Important as it is, however, to learn whence those views were derived, it is still more important to know what they were, how accurately and completely they are systematized in the *De Doctrina*, and what bearing in consequence that work has upon the interpretation of Milton's poetry. These questions, variously answered in the past, have now been very finely sifted by Maurice Kelley,[7] who, believing that the treatise is synchronous with *Paradise Lost* and also that it represents in all essentials Milton's ultimate doctrinal position, considers it to be of decisive significance for the right understanding of that poem. This brings Kelley into conflict with authorities like Sewell (see *Y.W.* xx. 115–16) who have found apparent discrepancies between the two works; but after a detailed examination of the arguments of these scholars Kelley maintains that in all major respects the alleged discordancies can be harmonized, *Paradise Lost*, for instance, being no less Arian in its theology than the *De Doctrina*. If this is true, and Kelley brings impressive learning and acuteness to the proving of his case, students of Milton will find that some of their difficulties have been removed. Thus it will no longer be necessary to argue with Sewell in favour of some earlier and more orthodox state of the treatise, more congruent with the poem, since 'in spite of the immense gulf that exists between a systematic theology and a successful work of poetic art' a settled corpus of belief is common to both as they

[7] *This Great Argument: A Study of Milton's De Doctrina Christiana as a Gloss upon Paradise Lost*, by Maurice Kelley. Princeton Univ. Press (*Princeton Studies in English*, vol. 22) and O.U.P. pp. xiv + 269. 33*s.* 6*d.*

now stand. And although some of Kelley's arguments may arouse further controversy, he has certainly done a great service by the methodical collection in the four central chapters of his book (iv–vii) of the comparable passages in prose and verse and by his exegetical comments. These chapters are preceded by an initial statement of the problems and by two chapters devoted to the dating of the treatise and to a demonstration that the MS. revisions suggest no salient changes in Milton's opinions. (Appendixes illustrate the handwriting of the various amanuenses and describe the revisions). In a final chapter Kelley summarizes his conclusions and reflects on their significance, deprecating certain tendencies of the 'New Movement' in Milton criticism and insisting once more upon the desirability of judging Milton's poem 'in the light of his professed motives and aims'.

The documentation, indexes, and bibliography appear to be all that could be wished.

One matter considered here, *Milton's Use of 'Begot' in Paradise Lost V, 603*, is also treated by the same authority in *S. in Ph.* (April). There also will be found a discussion of *The Causeway from Hell to the World in the Tenth Book of 'Paradise Lost'* by E. M. W. Tillyard, who suggests that Milton may have been influenced by a passage in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*, and characterizes the passage in itself and in its relations with other parts of the poem.

Further comment on *A Double Janus* (*Paradise Lost*, xi. 129; see *Y.W.* xx. 115) is provided in *P.M.L.A.* (June) by T. W. Baldwin, Allan H. Gilbert, and T. O. Mabbott.

The Political Implications of 'Paradise Regained' examined in *J.E.G.P.* (Oct.) by Z. S. Fink are concerned with Milton's reference to Satan as the 'great Dictator' of the fallen spirits, 'Dictator' there having the contemporary sense of a person constitutionally entrusted with special powers to carry the state through times of emergency. Milton, it is pointed out, had come to be opposed to this kind of institution, believing rather in the possibility of a form of government in which dictatorship should be unnecessary; and gives effect to his disfavour by attributing to Satan dictatorial powers which are unsuccessfully exercised.

Writing in *T.L.S.* (May 17) on *A Neglected Correction in Milton*

C. W. Brodribb revives and recommends the opinion that in *Paradise Regained*, iv. 157 'thee difficult' should be read for 'the difficult'.

Milton and the Theory of Climatic Influence is discussed in *M.L.Q.* (March) by Z. S. Fink, who seeks to estimate the extent to which the poet was affected by the belief that the cold climate of the north was unfavourable to certain ambitions, in his case to the writing of great poetry and to the attainment of his aims in political reform. It is suggested in conclusion that the belief helped to strengthen on the one hand his faith in the value of foreign institutions and on the other his reliance upon divine inspiration.

It is perhaps less surprising to find Locke and Newton sharing a religious faith than to find Milton at one with them; but according to the Principal of the Unitarian College at Manchester all three were 'Unitarian in the essential and historical meaning of the term'. Those who would have difficulty in stating precisely what this meaning is may learn something from this volume,[8] in which again the *De Doctrina* is regarded as a substantially accurate account of Milton's final views. The argument in favour of his essential Unitarianism relies upon such things as his Arian, Sabellian, and Socinian proclivities, his leanings towards Quakerism, and the quasi-mystical tendencies which have recently been attributed to him; and even those who are not convinced on the main issue may be helped by this careful discussion to form a more exact estimate of Milton's doctrinal beliefs at different stages of his career. The study is adequately documented, and there is a useful Index.

The last of the four Alexander Lectures on *The Renaissance and English Humanism* by Douglas Bush noticed above (p. 85) is devoted to Milton, 'the last great exponent of Christian humanism in its historical continuity'. The tracing of Milton's career attempted in this lecture and the delineation of his character and mind follow somewhat familiar courses, but the fusion and occasional conflict of humanism and Christianity in Milton and his works assume in this context a fresh significance

[8] *The Religious Opinions of Milton, Locke and Newton*, by H. McLachlan. Manchester Univ. Press. pp. vii + 221. 7*s*. 6*d*.

as once again (cf. p. 151, above) the need is stressed for a return at the present time to a religious and didactic view of literature to correct the bias created by scientifically determined modes of thought. These, it is suggested, have given us too much scholarship unvitalized by the moral and spiritual traditions which came to a culminating expression in Milton's poetry.

Two important bibliographical articles on *The First Edition of 'Paradise Lost'* by J. H. Pershing and by Helen Darbishire are noticed below, chap. xv.

A few articles and the following books were not obtained for notice: *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne*, and *The Complete Poetry of William Blake*, ed. by Robert S. Hillyer; *Sir William Alexander*, by Thomas H. McCrail; *Milton's Literary Craftsmanship. A Study of 'A Brief History of Muscovia', with an edition of the text*, by Robert R. Cawley; *Milton's Complete Works*, ed. H. F. Fletcher; *Milton in the Puritan Revolution*, by Don M. Wolfe.

XI

THE RESTORATION

By Beatrice White

With very few exceptions work on the Restoration period for the year under review is neither lengthy nor profound. This dictum, however, could not be applied to a study produced in 1940, which arrived too late for inclusion in this publication last year, *Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset*, by Brice Harris.[1] The first full-length portrait of Dryden's Eugenius, poet, wit, statesman, and patron, the work is intended as an introduction to a proposed study of patronage in general between 1640 and 1700. As might be expected from this statement by the author, the most interesting and valuable chapters of this industrious, well-documented book, which carefully follows Sackville through his sometimes inglorious but never dull career, from the ebullience of his youthful escapades to his emergence as a man of affairs, are those concerned with his patronage of literature. Here Harris traces the association of the generous, good-natured, gifted nobleman whose lightly-gained contemporary reputation for literary brilliance posterity has hardly endorsed, with the men of letters, great and small, of his time. Appended to the book is a list of thirty-five works dedicated to Sackville, from Etherege's *Comical Revenge* to Susannah Centlivre's *Love's Contrivance*, showing the range and extent of his prestige, and including works by Otway, Crowne, Shadwell, Dryden, and Congreve. A useful and reliable guide for the student through a welter of detail very completely assembled, Harris presents his wealth of material in a sober fashion, and the gay wickedness of the Restoration rakes, far from dazzling the reader, only occasionally warms the frigidity of the author's style. He has, however, given us an able, competent, and balanced performance which no student of the Restoration period can afford to ignore.

If the portrait of Sackville is presented in sober colours, it is recognizably robust, whereas that of Congreve in his latest

[1] *Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset: Patron and Poet of the Restoration*, by Brice Harris. Univ. of Illinois Press. Urbana. pp. 269. $3.50.

biography is so sicklied o'er with the pale cast of respectable virtues in a valiant effort to rehabilitate his reputation as a man as rather to disguise than emphasize the original lineaments. In *William Congreve the Man*, John C. Hodges[2] professes to add nothing directly to the mass of critical appreciation already available, but he attempts to make possible 'a more discerning and more sympathetic reading of Congreve by bringing from fresh sources new information about the boy and the man'. In pursuance of this laudable endeavour the author has discovered eight new letters, though it cannot be said that any of them is vitally significant, and four new portraits. Among the most interesting of the MS. sources hitherto neglected is the Trinity College, Dublin, Buttery Book. The chapters on Congreve's life in Ireland are well worth attention, but the author's naïve approach to his subject is almost everywhere conspicuous and capable of overflowing into trite and unnecessary redundancies. Hodges might have consulted the work of W. J. Carlton on Timothy Bright, physician and shorthand-writer, Congreve's ancestor; and he might have discovered that the theorbo, Bright's favourite instrument, far from being a 'flute-like' affair, was a smaller tenor lute. Misprints throughout give the impression of haste in an enthusiastic, partisan, labour of love which would have profited from revision of detail, some pruning, and rather more light and shade.

The colour lacking in these two books is supplied in *The Rochester–Savile Letters, 1671–1680*.[3] Here is the true Restoration flavour—sharp, crisp, and spicy. Here, in these thirty-three letters brought together for the first time to form a consecutive correspondence, is the amorality, the wit, the scandals, and the lively gossip of an age not always unconscious of its failings.

This is a careful and neat piece of editing, in the course of which Wilson has laid at least one whiskered ghost of wickedness—the 'mock christening' of Rochester's son, which even Brice Harris has repeated, the explanation being apparently too simple to have been grasped before by what seems 'the wilful

[2] *William Congreve the Man: A Biography from New Sources*, by John C. Hodges. New York: M.L.A.A. London: O.U.P. pp. vii + 275.

[3] *The Rochester–Savile Letters, 1671–1680*, ed. by John Harold Wilson. Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press. pp. ix + 127.

ingenuity of blundering'. Savile writes, awkwardly, 'My most deplorable excuse was made why I was not at ye Christning of my Ld Wilmot by my Ld Buckhurst & Sedley'; it was not the 'Christning' which was performed by Buckhurst and Sedley, but the 'deplorable excuse' for Savile's absence from the no doubt decorous ceremony.

The contemptuous attitude of these court wits to professional poets—Rochester writing of Dryden: 'He is a Rarity which I cannot but be fond of, as one would be of a Hog that could fiddle, or a singing Owl'; and Savile lightly dismissing Waller's works in the words, 'Hee has found noe more applause from them then I doubt Mr. Butler will from a third volume of Hudubras hee has newly putt out, whereby it is humbly conceived that a muse is apt to decay towards four score as well as other mortalls', while urging Rochester to 'take the opportunity to show us that five and twenty is much a better age for poetry'—is, by a pervasively generous and youthful cynicism, extended to themselves in Rochester's phrase, 'I have seriously considered one thinge, that of the three buisnisses of this Age, Woemen, Pollitics & drinking, the last is the only exercise att wch you & I have nott prouv'd our selves Errant fumblers'.

Wilson is to be congratulated on providing a useful and excellently documented source-book of hints and hearsay for the historian; and for the student of literature a picture, Hogarthian in colour and detail, of a gracefully graceless type of man of letters whose riotous Rake's Progress touched occasionally the confines of poetry.

In an interesting study of *Henry Lawes*[4] 'that with smooth aire could humor best our tongue', Willa M. Evans traces the career of the composer who was also the first critic and editor of Milton, from his Wiltshire childhood and connexion with Salisbury, through his associations with the great contemporary names in music, Coperario, Campion, Ferrabosco, and Lanier; his appointments as Gentleman of the Chapel Royal and later as a Member of the King's 'Private Musicke'; his experiences as a producer, director, and composer of Court masques, and his work as an editor, to his connexion with Davenant in the Restoration,

[4] *Henry Lawes: Musician and Friend of Poets*, by Willa McClung Evans. New York: M.L.A.A. pp. xvi+250. 15*s*. 6*d*.

when, as an ageing man, his star had paled before the prevalent taste for French music.

Miss Evans remarks in her Introduction that 'students of literature may find that an understanding of Lawes' compositions is essential to a full appreciation of the lyrics of the period', and we should have been greatly indebted to her had she found it within the scope of her book to work out in rather more detail the relation between verse and music. We know that the principle of Lawes's work as a composer was that notes should emphasize the meaning of words, and that he was aware of the musical possibilities of the English language. We are told, in a footnote, that he made, according to general opinion, a great mistake in subordinating notes to words, since this can result in the effect of a recitative. We are informed that for the past three hundred years his distinction has rested more on his selection and preservation of good poetry than upon his settings for his 'airs and dialogues'; and that he was capable of expressing in music something personal to the poet, setting forth the sense of the poems and expressing their emotional range by skilful variations in tone and pitch. It would have been most valuable if these hints and suggestions, useful as they are, could have been further elaborated. But within the limits of her book Miss Evans has performed a notable service in emphasizing the closeness and happiness of an alliance between music and poetry never surpassed, perhaps, until the days of Schubert and more lately of Hugo Wolf.

René Wellek's *The Rise of English Literary History*[5] goes some way 'to throw light on the whole question of the specific character of English scholarship, and thus of the English mind in general'. The author's chief concern is with 'the theoretical reflections of those engaged in literary history, and, beyond these explicit avowals, with the underlying methods, ideals, and conceptions that governed the actual writing of the history of English literature'. This is an extremely well-informed and well-equipped book, generously annotated and provided with a most comprehensive bibliography. The chapter on the seventeenth century tracing the processes of thought which led to Warton is stimu-

[5] *The Rise of English Literary History*, by René Wellek. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, and O.U.P. pp. vii + 275. 14*s*.

lating, and the whole work, in the wideness of its scope and the clarity of its method, is a useful and noteworthy achievement.

Dryden studies for the year include a bibliographical article by James M. Osborn: *Macdonald's Bibliography of Dryden: an annotated check list of selected American libraries'* (*Mod. Phil.*, Aug. and Nov.). Osborn here sets out to trace American library copies of the books, pamphlets, and broadsheets listed by Macdonald. His search extended to ten libraries including Yale, Harvard, the Folger, the Huntington, and the W. A. Clark; and his scrupulous check list incorporates notes of additions and corrections to more than one-third of Macdonald's descriptions. It covers the Dryden canon, works attributed to Dryden, and Drydeniana, and is intended, not as a supplement to Macdonald, but as an attempt to supply notes useful to scholars, who must be greatly indebted to Osborn's 'census and additions' until a new Dryden bibliography appears.

Esmond de Beer writes in *R.E.S.* (July) on *'Absalom and Achitophel': literary and historical notes.* In the course of his interesting article de Beer points out that whereas commentators on *Absalom* have always relied for identifications on the 'Key' published in 1716 in *Miscellany Poems*, and most of the 'Key' identifications are correct, some are wrong, and some are open to discussion. The identification of Amnon is not attempted in the 'Key', and de Beer suggests an allusion to the second husband, William Fanshawe, of Monmouth's uterine sister, Mary. Agag is to be identified not with Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, but with the Lord Chief Justice, Sir William Scroggs, against whom Oates (Corah) presented articles to the Council.

In *T.L.S.* (Dec. 27) R. Jack Smith calls attention to an anonymous translation of essays by Saint-Évremond, 1687, which in the preface praises Dryden as 'sweet, elegant and sublime'.

P. D. Mundy (*N. and Q.*, March 15) writes on the Cope, Dryden, Throckmorton, and allied Puritan families, and on 'The Cumberland ancestry of John Dryden' (April 26), connecting the poet's family with Cumberland and correcting some errors in the Dryden pedigree published in *Some Spenser problems* (*N. and Q.*, March 22). The same writer in *Recent work on Dryden* (*N. and Q.*, Sept. 6), suggests that the Grolier Club portrait reproduced in Osborn's

Dryden: Facts and Problems is not the poet, but in all probability Otway, traces Dryden's connexion with 'young Mr. Rogers of Gloucestershire', and corrects a mistake in the Dryden family tree. Jonathan Dryden was the nephew and not the brother of Sir Erasmus.

Pepys makes but a brief appearance this year. *Mariner's Mirror* (Jan.) has a short article by the late Edwin Chappell (ed. by Donald Dale) on *The Likenesses of Samuel Pepys*, in which the writer discusses the portraits of Pepys by the 'paynter' Savill. In *N. and Q.* (March 1) Donald Dale, from Chappell's papers, reviews in *Samuel Pepys and Tangier* Pepys's account of the expedition to Tangier; and in *Pepysiana and the bombed city of London* (Jan. 18) writes of St. Bride's and Trinity House. In two concise articles (*N. and Q.*, Nov. 1 and 8) on *The early life of Pepys 1632–3–1659* Dale relates in outline all that is known of the first twenty-seven years of the diarist's life. C. Wanklyn (*N. and Q.*, Jan. 18) brings to notice a Tangier document signed by Pepys and preserved in Lyme Regis Town Hall, calling for workmen to build 'peers' at Tangier Harbour.

Dale's brief note on Oldham portraits, *The likenesses of John Oldham* (*N. and Q.*, Feb. 8) may also be mentioned here.

The Bodleian Library Record (Dec.) includes a note, *Pepys designs a Book-Plate.* A letter in MS. Ballard 46 (fol. 145) from Robert Dale at the College of Arms to Arthur Charlett, Master of University College, Oxford, 1692–1722, discloses the fact that Samuel Pepys was responsible for the chief features of Charlett's book-plate.

Relevant here is John Summerson's article on *The monuments in the church of St. Nicholas, Deptford* (*Mariner's Mirror*, Oct.), in which he describes the monuments to maritime adventurers (including Edward Fenton and George Shelvocke, whose story of the albatross Wordsworth passed on to Coleridge), to ship-builders (including Peter Pett and Jonas Shish, at whose funeral Evelyn was a pall-bearer), and the monuments closely associated with Evelyn.

Further reference may be made to the article (see p. 157) by Joan Bennett, *An Aspect of the Evoluiion of Seventeenth Century Prose* (*R.E.S.*, July), in which she discusses the retreat from the

arts of rhetoric towards a formulated ideal of exact correspondence between words and things. She defines the new purpose of the prose writer as an effort to deal with verifiable matters of fact in an appropriate style, and allies this new purpose in writing to the new purpose in preaching and natural philosophy. The relation between the new thought and the new style is best seen by comparing Tillotson's prose, with its intentional lack of images and marked rhythmic pattern, with the rich, passionate cadences of Donne.

In *M.L.Q.* (March) Laurence M. Price writes on *Holland as a Mediator of English-German Literary Influences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* Holland, with its two centres of intellectual interchange, Leyden and Amsterdam, where the broadest toleration prevailed, and where students and travellers flocked and refugees found a home, was the gateway whereby English literature entered Germany.

Gertrude E. Noyes in *The Development of Cant Lexicography in England 1566–1785* (*S. in Ph.*, July) traces, in a careful article, the beginnings of the cant dictionary from Harman, Greene, and Dekker, and the advance in technique through the works of Richard Head and Elisha Coles, together with *A new dictionary of the terms ancient and modern of the canting crew*, by 'B.E., Gent.', to the publication of Grose's dictionary in 1785.

Reference may here again be appropriately made to R. C. Bald's article on *Shakespeare on the Stage in Restoration Dublin* (see Chap. VII, pp. 114–5). From an examination of nine plays in the Folger Shakespeare Library, all dismembered from the third Folio with MS. cuts and annotations for use in the theatre, Bald has been able to identify the company concerned as that of the Theatre Royal, Dublin, in whose repertory Shakespeare had an established place, the textual changes in the plays showing the prevailing passion for improvement '.

R. M. Lumiansky, writing (*M.L.N.*, April) on *Blair's Edition of 'The Unhappy Favourite'*, which was noticed in *Y.W.* xx. 120–1, proposes, by a convincing reference to the *Chapbook*, the reading of 'Refuge' for 'Revenge' which would elucidate a difficult passage in *The Secret History of Queen Elizabeth*, the source of the play.

Arthur Mizener, following a MS. note of Anthony Wood, suggests the Duke of Buckingham as the author of *Though Phyllis your prevailing charms* (*M.L.N.*, Nov.).

From material in the P.R.O. Arthur M. Coon, in *Izaak Walton a Stationer?* (*M.L.N.*, May) puts forward the suggestion that during the Interregnum Walton may have dealt in printers' stores.

J. Harold Wilson in a note *Rochester's Buffoon Conceit* (*M.L.N.*, May) refers this phrase of Sir Carr Scroope's to a short satiric poem of fourteen lines, presumably by Rochester, entitled *The Earle of Rochester's Conference with a Post Boy 1674*, from a MS. volume in two late-seventeenth-century hands now at the Ohio State University Library.

In *Nahum Tate, Laureate: Two Biographical Notes* (*M.L.N.*, Dec.) H. F. Scott Thomas draws attention to Tate's ill-health and his attempt to secure a new patron in Charles Howard, third Earl of Carlisle.

Thomas Driburg in *Faithful Teate: Forgotten Poet* (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 18 and 25) writes on the father of the Laureate, Nahum Tate, his interest being aroused by a collection of verse entitled, *Ter Tria: or the Doctrine of the Three Sacred Persons*, first edition 1658, second edition 1669. S. C. Roberts (*ibid.*, April 19) contributes interesting biographical notes on Faithful Teate.

Among the holograph letters which have come to light in the library of St. Michael's College, Tenbury, Worcs. is one from Edmund Waller to his cousin Walter concerning his repudiation of his wife to obtain release from prison (*T.L.S.*, Sept. 13). The poem on *The taking of Ramme by Leiftenant General Rumny* beginning

> Now had the Sun sunk in his liquid bed
> And sable Night had either Camp o'erspread,

there attributed to Waller, is shown by Esmond de Beer (*T.L.S.*, Sept. 27) to be an impossible attribution. Waller died in 1687, and the poem deals with Henry Sidney, Earl of Romney, who did not obtain the title till 1694.

XII

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

By Edith J. Morley

If the quantity of material to be noticed this year is smaller than has usually been the case, there is certainly no falling off in quality. The output of standard texts is a matter of congratulation to all concerned with their production in these difficult times, and the critical work published also includes valuable contributions to scholarship.

The Section opens as it did last year with the latest additions to the Blackwell edition of Swift.

Vols. x and xi of *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*,[1] edited by Herbert Davis, appear out of sequence close on the heels of vols. ii and iii (see *Y. W.* xxi. 187–8). The irregularity may be due to the war, but if so, it is the only sign that this excellent edition is suffering from present conditions, nor does it afford any cause of complaint to the reader who may even prefer to possess at the earliest opportunity the two works to which Swift owed his greatest contemporary recognition. The Introduction to the *Drapier's Letters* gives a lucid account of the political turmoil in Dublin between the years 1722 and 1725. Swift's intervention began in 1724 when he wrote the first *Drapier Letter*, 2,000 copies of which were distributed in the month of March. In it Swift told 'the Plain Story of the Fact' and proposed his plan of action. The second Letter answered the report of the London Committee which had inquired into the legality of Wood's patent; the third, addressed to the nobility and gentry of Ireland, was a more detailed examination of the report. The fourth, *Letter to the Whole People of Ireland*, is mainly a repudiation of the alleged slander that the Irish wished to shake off their dependence on the Crown of England. This was followed by the Proclamation against the Drapier, the trial of the printer, and Swift's *Seasonable Advice to the Grand*

[1] *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. by Herbert Davis. Vol. x. *The Drapier's Letters and Other Works 1724–1725*. pp. xxxii + 222. Vol. xi. *Gulliver's Travels, 1726*. Introduction by Harold Williams. pp. xliv + 316. Blackwell. 12*s*. a volume. £8. 8*s*. set of 14 volumes.

Jury. The fifth Letter (Dec. 14) professed to be a humble apology for the earlier pamphlets; the sixth, *An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament*, was not merely concerned with the coinage but also drew attention to many other Irish grievances. Before it was published, the cause was won and the patent surrendered.

In addition to the *Letters* and other matter in the main part of the volume, it includes in Appendixes various articles on the subject attributed to Swift, the Addresses against Wood's Patents, and Reports, &c., concerning them. The textual notes show what care has been devoted to secure a sound text, a task first undertaken by Davis in his O.U.P. edition of the Letters in 1935 (see *Y.W.* xvi. 285–6). His collations in the present edition are of outstanding importance to the student.

The volume containing *Gulliver's Travels* also gives the variant readings of the main editions, printing from the text of Faulkner's edition of 1735 (though the date 1726, that of its first publication, is given on the title-page). The textual notes are as detailed and accurate as those in *Drapier's Letters*. The choice of text is explained by the statement that it represents Swift's final revision. In the Introduction Harold Williams makes a brief but masterly comparison between the satire in *A Tale of a Tub* and in the *Travels*, showing that by the time he wrote the latter Swift 'had learned that restraint which is far more effective than exuberance and the play of lightning'. He makes the point, too often overlooked, that 'the fourth part of *Gulliver's Travels* is, in actual fact, an exaltation of virtue. . . . Gulliver, an average man, amazed the Houyhnhnms because he was so much better than the Yahoos' who represent 'man fallen from grace, and not as he sometimes is, or can be'. Williams also calls attention to the fact that while Swift was often indebted for some of his incidents to books of imaginary travel, he invariably makes of what he borrows 'something different and wholly his own'. Finally, the Introduction traces the history of the composition of the *Travels* from the first inception until the book was ready for publication.

These two volumes fully maintain the standard reached in those which had previously appeared in this edition.

The merits of Walter Graham's collected edition of Addison's

Letters[2] are obvious and outstanding. Here are printed 702 letters in comparison with the 200 given by Bohn. 'Four hundred and twenty-eight letters . . . are published in as complete a form as possible. . . . Two hundred and seventy-four are presented in abstracts'; the brief history of the correspondence tells us that more than 280 of those printed in full appear for the first time and that of those given in abstract 'fewer than fifty have been listed before'. The acknowledgements for permission to use unpublished materials prove the range and extent of Graham's labours and the scattered nature of his sources. It is improbable that much, if anything, is likely to be found to supplement his collection.

It is also true that the text is reproduced with meticulous care and that the editor explains the method he has adopted and consistently observed. As far as it is possible he reproduces the contractions, spelling, and punctuation of the originals and endeavours to retain 'the individual flavour of Addison's letters'. Indeed he believes—what is not always borne out by the text—that Addison's use of contractions 'indicated degrees of familiarity or informality not otherwise expressed'.

But granted these merits, the editor's work yet leaves a good deal to be desired, whether by scholar or ordinary reader. In the first place the annotation is much too sparse. The editor is apparently less interested in the political and constitutional than in the literary history of this country. But few of Addison's letters are of a personal nature and to his literary labours they contain scarcely a reference. Almost the whole correspondence is concerned with Addison's work as a politician: consequently a full account should have been provided of both the course of events and the public personages mentioned in the letters. To give but a single example, Mrs. Masham is merely named in a footnote on p. 92 as being the 'Bed-chamber woman' who is mentioned in a letter to the earl of Manchester. There is no hint of her influence with the Queen, nor is the reference expanded when we hear in a subsequent letter of 'the lady I formerly mention'd' who 'maintains her Post still in spight of opposition'. Indeed there is nothing to connect the two allusions. Very many similar omissions are noticeable, and when

[2] *The Letters of Joseph Addison*, ed. by Walter Graham. O.U.P. pp. xxxvi + 528. 30*s*.

biographical details are given they are not invariably reliable. Nor can the index be trusted as a guide to such footnotes as appear. A final omission to be regretted is that in the list of Letters there is no indication of the source used for each nor which is printed for the first time, though this information is available scattered above the individual letters.

The value of Graham's edition rests upon its exhaustive collection and accurate presentation of the Letters. The labour entailed must have been enormous, and though, as the editor acknowledges, little or nothing is added to the portrait of Addison as a man, it has resulted in 'the revision or documentation of accepted facts about him'. We may not agree that he becomes 'a more human figure—less coldly correct and unapproachable', but it is indisputable that we now have the opportunity to make his intimate acquaintance as a man of affairs in the pursuits to which he devoted the major part of his time and energies. 'Mr. Spectator' is seen in the right perspective, no longer as the principal figure on the canvas but subordinated to the official and Secretary of State.

Rae Blanchard's edition of *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*[3] fully justifies its place in the series of Oxford Letters, by both the value of the material included and by the excellence of its presentation. Steele may not rank among the greatest letter-writers of the eighteenth century: we do not go to him for the historical and social picture painted by Walpole nor for the divine chit-chat of Cowper, but he gives us in the jottings of his business life and in his hasty scrawls to wife and friends a revelation of himself and his multifarious doings that cannot be adequately obtained elsewhere. Miss Blanchard's careful collection and admirable notes provide just what is required by either the scholar or the casual reader. The only fault to be found with the volume is its division into General and Family Correspondence, for the separation of the letters into these two groups makes a cleavage which detracts from their interest. Steele's business life was not a thing apart from his personal interests: to obtain a true picture of the man we need to see him in his daily round, at home and abroad, snatching a moment from his urgent

[3] *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*, ed. by Rae Blanchard. O.U.P. pp. xxviii + 562. 35*s*.

affairs to send an excuse to Prue for breaking an appointment, or divulging to her the motives for some public or political move not elucidated to other correspondents. This may be illustrated from the year 1714, when Steele was expelled from the House of Commons for seditious libel as a result of his publication of *The Crisis*. The expulsion took place in March, and was followed in the spring of the same year by various actions against him for debt and by the consequent sale of his house in Bloomsbury Square. In the General Correspondence there is scarcely a reference to these matters; but in the Family Correspondence there are many allusions to Our Affairs (March 30) and to Steele's conduct of them, until we learn on August 4, after the Queen's death on the first of the month, that the tide has turned and he has 'been loaded with Compliments from the Regents' and 'assured of something immediately'. From then on until the end of the year, Steele confides his many projects and hopes to his 'dear Prue', but it is not until December that his letters to Lord Clare in the General Correspondence reveal any of his political associations and activities.

This is but one example of the disadvantages of the division of the correspondence into two groups. Another, of a more general and opposite nature, is the perpetuation of the legend concerning Steele's instability of character and irresponsibility by the encouragement to ignore his public work. His importance as a politician and his statesmanlike contributions to party and parliamentary affairs have been far too often underestimated by those readers of the family correspondence who took their cue from Macaulay and from Thackeray. Miss Blanchard's edition of the Letters would have been even better than it is, had she made it easier to read them in sequence and so to let them reveal all the aspects and activities of the writer. It is time to forget 'poor Dick Steele' and to see in his place the man who deserves the respect as well as the affection of posterity.

Finally it should be noted that the present edition contains twenty hitherto unprinted letters or notes by Steele and seven addressed to him not previously published. Unhappily the editor has not succeeded in finding any letter from Steele to Addison and only one (no. 38) from Addison to Steele. That of April 19, 1712, facsimiled and printed in Graham's edition of

Addison's *Letters*, p. 268, is not included by her as she had not been able to see it.

In a note prefixed to the third edition of the *Life*, Boswell announced his intention to publish a complete edition of Johnson's Poetical Works 'in which I shall with the utmost care ascertain their authenticity, and illustrate them with notes and various readings'.

That intention he did not carry out, nor has any subsequent editor undertaken the task adequately until now. It is therefore with peculiar satisfaction that we welcome *The Poems of Samuel Johnson*,[4] produced by David Nichol Smith and Edward L. McAdam, who have carried out Boswell's abortive project as completely as possible. The new edition is not likely to be superseded, since it could not be bettered whether in respect of text, examination of authenticity, record of history and variants, or necessary annotation. Moreover these modern editors have had, what Boswell could not have possessed, 'the advantage of the manuscripts and the information which have become available since his day'. The collaboration of the two workers, who started on their task independently, is justified by its results.

In the Introduction a full account is given of the known MSS. and of the previous editions of the various poems, and this is followed by a statement of the plan followed in the present volume. Johnson's MSS. or texts he is known to have revised are followed whenever they were available. For other poems the editors have had to select the version that seemed best in each case, but all variants are carefully recorded. 'Introductory notes state what is known about the occasion and composition of the poems and explain the relation of the different versions . . . they also deal with the problems of authorship. Sixteen pieces of which the authorship is doubtful . . . are printed together in an appendix, and another appendix gives a list of twenty-four poems which at one time or another have been ascribed to him wrongly or with no good reason.' Some twenty poems now included in the canon have not previously appeared in any collection of Johnson's poems and several of them have not

[4] *The Poems of Samuel Johnson*, ed. by David Nichol Smith and Edward L. McAdam. O.U.P. pp. xxvi+420. 25*s*.

before been printed. Of these the early poem *On St. Simon and St. Jude* is the most important.

The most notable innovation made by the editors is in the order of the minor poems which are arranged chronologically, irrespective of whether they are in English or in Latin (or, occasionally, in Greek). Johnson used Latin as a living language and as 'a natural medium of expression in certain moods': consequently the poems written in that language afford a valuable insight into his mind and character which is blurred if they are segregated into a separate group. It was in Latin, not English, that Johnson expressed his most intimate feelings. Thus in the poem on the final revision of the fourth edition of the Dictionary (p. 160), Johnson, in the words of his biographer, Murphy, 'gives the prominent features of his character; his lassitude, his morbid melancholy, his love of fame, his dejection, his tavern-parties, and his wandering reveries'. Murphy gives a rendering of this 'curious . . . piece'. In English, Johnson would not, nay, could not, so have unburdened himself:

> My task perform'd, and all my labours o'er . . .
> The listless will succeeds, that worst disease,
> The rack of indolence, the sluggish ease.

That all this follows close upon the *Parodies of the Hermit of Warkworth* adds poignancy to the Latin verses; which themselves elucidate the mood that produced the English doggerel. This is but a single illustration of the virtue of the editorial arrangement of the poems.

It is difficult to do justice to the annotation of the poems since examples inevitably fail to convey the right impression of consistent thoroughness. The reader is provided with everything he can need for the understanding of the poems, their origin, allusions, and background. At the same time there is nothing superfluous or fussy.

The two volumes of Walpole's *Correspondence with George Montagu*[5] constitute the ninth and tenth volumes of the Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's letters (see *Y.W.* xviii. 206–8 for vols. 1 and 2. The volumes of his correspondence with Madame

[5] *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with George Montagu*, ed. by W. S. Lewis and Ralph S. Brown, Jr. Yale Univ. Press and O.U.P. 2 vols. pp. lvi + 418 and viii + 560. £4. 14*s*. 6*d*.

du Deffand were not received for notice.) It may be said at once that they fulfil in every respect the hopes inspired by the first instalment of this great work of American scholarship, and the promise there made to supply a correct text, to include the letters received as well as written by Walpole, and to provide adequate annotation.

Walpole's letters to Montagu are usually regarded as 'of more general interest than are those written to any other correspondent', partly because of the picture they give of the daily life and background of eighteenth-century 'society', partly because of what W. S. Lewis calls their 'gaiety'. Now that for the first time we are able to read Montagu's contribution to the correspondence, we can understand why there should be an easy, light-hearted tone of familiarity in these letters which is absent from most of Walpole's correspondence. He and Montagu belonged to the same 'set'; they had been to school and college together, and, though Walpole was by some four years the younger, their friendship had begun at Eton. Youthful jokes, allusions and reminiscences are scattered through the pages: the two men share the same interests and move in the same aristocratic Whig circles, their type of wit and humour, their very modes of expression are similar. 'Much of what in Walpole's style we find most Walpolian can be traced, it now seems clear, to George Montagu.'

The correspondence between the friends covers some thirty years (1736–70) and consists of 449 letters, of which 262 are Walpole's and 187 are Montagu's. Many of Montagu's and a few from Walpole are still missing, and 'the correspondence as it now stands is very one-sided up to 1760'. The letters which remain have by great good fortune been preserved together, and are printed from photostats of the originals which came into the possession of the dukes of Manchester at Kimbolton Castle. They are here normalized in spelling and capitalization, and headings are given for letters obviously missing. Passages omitted on grounds of impropriety by earlier editors are restored, and errors of both dating and misreading are corrected. The annotation is full and satisfactory, so that all necessary commentary is available to the reader. Finally, an analytical Index, by Warren H. Smith and Mrs. R. G. Gettel, which runs to over 200 pages in double columns, completes an admirable edition.

Richard Boys has produced an edition of Dyer's *Grongar Hill*,[6] a poem which has waited long for adequate treatment. The editor gives a full history of the text, the earliest version of which was written when Dyer was a boy. Since the date was 1716, this was of course in heroic couplets. The next attempt was in Pindarics and was printed in Savage's *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations*. There are also several forms of the poem in so-called 'octosyllabics' (a mixture of eight- and seven-syllable lines) and the variants are here faithfully recorded. The Pindaric version is reproduced and, for purposes of comparison, *The Country Walk*. The editor thus justifies his claim that 'very few eighteenth-century poems have left such a clear trail of development behind them', and it is of undoubted interest to see the poet's progress from the early, halting efforts to the mature strength of final achievement. The critical commentary is of less value and novelty than the study of the texts, but has the merit of not over-estimating the worth or influence of the poem. Boys concludes his labours with a list of anthologies in which *Grongar Hill* has appeared, a Selected Bibliography, and an exhaustive index.

Joseph Manch, in his thesis on Swift's attitude to women,[7] has made out a good case for his belief that the Dean was 'woman's friend and champion, not her enemy and detractor'. The writer examines Swift's prose and verse as well as his relations to individual women, and succeeds in showing that his most trenchant satire is directed to the improvement of female education and is inspired by faith in women's capacity and character when these are given a chance to develop. In Swift's day, as Manch shows, the legal and social position of women necessarily resulted in the abuses and weaknesses which he hoped to remedy by his attacks on them.

In his dissertation on *Gray as a Literary Critic*,[8] H. W. Starr's careful investigation corroborates Oliver Elton's opinion that

[6] *Grongar Hill*, by John Dyer, ed. by Richard C. Boys. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press and O.U.P. pp. xiv + 114. 10*s*. 6*d*.

[7] *Jonathan Swift and Women*, by Joseph Manch. Univ. of Buffalo Studies. Vol. xvi. no. 4. pp. 135–214. 50 cents.

[8] *Gray as a Literary Critic*, by Herbert W. Starr. Univ. of Pennsylvania and O.U.P. pp. vi + 144.

'Gray, ranging over literature, tasting, valuing, understanding better than any man of his time' never published his ideas except casually in notes and letters. Indeed Starr goes further and is able to maintain that Gray held a low opinion of the function of criticism. He did not lead a revolt against contemporary rules and conventions: he ignored or rode roughshod over them, since 'Rules are but chains, good for little, except when one can break through them'. Starr considers that it is in his conception of imagination that Gray is most markedly in advance of contemporary thought. He also lays far more stress on the emotional effect produced by literature than on any other quality. His attitude is that poetry is an end in itself and that its main purpose is to give pleasure. Nor does he ever confuse moral and literary excellence.

The absence of an index is the chief defect of the otherwise useful bit of work accomplished by Starr.

This is not the place, nor is the writer qualified to discuss in detail, Norman Kemp Smith's important analysis of *The Philosophy of David Hume*[9] to which it is nevertheless necessary to call the attention of students of eighteenth-century literature. The author contends that it was 'through the gateway of morals that Hume entered into his philosophy' and that he was greatly influenced in his attitude by the conclusions of Francis Hutcheson in his *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* and his *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections*. Kemp Smith endeavours to prove that the interpretation of Hume's teaching depends on our realization that 'his philosophy did actually originate in his preoccupation with moral questions'. 'Hume's ethics is the most *stable* part of his philosophy', and 'to the end Hume held fast with whatever misgivings, and his associationist theories apart, to the principles and assumptions proper to his system'. 'Hume's ethics is integral to his general philosophical outlook, and stands or falls together with it.'

The argument falls into four parts—the Origins of Hume's Philosophy (in Hutcheson, Newton, and Locke); Preliminary Simplified Statement of Hume's Central Doctrines, taken mainly

[9] *The Philosophy of David Hume*, by Norman Kemp Smith. Macmillan. pp. xxiv + 568. 25*s*.

in the order of their exposition in the *Treatise* and *Enquiries*; Detailed Consideration of the Central Doctrines, taken in what may be presumed to have been the order of their first Discovery; concluding with The Final Outcome.

W. K. Wimstatt's study of *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson*[10] sets out less to discover new facts than to relate the form to the meaning which it has to express. Throughout he accepts the theory of the identity of style and meaning, and analyses the varieties of diction and illustration from this point of view. From the detailed examination of Johnson's rhetoric and style as a means of expression, the writer endeavours 'to reach a clearer notion not only of the expression but of the mind from which it proceeded'. The essay is closely packed with matter and does not lend itself to summary. But it merits attention from all who hold with Newman that 'style is a thinking out into language' and believe that though 'meaning is not identical with words' yet 'a detailed study of style can be fruitful'.

Wimstatt has produced a stimulating little work by an original method of critical investigation.

James L. Clifford presents us with the first full-dress life of *Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale)*[11] for which we have waited so long. For while much has been written about her relations with Johnson, with Queeney, and with Piozzi, there has not previously been any adequate attempt to deal with her complete personality. Clifford's painstaking and exhaustive work explains the omission. Mrs. Thrale, concludes her present biographer, 'was a bundle of contradictions, a chameleon changing colour with her varying surroundings': consequently the complexities of her nature are ill-represented by over-much concentration on any one period of her life or on her relations with any one individual or group of people. Clifford is certainly not guilty of any such lack of proportion in his treatment. He has searched the libraries of this country, of Italy, and of U.S.A. for 'all the extant Piozziani'; and he has obviously enjoyed the thrills of the discoverer as well as the opportunity afforded him to be-

[10] *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson*, by W. K. Wimstatt, Jr. Yale Univ. Press and O.U.P. xvi+166. 18*s*. 6*d*.

[11] *Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale)*, by James L. Clifford. O.U.P. pp. xx+492. 21*s*.

come acquainted with his subject and with her background. As he puts it: 'A difficulty . . . is sometimes a challenge.' In this instance it has been accepted and successfully met in so far as was, in the nature of the case, feasible.

Clifford has waded through the huge mass of Mrs. Thrale's extant correspondence (2,500 of her own letters and 2,000 addressed to her) and journals: he has read in MS. *Thraliana*, 'the six volume diary and commonplace book' now edited by Katherine Balderston; he has consulted her so-called *Children's Book* and the unpublished five-volume literary autobiography compiled for her adopted son. He has displayed admirable discrimination in determining the relative value of sundry types of evidence, and he has shown no trace of a factious desire to differ from commonly accepted opinion. Consequently his conclusions bear the stamp of truth which the reader is predisposed to accept. His description of the girl, Hester Salusbury, and her early years, his account of her second marriage and her old age contribute to what is felt to be a recognizable portrait of a woman interesting in herself and not merely in relation to other people. She appears not only as the 'Mistress' of Streatham, or the infatuated widow who threw herself at Piozzi, but as a human being, worth attention apart from all the controversies that have raged around her memory.

She is as much the central figure of this book as is Johnson of Boswell's *Life*, and it is no exaggerated compliment to give Clifford credit for something approaching similar industry in the collection of his material and a similar sense of proportion in its employment.

Criticism is disarmed by Richard D. Altick's frank confession that in spite of 'very genuine affection' for the subject of his thesis, *Richard Owen Cambridge: Belated Augustan*,[12] 'I cannot bring myself even to pretend to find much greatness in him'. This refreshing admission of an attitude all too rare among 'researchers' for academic distinctions is the prelude to a sound but light-hearted account of an admittedly minor writer. Even of *The Scribleriad* Altick concludes that the respect which it enjoyed in its own day was less the result 'of its own continuing

[12] *Richard Owen Cambridge: Belated Augustan*, by Richard D. Altick. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press and O.U.P. pp. 160.

vitality' than 'of personal liking for its author'. 'And it resides on the shelves of libraries to-day, utterly forgotten except by those occasional scholars who must have a sampling of everything that the eighteenth century read and discussed.' Cambridge was probably more successful as a periodical essayist than as a poet, but his chief achievement was not as a man-of-letters. 'He wished to be remembered as a friend of men and women rather than as a writer; and in the former role he fully deserves remembrance.'

'Although a secondary writer, Charlotte Smith[13] has her place and is worthy a record.' It is, however, questionable whether, except in a doctoral dissertation, this need occupy 564 pages, plus an appendix, bibliographies, and index which bring the total number up to 634. Florence Hilbish has accomplished her task with enthusiasm and industry, nor does she over-estimate the achievement of her 'poet and novelist'. But she shows unnecessary zeal in tracing influences and drawing analogies, sometimes with rather ludicrous results: e.g. 'A more remote influence upon Mrs. Smith may be Mrs. Alphra [*sic*] Behn, who, far ahead of her time introduced . . . three elements, two of which lay dormant until the time of Charlotte Smith, namely the negro slave and brief descriptions of scenery. The third element, that of plunging straight into her story, was utilized by other novelists earlier than Mrs. Smith.' This quotation is a not unfair example of the style of the thesis, which also suffers from frequent grammatical lapses. It is a pity that Miss Hilbish did not reduce and recast her book before publication: in its present form, its merits are likely to be overlooked by the reader.

In *The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England*,[14] Donald Stauffer makes a valuable contribution to literary history and the analysis and evolution of a literary *genre*. His erudite survey of his chosen subject is distinguished by critical acumen as well as by mastery of detail so that there is no

[13] *Charlotte Smith: Poet and Novelist (1749–1806)*, by Florence M. A. Hilbish. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press and O.U.P. pp. x + 634.

[14] *The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England*, by Donald A. Stauffer. Princeton Univ. Press and O.U.P. 2 vols. pp. xiv + 572 and viii + 293. $8.50 or 51*s*.

likelihood that his work will be superseded. It is therefore regrettable that the author has thought it necessary to pour out the whole contents of his note-books in what appears to be an attempt to follow Wordsworth's injunction to give all he can, when by better arrangement and compression he could have made his points clearer. As it is, the quotations are so full and so frequent that he seems to waver between the compilation of a biographical anthology and an exposition of the art of biography. This is so much the case that it is difficult to follow his argument: indeed, this often deviates into an account of individual biographies and ceases altogether to be historical. Stauffer's wood is lost among the trees, and this is a real misfortune when the foliage is so rich and varied. Even the final chapter of the history, which runs to a hundred pages and is entitled 'The Trend of Biography', does not clearly disclose the general direction and tendency of the art. Like the rest of the volume it is packed with good and entertaining matter, but much of this is not to the specific purpose.

Generally speaking, probably as a result of this central weakness of structure, Stauffer's accounts of individual biographers are more satisfactory than his historical survey. His section-headings, e.g. 'Biography and the Romantic Spirit'; 'Knowledge Infinite (Eccentrics and Antiquaries)', betray something of his difficulty with the arrangement of his material; and an examination of the contents of separate chapters does little to reconcile us to the artificial grouping, or to help us to a conception of the development of biography as a literary 'Kind'.

On the other hand, over and over again during the perusal we delight in the author's dissections of his examples and are grateful to him for his unlaboured introductions of personalities hitherto unknown to us. Stauffer's immense amount of information is presented with the minimum of pedantry and the maximum of critical insight.

In his *Three Tours through London*,[15] W. S. Lewis has once more proved his knowledge of the eighteenth century, this time in a way that gives him more scope for originality of method, if

[15] *Three Tours through London in the Years 1748, 1776, 1797*, by Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis. Yale Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xii + 135. 15*s.* 6*d.*

not for more scholarship, than was offered by his edition of Walpole's Letters. He describes London from the point of view of a tourist—himself—in the three years 1748, 1776, and 1797, and since tourists, 'however diligent and eager . . . are not after all expected to see everything', he is able to confine himself to those aspects of the town which he finds most striking. The resulting essays, first delivered in the form of lectures, present a vivid picture of some of the more arresting differences between the town in the three selected years and the London of to-day; and the fact that he rigidly confines himself to particular dates prevents the kind of generalized confusion so often evoked by an attempt to present a complete view of a century which was full of change and development. Every detail given is verified by references to the source from which it is derived, so that the effect of the whole is completely convincing. It is regrettable that the illustrations, in themselves well-selected, are so badly reproduced and inadequately documented.

Life in Eighteenth Century England[16] is the fourth of a series of portfolios designed to give a survey of cultural history through reproductions of selected works of art with explanatory captions and an interpretative booklet. The Boston Museum of Fine Arts, which is responsible for the venture, envisages the ultimate production of one hundred portfolios to illustrate the development of human culture from the earliest times. If Robert Allen's number may be regarded as representative, the series should be of high value to students. His explanatory booklet contains in thirty-two pages an admirable epitome of English life, history, art, and literature, followed by a list of records of eighteenth-century music and a brief bibliography of useful books on the period. The forty plates are excellently reproduced and cover every aspect of life, commerce, art, and letters. The portfolio merits wide popularity.

A paper by N. Hardy Wallis on '*Fugitive Poetry*'. *An Eighteenth Century Collection* appeared in the volume of *Essays by Divers Hands*[17] noticed above. Wallis describes a Miscellany compiled

[16] *Life in Eighteenth Century England*, by Robert Allen. A Portfolio of 42 plates + booklet of 40 pp. Museum of Fine Arts. Boston: U.S.A. $5.20.

[17] See Chap. I, p. 12.

by John Bell towards the end of the century—the exact date is not given. It consists of six volumes of Epistles, Elegies, and Odes—a few of them by well-known poets such as Johnson, Parnell, Beattie, and the Wartons. But the Miscellany is chiefly interesting as proving 'to what levels of bathos the writers could descend'. Some of the chosen examples are delightful from this point of view but there are also quotations which are genuinely poetic, of which the most attractive is *The Bullfinch in Town* by Shenstone's friend, Lady Luxborough.

The current volume of *Essays and Studies*[18] contains three contributions dealing with the eighteenth century. *The Real Thomas Amory* by Katharine A. Esdaile presents for the first time a portrait of the author of *John Buncle*, who is shown to be the original from which his hero was depicted. The book and its characters and incidents are proved to be to a great extent founded upon autobiographical fact. In *Landscape in Augustan Verse*, Dorothy M. Stuart writes charmingly but from a nowadays somewhat discredited point of view of the treatment of external nature by poets in the first half of the century. Her examples are selected to prove her thesis, and should be supplemented by those to be found, e.g. in *Nature and the Country in English Poetry of the First Half of the Eighteenth Century*, by C. E. de Haas (see *Y.W.* ix. 264–5). That writer's deductions differ materially from hers, and, we think, are more convincing. *Some Poetical Miscellanies, 1672–1716* by Hugh Macdonald analyses the contents of anthologies between those dates in order to illustrate changes in the poetic taste of the period.

The scope of *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction: A History of its Criticism and a Guide for its Study, and an Annotated Check List of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700 to 1800*,[19] by Philip B. Gove, is fairly indicated by this description on its title-page. It is an attempt to 'organize and epitomize . . . all the relevant critical material' and 'to demonstrate by cumulative evidence that the imaginary voyage constitutes an organic, shifting division of fiction, recognizable, but indefinable as a static, fixed,

[18] *Essays and Studies*, by Members of the English Association, ed. by Arundell Esdaile. Vol. xxvi. pp. 112. 7*s*. 6*d*.

[19] *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction*, by Philip Babcock Gove. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. pp. xiv + 446. 23*s*. 6*d*.

and exclusive genre'. Part One is concerned with 'A History of the Criticism of the Imaginary Voyage', and deals with such matters as the use of the term 'imaginary voyage' and its application in critical discussion. Part Two consists of the check list of 215 imaginary voyages in the eighteenth century, arranged chronologically, irrespective of language. It contains 67 English examples, 65 French, 59 German, 10 Dutch, 5 Danish, 5 Swedish, 2 Italian, 1 Latin, and 1 Japanese. This summary typifies the careful scholarship which has gone to the compilation of a volume upon which future workers in the same field will certainly come to rely for help in their investigations.

The current (jubilee) issue of the *Burns Chronicle*[20] prints two letters from the poet, the first of which is reprinted from the *Scots Magazine*, Jan. 1937; the other, no. 273 in the Clarendon Press edition, is there described as 'MS. not traced'. It is here reprinted from the MS. Among other contributions are *The Death of Burns. His Final Moments: His Last Words. An Unpublished Account*; *Forgeries of Burns Manuscripts: The Cause Célèbre of 'Antique Smith'*, by John Clarke; and *Prototype of 'Dr. Hornbrook', John Wilson, 1751–1839*, by J. C. E.

We are glad to welcome *Comparative Literature Studies*,[21] a brave war-venture under the general editorship of Marcel Chicoteau and Kenneth Urwin. The second issue includes *inter alia* the first half of an article by the former: *Note sur la Suisse alèmanique et les pèlerins anglais de Joseph Addison à William Wordsworth*. In this he shows that few English travellers in the eighteenth century did more than traverse German Switzerland while they were, on the contrary, attracted to French Switzerland with its free institutions and liberal culture.

In *D.U.J.*, vol. xxxiii, no. 2. A. Lytton Sells writes on *Oliver Goldsmith's Influence on the French Stage.*

The Autumn issue of *English*, vol. iii, no. 18, contains an essay by G. Wilson Knight *On Eighteenth-Century Nationalism.*

[20] *Burns Chronicle and Club Directory.* Second Series. vol. xi. The Burns Federation, Kilmarnock. pp. viii + 132. 3*s.*

[21] *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. ii. Cardiff: Priory Press Ltd. pp. 27. 4*s.* 6*d.*

In *E.L.H.* (June) Rae Blanchard, writing on *Pope's 'Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day'*, gives grounds for dating the poem as early as 1711 by reference to the correspondence between Pope and Steele, and particularly to a letter from the former of December 1712.

In *Library*, Dec. 1940–Mar. 1941, Robert E. Brittain writes on *Christopher Smart in the Magazines.* In the same periodical (June) Jeremiah S. Finch has an article on *Sir Hans Sloane's Printed Books*, noticed below (Chap. XV, 232).

In *M.L.N.* (Jan.), Louis L. Martz has an essay on *Tobias Smollett and the 'Universal History'*; M. M. Shudofsky describes (Feb.) *An Early Eighteenth-Century Rhymed Paraphrase of 'Paradise Lost', II*; in April there is a note by Earl Wasserman on *Moses Browne and the 1783 edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher.* Frederick A. Pottle examines (May) *The Dark Hints of Sir John Hawkins and Boswell*; William C. Holbrook discusses (Nov.) the use of *The Adjective 'Gothique' in the XVIIIth Century* and shows that it was never used like the English equivalent, to imply the ghastly or superhuman: Walter R. Irwin describes *An Attack on John Fielding*, and Dixon Wecter locates and publishes two letters by Johnson and one by Boswell in a note entitled *Dr. Johnson, Mrs. Thrale and Boswell.* In the same periodical (Dec.) W. H. Miller writes on *The Authorship of 'A General View of the Stage'*, which he ascribes to Thomas Wilkes.

In *M.L.R.* (July) Gilbert Highet advances the thesis that *The Dunciad* 'is obviously a failure' by reason of the choice of subject, the complexity of structure, and the awkwardness of tempo. Howard P. Vincent contributes (Oct.) a note on *Henry Fielding in Prison.*

N. and Q. contains the following on the dates specified: April 12, *The Birth and Parentage of William Combe*, by F. Montgomery; and *Thomas Coxeter the Younger to Dr. Johnson* (an unpublished letter of 23 April 1771), by James L. Clifford; May 3, *Some Notes on the Twickenham Pope*, by George G. Loane (Replies: May 17, B. H. Newdigate, and June 14, Geoffrey Tillotson); May 17, *Thomson's Subscription 'Seasons'*, by John E. Wells; and *Collins's 'Young Damon of the vale is dead'*, by

P. L. Carver; Aug. 2, *Cowper's Mr. Gregson*, by E. A. Barnard; Aug. 23, *Johnson: A Slip in Latin Poetry*, by V. R.; Nov. 15, *Johnson, Boswell and Grattan*, by V. R.; Nov. 22, *Sources of David Mallet's 'Mustapha, a Tragedy'*, by Herbert W. Starr.

In *P.M.L.A.* (Mar.) Robert E. Brittain in a paper entitled *An Early Model for Smart's 'A Song to David'* suggests Smart's authorship of an unsigned poem, *The Benedicite Paraphrased*, which appeared in Dodsley's *Museum* of 6 December 1746. In the same periodical (June), Louis L. Martz writes on *Smollett and the Expedition to Carthagena* and contrasts his treatment of the subject in *Roderick Random* where he is satirical, with those in his *Compendium of Authentic and Entertaining Voyages* and in his *Complete History*.

In *P.Q.* (Jan.) is a paper by John R. Moore on *Defoe and the Eighteenth Century Pamphlets on London*. In *S. in Ph.* (Jan.) he suggests *A New Source for 'Gulliver's Travels'*.

In *R.E.S.* (Jan.) D. Nichol Smith examines *The Early Version of Shenstone's 'Pastoral Ballad'*, showing the extent of the revision it underwent before attaining its final form. The early version survives in a transcript by Percy in his copy of the collected edition of Shenstone's *Works*, 1764. In the same issue, Luella F. Norwood discusses *The Authenticity of Smollet's 'Ode to Independence'* and gives evidence 'establishing beyond doubt' his authorship. A. T. Hazen has (April) a Note on *The Cancels in Johnson's 'Journey' 1775*; and Norman Ault a letter on *Pope's 'Lost' Poems*. Ault contributes an article (Oct.) on *Pope and Addison* in which 'in the light of much new evidence' he re-examines the history of the 'Atticus' lines and their relation to the *Epistle to Mr. Addison*. In the same issue, John R. Moore publishes a note on *Defoe's Religious Sect* in which he concludes that 'as far as Defoe had a religious denomination . . . it was Presbyterian'.

The following have appeared in *T.L.S.*: Feb. 1, *A Passage in Gibbon*, by J. H. Vince; and *Ambrose Philips*, by Mary G. Segar (Replies: Feb. 22, F. W. Bateson; March 8, Mary G. Segar); Feb. 22, *Gibbon's Syntax*, by E. Harrison; March 1, *The Game of Ombre in the 'Rape of the Lock'*, by F. W. Bateson (Replies:

March 8 and 29, Dermot Morrah; March 15, Montague Summers; March 22, Geoffrey Tillotson); March 8, *Popes 'Lost' Poems*, by Norman Ault; April 5, *A Gothic Bibliography*, by Montague Summers (Replies: April 19, Alec Craig; May 24, Montague Summers); *William Blake*, by Ruthven Todd; and *A Chatterton Edition*, by P. H. Muir; June 28, *Chatterton's Last Days*, by E. H. W. Meyerstein; Aug. 2, *Burns's 'Clarinda'*, by W. Forbes Gray; Aug. 16, *Baretti's 'Carmen Seculare'*, by R. W. Chapman; Oct. 4, *Swift's Secret*, by W. S. Kerr; Nov. 29, *Swift's Secret*, by Harold Williams.

XIII

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

I

By Dorothy Margaret Stuart

'It was not to be thought of that the flood' of books would flow freely during the years of war. Already in 1941 a progressive shrinkage became noticeable. No outstanding literary biography and—with one exception recorded later—no monumental work of literary criticism was in that year devoted to any writer of the period here under survey. Against this may be set the sustained interest and enthusiasm shown in periodicals on either side of the Atlantic.

The new psycho-analytical technique was carried a stage farther by one of its pioneer exponents, G. Wilson Knight; Coleridge, Shelley, and Keats are subjected to his invisible scalpel in *The Starlit Dome*.[1] As Desmond MacCarthy has truly said, 'application of psycho-analysis to biography and criticism inevitably narrows down the subject to a clinical case'; and those who care—or can bear—to see the souls of great poets thus clinically disintegrated will find much to please them in this book.

In complete contrast is Dame Una Pope-Hennessy's agreeable set of essays, *Durham Company*.[2] Byron, Wordsworth, Scott, and Surtees are set in clear relief against the background of some part or other of the County Palatine, and there they are studied in a leisurely and sympathetic manner, with just enough, and not too much, appropriate quotation from their works.

Of these four the first two figure prominently in *The Athenaeum: a Mirror of Victorian Culture*,[3] by Leslie A. Marchand. This is a detailed and well documented chronicle of some fifty

[1] *The Starlit Dome*, by G. Wilson Knight. O.U.P. pp. 314. 16*s*.

[2] *Durham Company*, by Una Pope-Hennessy. Chatto and Windus. pp. 223. 7*s*. 6*d*.

[3] *The Athenaeum: a Mirror of Victorian Culture*, by Leslie A. Marchand, Univ. of North Carolina Press and O.U.P. pp. xii+411. $3.50.

years in the history of 'the first literary paper to make honesty its aim'. Many of the Victorian judgements cited are illuminating—for example, when Thackeray is rebuked for his 'preference for the unpleasing' and warned to 'beware of banter', while Tennyson is kindly pardoned for the weakness of his Wellington *Ode* on the grounds that it was 'a hurried composition'. In spite of a few inaccuracies and the occasional use of such idioms as 'coverage', it is a useful book.

Almost as much interest was shown in Jane Austen's back as in her books. R. W. Chapman wrote (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 11) under the heading *Jane Austen's Back*, quoting the evidence of Anna Lefroy that 'in the sketch of Aunt Jane sitting out of doors there is a great deal of resemblance', even though 'the Figure only is attempted', and affirming that this sketch is 'in all probability almost all we have of an authentic portrait'. A week later both J. N. M. and T. Erskine Swanzy noted a curious point of contact between Chapman's letter and one in the same issue from Enid Starkie on *A Line in Baudelaire*. The line contained an allusion to '*Constance*', i.e. that 'Constantia wine' mentioned in *Sense and Sensibility*.

V. R. raised *A Botanical Point* from Chapter XIII of *Emma* (*N. and Q.*, Feb. 15), and suggested that it was an alder, not an elder, that was 'looking as if it must soon be coming out' when Frank Churchill came to Randalls in the spring. On 22 February he was dealing again with the enigmatical tree; and on 8 March both E. J. W. and William Harcourt-Bath defended the accuracy of Miss Austen's observation on the ground that it was the leaf and not the blossom of the elder that Emma had in mind.

M. H. Dodds and T. C. C. reopened (April 12) the question as to whether youthful gentlewomen of the Jane Austen period 'might run with propriety', and gave relevant instances, Dodds adding corroborative evidence from Mrs. Ewing's *Six to Sixteen*. H. W. Crundell had a note (May 31) on the phrase 'pride and prejudice', commonly supposed to have been borrowed by Miss Austen from Dr. Lyster in Fanny Burney's *Cecilia*, but used earlier by Jeremy Taylor in a passage on Anger in *Holy Living and Dying*. This passage appeared in an anthology in 1805 'and may have been seen there by Miss Burney'—a queer slip, as *Cecilia* was published in 1782—so 'why not by Miss Austen

also?' R. H. followed (June 21) with an example of 'pride and prejudice' from Gibbon's chapter on Roman slaves and another from some lines written by Mrs. Piozzi in 1791. R. W. Chapman corrected (April 12) an error of his own in his edition of the *Letters* when he had sought to convict Miss Austen of error concerning the date of Michaelmas.

A second volume of J. G. Tait's new edition of Sir Walter Scott's *Journal* (1827–8) was published by Oliver and Boyd, but was not available for notice in *Y.W.*

In *M.L.N.* (April) there was a paper by Raven I. McDavid on '*Ivanhoe*' *and Simms*' '*Vasconselos*', demonstrating how the American novelist, after abandoning his own particular field (south-western Carolina in the Revolutionary period) for that of Havana at the close of the Age of Chivalry, borrowed details of plot and action, as well as the general *mise en scène*, from Walter Scott. Of greater interest to English students was J. R. Moore's article (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) on *Defoe and Scott*. 'The influence of Defoe on Scott', he says, 'is not more remarkable than the influence of Scott on Defoe's literary reputation': and he notes that when Scott quoted Defoe it was usually from memory, with small resulting variations in the text. Parallel passages are given, the most impressive being those which show Scott's indebtedness to Defoe when writing *The Pirate*.

W. M. Parker contributed an 'Antiquarian Note' to *T.L.S.* (Jan. 4), with facsimile of MS., on Scott's prologue to *Helga or the Rival Minstrels*, an unsuccessful play by Sir George Mackenzie, produced at Edinburgh in 1812. H. G. L. K. answered (*N. and Q.*, Feb. 8) a question as to the persons known to have been in the secret of the authorship of the Waverley Novels, and gave Lockhart's list of such persons, adding evidence from Miss Aikin's diary that as early as 1815 'the secret was being probed in London'. W. H. J. gave (Feb. 22) further instances, including a passage in a letter from Croker to Lockhart, 1820; and on 29 March, St. V. T. added Mr. and Mrs. Charles Mathews to the company of those who were already 'in the know' in the year of Waterloo.

Lawrence Phillips continued to seek information in *N. and Q.* as to knotty points in the novels and to receive an appreciable

amount in response. Two questions relating to *Quentin Durward* were answered by St. Vincent Trowbridge (March 15), and two by T. C. C. (April 19). On *Redgauntlet* answers were forthcoming from E. J. G. Forse (Aug. 9) and Philoscotus (Dec. 12). On *The Betrothed*, *The Chronicles of the Canongate*, *The Highland Widow*, and *The Two Drovers* Forse was able to throw a certain amount of light (Aug. 16); and Hibernicus on *The Talisman* and *Aunt Margaret's Mirror* (Sept. 13).

Philoscotus pointed out (April 19) that though Scott quoted no less than four times from Rowe's *Fair Penitent*, Act I, Scene I,

> At length the morn and cool indifference came,

not once did he succeed in reproducing it correctly. Hippocleides was curious (April 26) as to Rob Roy's invocation of 'the soul of St. Maronoch' (chapter xxxiii); and E. J. G. Forse supplied (May 10) biographical details concerning this disciple of St. Columba and patron-saint of Kilmarnock. It was Hippocleides also who noted (July 28) that in *The Highland Widow*, Scott, instead of using Thomas Campbell's spirited version of *Hybrias the Cretan*, gave 'a paraphrase rather than a rendering, omitting several details which Campbell gives'. Charles Duffy then suggested (Sept. 20) that Fitz-James's lines in *The Lady of the Lake* (Canto IV, xix) indicate that Scott may have been familiar with the original. Campbell himself attracted only one sign of attention—a short correspondence on the date of his marriage (*N. and Q.*, Feb. 8, March 1, and May 3).

Walter Scott and the Unseen World formed the subject of a query from Philoscotus (*N. and Q.*, Aug. 9). Friedländer, in his *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, has a footnote giving Eberty's *Leben Walter Scotts* as his authority for the statement that Scott believed that the souls of good men acted as guardian spirits, but this is not corroborated by the *Journal*, 10 December 1825. H. G. L. K. advanced (Sept. 20) the interesting theory that Friedländer had confounded Walter with Reginald Scott. Reginald's belief that 'famous men after death become tutelary spirits to places they had loved when in the flesh' is summed up by Sir Walter in *Demonology and Witchcraft*, Letter IV.

An interesting paper by H. G. L. K. (*N. and Q.*, Aug. 23) on *Sir Walter Scott's Nephew, William Scott* threw fresh light upon

this illegitimate son of Scott's feckless brother Daniel. On the more human and personal side lovers of Scott must have read with pleasure the note by N. (*N. and Q.*, March 1) that the construction of the Abbotsford chimneys was such that no 'climbing boys' were needed to keep them free from soot: *teste* a letter to Joanna Baillie, February 1824.

Either because he glimmers with the reflected glory of his father-in-law or because he has found so active a 'producer' as A. L. Strout, J. G. Lockhart is getting an ever larger share of critical attention. An interesting article by C. L. Clines (*M.L.N.*, Feb.) on *Disraeli and John Gibson Lockhart* gave some new letters, from the Hughenden archives and other sources, illustrating the relations between the older man and the younger, with special reference to the abortive *Representative* newspaper and J. G. L.'s 'side-wind sneer' at *The Young Duke* when reviewing Morier's *Zohrab* in the *Quarterly Review*, XLVIII.

Lockhart and Croker (*T.L.S.*, Aug. 30 and Sept. 13) by A. L. Strout contained, among other interesting items, some extracts from letters in the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan. These support Strout's view that, far from having forced Croker gradually out of the *Quarterly*, Lockhart desired his assistance, regretted his secession in 1825, and was 'only too happy to get him back again' in 1831–2. Strout was also the writer of the article (*N. and Q.*, Jan. 11) on *Lockhart and John Scott*, giving the text of a curious broadside (in the National Library of Scotland) in which there is 'an exudation of Whig venom' taking the shape of a mock-antique ballad chronicling the dispute between the editors of '*Maga*' and the *London Magazine*.

A query (*N. and Q.*, March 15) as to whether Lockhart's novels were worth reading elicited a long reply from H. G. L. K., giving analyses of plots and characters, and quoting Saintsbury to the effect that Lockhart 'is one of those who seem to miss their due meed of fame'.

One cannot help wishing sometimes that A. L. Strout would compile a sort of *Who's Who* of the Abbotsford circles, inner and outer, which he knows so well. He had informative papers on *James Hogg's 'Spy'* (*N. and Q.*, April 19 and Nov. 29 and

on *The Authorship of the Review 'On Hogg's Memoirs' in Blackwood, 1821.* All the evidence seems to indicate that John Wilson was the author of that scurrilous review. In *N. and Q.*, Dec. 13 and 27, there were two groups of *Miscellaneous Letters to, from, and about James Hogg*, presented by Strout. To him, too, we owe the text of an undated 'poem' in the National Library of Scotland, *The Ensign's Tear*, signed with the name of 'Timothy Tickler', one of the most popular characters in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ.*

Scholars in the United States were not starved of paper so early or so severely as their English colleagues, and a book as monumental as Raymond D. Havens's *The Mind of a Poet*[4] was still possible in 1941. This, as its subtitle tells us, is a *Study of Wordsworth's Thought with particular reference to the 'Prelude'.* The first of its three sections consists of ten chapters analysing various aspects of the poet's mind and of his poetical development, starting from his 'Matter-of-factness' and ending with his 'Imagination': the second or middle section of eight chapters provides a close commentary on the *Prelude*: the last and briefest, 'The Ministry of Wonder', continues and completes the commentary. Each chapter in each group is copiously documented, and the whole book forms a useful (if ponderous) companion to the edition of de Selincourt—an editor to whom Havens offers well-merited bouquets.

Havens states that 'a strong case has been made against Garrod's dating of the *Prelude* by Mr. O. H. Bishop', but he does not mention Sockburn as the most likely alternative to Racedown as the place of the poem's inception. Bishop himself dealt with the problem in *The Origin of the 'Prelude' and the Composition of Books I and II* (*S. in Ph.*, July), and set out firmly to re-establish the earlier view that Wordsworth formed the design of writing a poem on his own life in the summer–autumn of 1799, when he and Dorothy were staying with the Hutchinsons at Sockburn, Co. Durham—the visit is delightfully described in Dame Una Pope-Hennessy's *Durham Company*, Chapters II and III (see above, p. 193). De Selincourt accepted Garrod's identification of Racedown as the house mentioned in

[4] *The Mind of a Poet*, by Raymond Dexter Havens. Johns Hopkins Press and O.U.P. pp. xviii + 670. $5.00.

the preamble, thus fixing the genesis of the *Prelude* in 1798 at Alfoxden: but Bishop now brings forward convincing arguments in favour of Sockburn.

Douglas R. Angus contributed to *M.L.R.* (Oct.) a note on the relationship of Wordsworth's *Immortality* Ode to Ruskin's Theory of the Infinite in Art, suggesting that when Ruskin formulated this theory (*Modern Painters*, Vol. II) he had the poem continually in mind.

In an article on *Wordsworth and Blake* (*Dublin Review*, April) Charles Williams pointed out that both in the *Prelude* and in *Jerusalem* there is presented 'a great Form in one sense or another answering to England'. *Haydon's Letter arranging for Keats to meet Wordsworth* was discussed (*N. and Q.*, May 10) by T. O. Mabbott, who gave the rest of an unpublished letter from Haydon to Monkhouse. This clears up the hitherto obscure point as to whether the two poets met twice or once only in December 1817, and makes it practically certain that they met twice. L. N. Broughton had an Addendum (*P.M.L.A.*, June) to John Edwin Wells's article on *Wordsworth and de Quincey in Westmorland Politics* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec. 1940). Here a missing letter, at the existence of which Wells had only guessed, is brought to light and fitted neatly into its proper place.

E., under the heading *A Critic of Wordsworth*, asked (*N. and Q.*, Nov. 15) what critic it was that reprimanded Wordsworth for saying that his heart danced with the daffodils. Hibernicus, in reply (Nov. 29) cited Anna Seward as being among 'those who could not stand those daffodils'.

E. H. W. Meyerstein drew attention, in a letter headed *Wordsworth and Coleridge* (*T.L.S.*, Nov. 29), to the identity between the fragment of an ode, *Beauty and Moonlight*, given by de Selincourt in his 1940 edition of Wordsworth's *Early Poems*, and Coleridge's *Lewti or the Circassian's Love Chant*, first printed as a whole from the British Museum MS. in 1899. He gave reasons for regarding the extended version as the joint work of Wordsworth and Coleridge, 'or more properly perhaps an elaborate re-handling by the latter of one of the former's juvenile pieces'. A week later there was another communication from him on the same theme, and one from James R. Sutherland

a week later still; finally, on 20 December, de Selincourt himself accepted Meyerstein's view, gave further examples of Wordsworth's indebtedness to Coleridge, and pointed out that another Wordsworthian poem attributed to S. T. C. underwent treatment similar to that applied to *Lewti*.

B. G. Brooks contributed to *The Nineteenth Century* (July) an article, *The Young Wordsworth*, inspired by de Selincourt's edition of the *Early Poems*.

A phrase from *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, the 'sole Arabian tree', inspired an article by Sir Osbert Sitwell (*T.L.S.*, April 26) from which sprang a correspondence lasting, off and on, till 16 August. Coleridge figured prominently in the article and in its immediate sequels. Sitwell's whimsical identification of the 'Person from Porlock' as a recurrent poltergeist 'destined to wake all poets from their divine trances' is worth remembering.

Henry Pettitt in *Coleridge's 'Mount Abora'* (*M.L.N.*, May) suggests that light may be thrown upon this Mount by an entry concerning 'Abur, a mountain in Arabia' in the Rev. Clement Cruttwell's *New Universal Gazetteer*, London, 1798.

Perhaps the most noteworthy piece of Coleridgean criticism was in *R.E.S.* (Jan.) on '*A woman wailing for her demon-lover*', by Thomas Copeland. This is described as 'a suggestion in the nature of a note to Lowes's *Road to Xanadu*'. Lowes does not propound any theory as to the origin of the demon-lover, and 'Kipling's comment throws out only astral hints'; but Copeland suggests that the germ of the image may lie in the *Book of Tobit* upon which Coleridge was meditating an essay about the time *Khubla Khan* was written. An interesting comparison is made with *Paradise Lost*, Book IV, where the description of Eden is prefaced by allusions to 'Asmodeus and the spouse of Tobit's son'.

Coleridge's *Wanderings of Cain* and Blake's *Death of Abel* were added by T. O. Mabbott (*N. and Q.*, Aug. 23) to the long list of poems in which those brothers appear.

In *M.L.N.* (May) Varley Lang, in an article on *Character in the Elia Essays*, argues that 'character delineation forms the backbone of the Elia Essays'. 'Sometimes in his eagerness Lamb drags in characters by the ears to the detriment of the structure of his essays': for example, when he leaves G. D.

'suspended between life and death' while a character-sketch of the doctor is interpolated. E. G. B. in *Notes on the Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb*, Lucas's edition (*N. and Q.*, May 10), gives an unpublished acrostic on the name 'Sarah Lachlan' written in that lady's album opposite a painting by Emma Isola. A note *On Charles Lamb's Grave* by A. H. W. Fynmore appeared on 1 November.

W. R. Niblett discusses *Hazlitt's Contribution to Literary Criticism* (*D.U.J.*, June). After describing the formative influences on him of Priestley, Hartley, Coleridge, and others, Niblett claims that the body of Hazlitt's criticism between 1817 and 1830 forms the first important survey of English literature after Johnson's *Lives*. While suffering from defects due to political or personal prejudice, inaccurate historical knowledge, and a tendency to rhapsodic outbursts, Hazlitt's criticism 'gains its essential excellence from the penetration of his own self-knowledge; he is never far from analysing his own consciousness and character'.

Southey has long suffered from rather more than merited neglect, but one sees signs that the eclipse is passing. In *S. in Ph.* (Jan.) Frank Taliaferro Hoadley had an article on *The Controversy over Southey's 'Wat Tyler'* (1794) showing how this immature work of a young poet 'inflamed by American and French radicalism', being published in 1817, when Southey's opinions had become much modified, 'served as a windmill which leading Whigs, Tories, and Republicans alternately charged and defended'. Among the controversialists were Hone, Hazlitt, Brougham, Coleridge, and Jeffrey, and the repercussions of the tumult touched Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats. Hoadley casts an interesting floodlight on a hitherto obscure patch of literary history.

C. L. Clines, writing in *R.E.S.* (Jan.) on *The Correspondence of Robert Southey and Isaac D'Israeli*, throws some light on the character of each, though the interest is historical rather than literary. Finally, T. Edward Munce, Jr., contributed a note on *Southey and Marston* (*T.L.S.*, Oct. 25) in which he tracked a remark of Southey's (recorded by Coleridge) to Marston's *Scourge of Villanie*.

Byron provides an exception to the general rule that people who are themselves theatrical are not 'good theatre'. It is difficult to write a dull book about Byron. Peter Quennell has written one the reverse of dull in his *Byron in Italy*.[5] Besides following the noble poet's moral and social fluctuations in vivid detail he attempts (perhaps not quite so happily) to examine the English Romantic poets from 'a new and dispassionate standpoint'—also a difficult thing. By the way he seeks to trace back to the influence of Romantic literature 'some of the maladies with which the present generation is infected'—a very fashionable line of research at the moment. Whether one agrees as to the source and nature of the alleged infection or not, this is a stimulating book. It is a little curious (in view of the above claim made boldly on the jacket-'blurb') that the Index should contain no single entry under 'Romantic Revival' or 'Romance'; even the 'Romantic Catastrophe' (pp. 262–74) remains unindexed, though it is the most provocative and not the least important section from a purely literary angle.

Stephen A. Larrabee, writing in *M.L.N.* (Dec.) on *Byron's Return from Greece*, demonstrates, with the aid of C. R. Cockerell's *Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant* and the Elgin papers, that Byron sailed from the Piraeus on 22 April 1811, aboard the ship bearing the Elgin Marbles. Neither of these sources of information has been utilized either by Sir John Murray in his 1922 edition of Byron's *Letters* or by any other biographer of the poet. Larrabee alludes to *The Curse of Minerva*, but omits Byron's satirical lines on Lord Elgin's 'stone-shop' in Piccadilly, filled with

> Misshapen monuments and maim'd antiques.

David V. Erdman in *Lord Byron and the Genteel Reformers* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) is concerned rather with Byron's 'political connexions and ambitions' than with his poetical activities. Together with Hazlitt, Lamb, and de Quincey, he made a brief appearance in the course of a correspondence on Figures of Speech (in this instance, the Climax) that was launched by Jane Green in *N. and Q.* (April 5) and ran on till June 17.

An English edition of Margaret Armstrong's study of Trelawney, *This was a Man*, was published by Robert Hale.

[5] *Byron in Italy*, by Peter Quennell. Collins. pp. 296. 12*s*. 6*d*.

No copy of Newman I. White's life of Shelley has been received, and it is therefore not possible to do more than record its publication in the early summer of 1941 and the review in *T.L.S.* on 21 June of that year. On 27 September Frederick L. Jones pointed out that White, like Dowden and other biographers of Shelley, had omitted to mention that in the spring of 1819 the Shelleys moved from the Palazzo Vespi to 65 Via Sistina, next door to Mrs. Amelia Curran, the artist.

Kenneth W. Cameron proposes *A New Source for Shelley's 'Defence of Poetry'* (*S. in Ph.*, Oct.) in Imlac's discourse on poetry in *Rasselas*, from which Shelley is here stated to have taken 'a series of critical principles' which he developed in accordance with his own 'romanticistic' (*sic*) mental patterns. James A. Notopoulos (*M.L.R.*, Jan.), discussing *Shelley's Translation of the 'Ion' of Plato*, restates and considers certain problems in the text, and emphasizes the importance of this translation because of the influence exercised through it upon his own theory of the nature and function of poetry.

P.M.L.A. (June) printed two distinct articles under the joint title of *Literary Sources of Shelley's 'Witch of Atlas'*, explaining in an editorial note that they were 'revised by interchange of material by their respective authors', an unusual, but in this instance successful, procedure. Carlos Baker was responsible for the first, *Spenser and the 'Witch of Atlas'*; D. L. Clark for the second, *What was Shelley's Indebtedness to Keats?* The hunt for subconscious memories, analogies, plagiarisms, &c. is 'up' once again, and it must be conceded that many of the affinities noted in Baker's essay are sufficiently striking. Una, 'circummured by an aura', is seen as the direct ancestress of the Witch; and the interesting point is made that into the seventy-fourth stanza of *The Witch of Atlas* Shelley condenses Spenser's beast-fable of the Fox and the Ape from *Prosopopoia or Mother Hubberd's Tale.*

D. L. Clark's aim in the second of these twin-articles is to examine Shelley's indebtedness to Keats as set forth in J. L. Lowes's article (see *Y.W.* xxi. 217–18), and 'to go beyond to the probable literary sources' of the *Witch of Atlas.* Evidence is adduced, supported by an imposing array of dates and references, to prove that when Shelley wrote his great poem he had

not even seen the little volume sent to him by Keats in August 1820, and further, that (*Hyperion* always excepted) his opinion of Keats as a poet was so low that it seems unlikely that he would have found 'much worthy of his imitation' in the 'diction, imagery, or phrasal patterns' of his poetry. Clark shows that many of the phrases and images cited as being derived from *Endymion* had in reality been used by Shelley himself in his earlier works, or were echoes from other poets, ancient and modern, beginning with Euripides and ending with Southey.

Shelley's Use of Gray's Poetry was dealt with (*S. in Ph.*, March) by F. J. Glasheen, whose array of examples makes a better impression than many of the solemnly-proffered instances of verbal echoes of which recent criticism has been so productive. Of especial interest are the points of resemblance between the *Elegy* and *Queen Mab*. 'None of Shelley's first-rate poetry reveals the influence of Gray', says Glasheen, marked though that influence may be in his weaker work.

Julia Cluck's article, *Elinor Wylie's Shelley Obsession* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) is mainly a consideration (more serious than English critics might be inclined to concede) of *The Orphan Angel* and other works by the same afflicted writer who in her later years 'came to have the hallucination that she was a reincarnated Shelley'.

In *N. and Q.* (May 17) B. H. Newdigate had a note on Shelley's silver whistle, coral and bells in the collection of relics bequeathed by Lady Shelley to the Bodleian.

Keats was one of the few major English poets of this period to whom a book was entirely devoted. His biographer, Betty Askwith,[6] having found previous lives of him 'either too dry or too sentimental', determined to do the thing as she felt that it should be done. Her hero is not the poet of whom Tennyson said that, if he had lived, 'he would have been the greatest of us all'; it is the 'gay, tragic, sprightly little figure about whom so very little has been written'. We are invited to contemplate, not the writer of *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, but the lover of Miss Brawne. This is surely 'writing up' rather than 'writing about'. Yet the book is full of vitality, and may possibly attract some

[6] *Keats*, by Betty Askwith. Collins. pp. 288. 12*s*. 6*d*.

hitherto uninterested persons with the result of making them read Keats's poetry for themselves.

Uncertainty still attaches to the exact dates of his birth and death; and Harold E. Briggs, replying (*P.M.L.A.*, June) to Pershing's previous article (see *Y.W.* xxi. 216) had a note *On the Birth and Death of Keats.* According to this note, the first date is still unsettled, the second almost certainly 24 February.

Impassioned discussion of *A Line in Keats* (the eleventh in the sonnet *To Sleep*) broke out on 8 March in *T.L.S.* when C. Archer queried the word 'lords' and suggested 'hoards' as an alternative. Laurence Binyon wrote (March 29) citing M. Buxton Forman's note on p. 339 of his edition of Keats's *Letters* (1935) to the effect that his father had declared that the reading 'hoards' should 'unhesitatingly be adopted': yet in the 1906 Oxford Edition of the *Poems* he reverted to 'lords' as given by him in his edition of 1886.

R. W. King (also on March 29) pointed out that of eight or nine texts printed since 1901 only W. T. Arnold's 'Globe' edition (1908) gives 'hoards'—the version in Woodhouse's two transcripts. Attention was drawn to the fact that in the massive Oxford edition of 1939 Garrod sticks to 'lords' on the evidence of a Keats's holograph, in spite of his avowed confidence in Woodhouse as a copyist. On the same day E. H. W. Meyerstein argued in favour of 'lords', with examples from Spenser and Chatterton as well as from *Endymion.* H. W. Garrod supported Meyerstein strongly (April 12), analysing the MS. sources and citing another example from *Endymion.* Finally the correspondence was closed by Meyerstein (April 19) with additional evidence in favour of his (and Garrod's) reading.

W. W. Beyer in a note *On the Date of Keats's First Letter* (*N. and Q.*, Sept. 27) pointed out the difficulties with regard to the date affixed by M. Buxton Forman in his edition of the *Letters.* Forman later (Nov. 8) acknowledged that his dating was wrong.

Malcolm Elwin's full-dress biography of Walter Savage Landor[7] opens with a long extract from that chapter of *Bleak House* in which Lawrence Boythorn makes his characteristic entrance,

[7] *Savage Landor*, by Malcolm Elwin. Macmillan. pp. xxi + 498. 18*s*.

half-gentle, half-tempestuous. Truly, as the author remarks, 'the time is overdue to reveal Landor before Boythorn'—and not only before, but after, and distinct from, that noisy, if amiable, Titan. Even in these pages, where a conscious effort is made to disengage them from each other, the figure of Walter all too often casts upon the page the shadow of Lawrence. Forster's official biography and Sidney Colvin's monograph in the English Men of Letters Series present only daguerrotype profiles of their subject: now we have him carved in the round, and not only carved, but touched with dabs of colour as were the statues of Praxiteles and Phidias. New sources of information have been tapped, and there are other tinted images in the gallery, all life-size and most of them lifelike. It is a pity that long irrelevancies, some of them highly controversial, have been allowed to obtrude themselves so frequently.

R. H. Super's article, *Extraordinary Action for Libel: Yescombe v. Landor* (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.) should be read in conjunction with Elwin's fourteenth and fifteenth chapters, which it complements. It is a squalid story and not really relevant to the study of Landor as a man of letters, even if it be true that in fairness to him 'the matter should be set forth as completely as possible'. Robert F. Metzdorf contributes an Addendum to the above article, *A New Landorian Manuscript*, recently discovered in the Charles A. Brown collection at Rochester, N.Y. It is a hitherto unknown MS. of the pamphlet, *Mr. Landor's Remarks on a Suit Preferred against Him.*

A welcome addition to the Clarendon Series of English Literature was *Robert Browning: Poetry and Prose*,[8] edited by Sir Humphrey Milford. Stewart W. Holmes applied the new psychoanalytical method to this poet in *P.M.L.A.* (Sept.) when he wrote on *Browning's 'Sordello' in the Light of Jung's Theory of Types.* This is yet another quest for analogies—this time an unconscious parallelism, as the two works are separated by something like a century, and it is not suggested that Jung ever read *Sordello.* But Browning and Jung both describe 'the *malaise* of the modern civilized world' and define its causes. Moreover, each commends the same cure—'the exploration of

[8] *Robert Browning: Poetry and Prose*, ed. Sir Humphrey Milford. O.U.P. pp. xv + 203. 3*s.* 6*d.*

the psychic life'. The poet would no doubt have endorsed the view of the psychologist that 'man is never helped in his suffering by what he thinks for himself but only by revelations of a wisdom greater than his own': yet he might have been considerably astonished to find his poems interpreted by the light of this latest

dark lanthorn of the spirit
Which none sees by but those that bear it.

Pippa Passes has hitherto been regarded as one of the most original of Browning's poems, but Frederic E. Faverty (*S. in Ph.*, Jan.) in *The Source of the Jules–Phene Episode in 'Pippa Passes'*, traces at least this part of the work to 'a plot which held the public interest throughout the entire nineteenth century, appearing first in story-form in 1801, later in Bulwer Lytton's dazzling theatrical success, *The Lady of Lyons*'. Faverty considers that Lytton's play is the demonstrable source of the Jules–Phene passages, and suggests that Browning may also have consulted the source used by Lytton, *The History of Peronron or the Bellows-Mender*, translated from the French by Helen Maria Williams, first edition, Dublin, 1801. In *Some Additional Sources of Browning's 'Saul'* Henry W. Yocom suggested (*N. and Q.*, July 26) Josephus, Hilman's *History of the Jews*, and a musical drama, *Faustus*, published in 1829.

The Dating of Browning's Conception of the Plan of 'The Ring and the Book' was discussed by P. Cundif (*S. in Ph.*, July). The view is here supported, with evidence from Browning's letters to Miss Wedgwood and Isa Blagden, that the plan as well as the moral purpose of the poem was conceived 'upon first reading the *Old Yellow Book* in 1860', though the actual writing of it may not have been begun till 1862, the year in which Browning visited the Pass of Roland. Finally there was a letter, *Browning Vindicated*, by A. R. Barbour (*T.L.S.*, Dec. 13), referring back to Frederick Page's letter in *T.L.S.*, 20 May 1940 (see *Y.W.* xxi. 225).

Charles Dickens was the central figure in two widely dissimilar studies. Mary L. Brecker, conductress of the Readers' Guide column in the *New York Herald-Tribune*, in *Introducing*

Charles Dickens,[9] attempts to do for the novelist what he himself did for Gadshill—i.e. to insert plate-glass windows and plant plenty of red geraniums. Her touching belief that 'everybody, sooner or later, reads Dickens and keeps on doing so' is unfortunately not verified on this side of the Atlantic; but it is to be hoped that this gaily coloured piece of propaganda may do something for some of those younglings whose eyes are still sealed.

Very different in colour and form is *The Dickens World*,[10] 'Dickens' being used as an adjective. The object of this extremely serious study is to give a simple account of the novels and minor works 'regarded as documents useful for the understanding of nineteenth-century social history in Great Britain'. Politics (as he saw them) and political economy (as he understood it) have certainly their place in what it might have been more accurate to call the Dickens background; but it seems odd at first to see his riotous works of fiction being used to illustrate the more sober and solid side of history. That it should be done at all is further evidence of his 'survival-value'. People who will not—or cannot—read him as Saintsbury said he should be read, simply for the pleasure to be derived from him, are willing and able to delve into him for 'documents'. It will be a pity if they do not snatch some enjoyment during the process.

A series of articles on the *Dickens Dietary* began in *The Dickensian* for June. They were written by T. W. Hill, and opened appropriately with *Breakfast*.

H.L.Q. (Oct.) contained *Additions to the Nonesuch Edition of Dickens's Letters* chosen by Franklin P. Rolfe from the collection (not fully exploited by Dester) in the Huntington Library. Though of unequal interest, these addenda obviously demand the attention of every future editor of Dickens's letters and chronicler of his life. Light is thrown upon his strongly-held opinions as to the relationship that should prevail between publisher, publisher's adviser, and author; upon the plot of *David Copperfield* and the downfall of Mr. Mantalini; and upon his friendship with John Leech.

[9] *Introducing Charles Dickens*, by Mary Lamberton Brecker. pp. 240. Harrap. 10*s*. 6*d*.

[10] *The Dickens World*, by Humphrey House. O.U.P. pp. 232. 10*s*. 6*d*.

Thackeray's explicit veto upon any biography of himself continues to be disregarded, and even his heirs are now ranged against him, for they have authorized J. W. Dodds to print in his *Critical Portrait*[11] some hitherto unpublished letters which—though neither discreditable nor exciting—the novelist might well have preferred to remain so. If this were a purely 'critical' portrait, these letters and a great deal of narrative based on vague data, would be irrelevant. The painter brings to his task a bold brush and a palette not ill supplied with colour; but the perspective and the detail of the English background seem a little faulty in places, and the colours sometimes jar. The chief value of his method is the prominence which it gives to minor writings and fugitive pieces, all likely to be of increasing interest to the student of social history as well as to the devout Titmarshian. Others will find helpful his analyses of the major novels and his comments on Thackeray's style.

The Brontës' Web of Childhood,[12] by Fannie E. Ratchford, is a study based upon the note-books filled by the children at Haworth Parsonage. The writer claims to have demolished three widely held theories. (1) That Bramwell Brontë could have written *Wuthering Heights*; (2) that Emily's poems reflect personal experiences; (3) that Charlotte was in love with M. Héger. Of these, the first and second propositions may seem no longer to require demolition: the third surely remains a *chose non jugée*.

An allusion (*N. and Q.*, May 10) to the centenary of Rachel's visit to England drew forth an interesting letter (June 14) from Hibernicus, with relevant quotations from Sir Henry Taylor, Charlotte Brontë, and Matthew Arnold.

H. W. Garrod's article, *Matthew Arnold's 1853 Preface* (*R.E.S.*, July), throws light upon the episode of Alexander Smith, whose poems appeared simultaneously with Arnold's and were reviewed in some quarters in conjunction with his—notably by Clough in the *North American Review*. Ian A. Gordon published (*M.L.N.*, Nov.) *Three New Letters of Matthew Arnold, 1881–2*. These were

[11] *Thackeray: a Critical Portrait*, by John W. Dodds. O.U.P. of N.Y. pp. viii + 257. $3.

[12] *The Brontës' Web of Childhood*, by Fannie Elizabeth Ratchford. Columbia Univ. Press and O.U.P. £1. 3*s*. 6*d*.

addressed to R. D. Adams, a Sydney business man with literary leanings. Clough himself made a brief appearance in the *Cain in Literature* correspondence when G. G. L. cited (*N. and Q.*, Sept. 27) his poem, *The Song of Lamech.*

Sydney Race in *The Diary of John Chapman* (*N. and Q.*, April 26 and May 17) discussed and corrected certain errors in Gordon Haight's book, *George Eliot and John Chapman*, and gave some fresh information. In *George Eliot as an Industrial Reformer* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) Walter Francis Wright traced her 'novelistic' attempts to deal with industrial issues and to 'fit economic and social progress into a cosmic pattern'.

E. G. Sutcliffe, writing on *Psychological Presentation in Reade's Novels* (*P.M.L.A.*, July), showed, among other things, how Reade's jealousy of George Eliot drove him to adopt, 'in ways more curious than admirable', the new methods of psychological analysis employed by her. Also how his tendency to 'visualize and depict human beings in terms of animal resemblances' was increased by the *Origin of Species* (though it had manifested itself before 1859) and the various ways in which it found expression.

To the memoir of John Sterling by Julius Hare and the *Life* by Carlyle, Anne K. Tuell has added a comprehensive study of him in his relation to the Victorian age.[13] In addition to the large quantity of printed material, she has been able to draw upon the store of unpublished letters in the possession of his granddaughter. She has thus thrown new light upon the varied phases of his comparatively short career—political, literary, and religious. He is presented in turn as 'the youthful Radical', the 'hierophant of German', and 'the celebrant of Art', while the latter half of the book discusses in detail his relations with the Church.

The centenary of Mrs. Juliana Horatia Ewing was marked by a sympathetic article, *Juliana Ewing's World*, in *T.L.S.* (Aug. 9).

[13] *John Sterling: A Representative Victorian*, by Anne Kimball Tuell. New York: The Macmillan Co. xii + 405. $3.50.

XIV

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

II

By H. V. Routh

Owing to obvious difficulties one of the most interesting publications of 1940 has only now become available for notice. This volume is the American centenary life of Thomas Hardy [1] (born 1840), conceived on almost ideal principles: the study of the novelist's education and experiences as far as they survive in his work. Weber has not succeeded in collecting any new material of first-class importance, but he has been able, since Hardy's death, to amplify and concentrate the facts of his career, so as to give more life and meaning to what we know of his books.

Thus we learn that Hardy not only began writing poetry in the sixties, and tried frequently and unsuccessfully to get it printed, but also that he used his unpublished verses to supply episodes for his fiction. So with *The Poor Man and the Lady*, his first experiment, which three publishers refused. It served as part basis for his next three novels. Of these *Desperate Remedies* seemed to be too complex, and *Under the Greenwood Tree* too simplified, so he tried to steer a middle course in *A Pair of Blue Eyes*. When, however, W. Tinsley, his publisher, suggested its appearance in *Tinsley's Magazine*, Hardy realized the need of contriving specially tense situations and sentimental episodes because suitable to a serial, and never afterwards abandoned the habit nor the periodicals. It is noted that *Far from the Madding Crowd* is the author's first attempt at what Christopher Julian called 'concatenated affection', that is to say, the hero loves someone, who loves someone else, who loves someone else. In *The Return of the Native*, his most perfect work of art, begins the quest of 'an hitherto unperceived beauty', as he noted in his journal. In *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, Michael Henchard (suggested by Trollope's portrait of his father in *Autobiography*) is the most forceful figure he ever created and exemplifies the idea that character is destiny. The sensationalism of the story

[1] *Hardy of Wessex: His Life and Literary Career*, by Carl J. Weber. Columbia Univ. Press. pp. xii + 302. $3.00.

is due to its appearance in *The Weekly Graphic*. *The Woodlanders* illustrates the unhappiness which may be traced to social conventions.

Weber has some interesting paragraphs on the origin of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. Hardy had in mind the social decadence of his own family and also of the Turbervilles who survived in a drunken peasant named Troublefield. He had also recently read Malthus and was impressed with the disastrous consequences of a large family linked to straitened circumstances, and shortly before must have read or seen *A Doll's House* and *Ghosts*. *Tess* is strikingly original in that the seduced woman, unlike Scott's Effie, Dickens's Emily, or George Eliot's Hetty, is the strongest character in the book.

The biographer includes some unforgettable sidelights on the character of the first Mrs. Hardy, and, what more concerns the student, a paragraph on his 'verbal awkwardness' (p. 187) in both prose and verse, due to his incomplete and self-acquired education in the classics. The many and recondite appendices might be described as a concession to American scholarship.

A Concordance[2] of Edgar Allan Poe's poetry would hardly seem to make a wide appeal to students, till one remembers that Poe, a leader of the American romantic movement, has played no small part in the development of verse-technique up to the present day. His versification should certainly interest contemporary poets. As the compilers admit, there are many studies of Poe's aesthetic theories, metrics, rhymes, and rhythms, but none of his diction which means, nowadays, the iteration of key-words, the effects achieved through the juxtaposition of vowels and of onomatopoeia. In fact Booth and Jones undertake to show us how much the sound of words, how much their association, contribute towards the inner meaning of a poem.

The reader cannot help being surprised at the excessive number of key-words, nearer four than three thousand (some, at least, merely connective tissue) and cannot help regretting that the compilers, when recording their examples of arrangement, nearly always confine themselves to a single line. However, the specialist

[2] *A Concordance of the Poetical Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, by B. A. Booth and C. E. Jones. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. pp. xiv+211. 33*s*. 6*d*.

will learn much by following the reappearance of certain schemes, and the general reader will be intrigued by these tempting and mysterious single-lines each hiding a secret which only the paragraph or the poem reveals.

One of the most questionable productions of the nineties is *A Shropshire Lad*. The retiring and acrid Latinist, who knew so little about peasant life and even less about Shropshire, produced these verses in a few months under 'pressure of excitement', yet was not in love, nor struggling against fate, nor indeed under any pessimistic inspiration which he avows. So his appearance as an artist and an artistic influence is hardly less than a phenomenon. Grant Richards should have solved the enigma in his biography,[3] but some critics complain that the bulk of the volume is devoted to reiterating that Housman was a gastronomic, an artist in wines, and that he preferred Burgundy to Bordeaux, though his friend and admirer fails to convince us that he had the temperament and personality generally associated with either beverage at its best.

The book certainly is prolix, but the practised student can with some little trouble collect the relevant data and find an answer to his question. Apparently Housman's character was embittered by certain experiences on the threshold of manhood; though nothing tragic or memorable. He was ploughed in 'Greats' and passed through a few years of financial embarrassment; greater poets have endured worse. But he was devoured with a passion to excel and was highly gifted with a sense of literary form and insight into the spirit of poetry. Thus he succeeded in making his mark in the science of textual criticism, being in sympathy with the genius of this or that Latin poet, able to divine the words which he must have used; and in 1892 he was appointed professor of Latin at University College, London. Four more years of brilliant scholarship, however, still failed to win him the fame he yearned for. But while suffering from ill health after the rigorous winter of 1895–6, and anxious to create some relaxation from a learned controversy, he amused himself with experiments in English verse, realized that his achievement was good, and saw in a flash that the reputation he sought by

[3] *Housman 1897–1936*, by Grant Richards. With an Introduction by Mrs. E. W. Symons. O.U.P. pp. xxii + 493. 21*s*.

emending ancient texts might be won at a stroke by writing modern poetry. Hence the 'excitement' which produced *A Shropshire Lad.* Richards has collected many of the criticisms which greeted its publication. The more discerning dwelt on the escape from 'those moods of luxuriant melancholy of which so much poetry of the 'nineties was the mannered expression' and commended the simplicity which was the outcome of multiplied exclusion. It was noticed that unlike Hardy he did not attempt to generalize his pessimism and present it as a philosophy; he merely repeated his mood again and again, but it never grew monotonous because re-experienced and redefined in every lyric.

There are several interesting appendixes, especially an inquiry by G. B. A. Fletcher into Housman's technique of versification, instancing his no doubt unconscious reminiscences of the Bible, Shakespeare, Arnold, Heine, the Greek and Latin poets; his 'repetitions and favourite turns', his alliterations, rhymes, and compound epithets; his verbal usages either not given in the O.E.D. or illustrated only by examples at least thirty years earlier than *A Shropshire Lad.*

Housman's most conspicuous contemporary and contrast was Kipling, now at last himself beginning to attract academically critical attention, so one welcomes an appreciation and selection by T. S. Eliot,[4] who has in his turn and for his day succeeded to their position of authority. The 'Kiplingite' will meet all his favourite poems, but he will be less gratified when he turns to the introduction. Eliot recognizes that his author sometimes means more than he appears to do, even attaining to prophetic inspiration; that at other times he tells a story, whether in prose or rhyme, which has an inner significance, such as he could hardly hope his own generation would understand, for instance *An Habitation Enforced* or *The Wish House.* But the critic insists that at heart he was a ballad maker, conveying no more to the simple-minded than could be absorbed in a single reading. Within these limits he is a superb craftsman, skilled to achieve the particular form particularly suitable to the particular theme, but not master of a consistent pattern. Consequently we cannot trace a development of poetic feeling and expression, but only

[4] *A Choice of Kipling's Verse,* ed. by T. S. Eliot. Faber and Faber. pp. 306. 8*s.* 6*d.*

a development of interest, namely from colonial life to imperialism, from imperialism to historicity. In other words he is not a poet in the truest sense of the term. He has not attempted the art which compels contemplation by the rather vague suggestiveness of music and symbol. He elicits the same response from everyone.

Does he? Eliot himself admits that 'there is always something alien about Kipling, as of a visitor from another planet; and to some readers he may still seem alien in his identification of himself with Sussex'. This comment is perhaps the most illuminating of the critic's contributions to the subject, but some others might suggest that the secret of the poet's appeal is to be found in a peculiarly canny insight into the characters of primitive men disguised as modern, a cunning familiarity with primordial human nature; and that his apparent vulgarisms and audacities of expression assume an unexpected significance and 'roominess' when we take up this attitude to his work. The twentieth-century insistence on sense confusion and imagistic symbolism may be overdone as a test of poetic art.

It would be interesting to have Richard Church's opinion. Apparently he would not be in sympathy with Eliot's aestheticisms, and at the same time he has not placed Kipling among his 'eight for immortality'.[5] They are W. H. Davies, De la Mare, Frost, Yeats, Blunden, V. Sackville-West, Eliot, and Robert Graves. His views are worth thinking over. Davies was a child in his attitude to nature, because he never tried to codify it, nor generalize into principles what he sees, hears, and smells. Frost, all compact of piety, enthusiasm, and unworldliness, has achieved in his style a 'marvellous utilization of the laconic'. Yeats was preoccupied with the doom of European civilization. Blunden has the 'gift of descriptive evocation'. T. S. Eliot began as a stranger in an uncongenial world which he treated as a bitter joke, and created an enthusiastic following thanks to the vagaries and freaks of his technique. Since then he has come to know 'Death's other kingdom' and the death which initiates a new life based on the humility of self-knowledge. Graves's 'development as a poet has been littered with his suicides. From each he has sprung to a new life—but the same poet has survived!' It will

[5] *Eight for Immortality*, by Richard Church. Dent. pp. ix+113. 6*s*.

at once be noted that Church looks for poetry in a life-long tension and quest for spiritual adjustment. The artist after the excitement of youth enters upon a bleak period of middle-age during which he must tear out the lie, the pose, the bitterness which is an excuse for wit, and learn to know and thereafter to express his soul as revealed in contact with his epoch. His old self must die. 'The more violent this death, the more agonizing this rebirth, the firmer is the poet's technique and the more personal and original his idiom.' These interpretations (so commendably distinct from the current points of view of the last twenty years) throw a flood of light on the problems of the Inter-war Period, which had only too good reason to unlearn the affectations of the Decadent School, the false emancipations of the Edwardians, and the falser cults of the Georgian epoch. Whether Church's way is the only way is another matter.

Should Conrad be judged by these standards? We get little help towards an answer from Miss Bradbrook's essay,[6] though written with intensity and thoughtfulness. It is a handy little 'companion' in which her impressions or discoveries prove to be much the same as other people's. At any rate it is well to be reminded that Conrad carefully cultivated Henry James, and that he did not usually draw character from the inside; that he could not dramatize another man's mind but maintained the 'exterior method', describing only what can be seen, rendering justice to the visible universe and the world of the senses—and yet it is remarkable how many of his personages we know *inside-out.*

Some additional light has been thrown on Masefield's development, this time by himself.[7] Perhaps because it is difficult at the present moment to concentrate upon a creative effort, he has novelized the months he spent earning his living in an American carpet factory nearly half a century ago. The uneventful story is made interesting by the sheer force of style, but also because it records the birth, though not the birth-pangs, of a talent. Masefield had intended to save enough money to study medicine and then to go out to distant and remote countries and

[6] *Joseph Conrad: Poland's English Genius*, by M. C. Bradbrook. C.U.P. pp. 80. 3*s.* 6*d.*

[7] *In the Mill*, by John Masefield. Heinemann. pp. 160. 7*s.* 6*d.*

combat tropical diseases. That aspiration eventually became the theme of *Multitude and Solitude*. Meanwhile he had acquired the habit of reading, and in the fullness of time he opened a volume of Keats.

> I knew then that life is very brief and that the use of life is to discover the law of one's being and to follow that law at whatever cost to the utmost. I knew then that medicine was not the law of my being, but the shadow of it; and that my law was to follow poetry, even if I died of it.

Of course he read many others, especially Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, du Maurier, and Crawford, but the quest for poetic beauty was his lode-star. To fulfil this quest he sailed for England and settled in London in 1897. There he learnt to cultivate Kipling, Synge, and Yeats, and when we remember first their influence and secondly the inevitable reaction, we know something about the origin of *The Everlasting Mercy*, *The Widow in the Bye Street*, and *Dauber*.

Both those Irish influences are represented in the publications of 1941. *Everyman's Library* has added to its list a volume of selections from Synge.[8] Ernest Rhys, in his too short introduction reminds us that French drama counts for much less than Irish folklore and dialect, and for that reason he was well-advised to include passages from *Aran Isles*. These excerpts, so remarkable for their restraint and implication, reveal the poet in search of atmosphere. For instance: 'The sense of solitude was immense. I could not see or realise my own body, and I seemed to exist merely in my perception of the waves and of the crying birds and of the smell of sea-weed.' Or again: 'It is only in the intonation of a few sentences or some old fragment of melody that I catch the real spirit of the island.' The poems reveal Synge in his phase of self-discovery leading to crude realism.

L. Macneice's study of Yeats[9] is more significant and more complicated. It will seem to be prolix and elusive unless the reader understands it to be the work not only of a young man,

[8] *John M. Synge: Plays, Poems and Prose*, ed. by Ernest Rhys. Dent. pp. xlii+301. 3*s*.

[9] *The Poetry of W. B. Yeats*, by Louis Macneice. O.U.P. pp. xi+242. 8*s*. 6*d*.

but of a young poet. That means of one who is still seeking or has only just found his own spiritual centre, an attitude which inspires him to reconcile his sensations to his sensibilities, and to invent myths, symbols, rhythms, and rhymes, which adequately express the fusion. This adjustment is complicated by false starts and fruitless experiments—'a development littered with suicides' (to borrow Church's phrase from *Eight for Immortality*)—partly because the literary tradition has been diversified into so many schools since Victorianism collapsed; and partly because civilization and de-civilization have profoundly modified our 'sense-data', in fact our whole experience of life, during the last thirty or forty years. Macneice obviously understands Yeats to have followed the same quest, in a similarly round-about and erratic way, trying every false trail till he has reached the true one, his chief difficulty being himself.

'A man's early poetry is not helped, but hampered by what he has read', and Yeats after cultivating pre-raphaelitism, the decadent school, nostalgia, *Weltschmerz*, frustrated love; after imposing aestheticism on the legends of Ireland, which smacked of Villon (this period culminating in *The Wind among the Reeds*, 1899); began to learn much from Synge, especially 'all that is salt in the mouth, all that is rough to the hand, all that heightens the emotions by contest'. So by 1906 he has begun to understand that the best poetry is produced when 'the dreamer is leaning out to reality' supremely engrossed with life, 'yet with wildness of the fancy always passing out of what is simple and plain'. This transition is consummated by *Responsibilities* (1914), so called because 'in dreams begins responsibility', by which he meant that the dream-world sanctions and sanctifies the real world, or, as the Irish peasant said, 'God possesses the Heavens, but He covets the earth'. The final adjustment of the Seen to the Unseen is manifest in *The Tower* (1928) and *The Winding Stair* (1933), the highest achievement of his genius, both charged with esoteric philosophy, remote symbolism, and even perverse thinking, once described as 'the ash of poetry', because he had been through the fire. Nevertheless Macneice claims with good reason that he is now exercising much influence on the rising generation because he has attained to *dryness* and *hardness*; because he has imposed form and permanence on his thought and diction, amid a world in chaos; because he has

not despaired of human nature. Thus, 'when he was young his muse was old, as he grew older his muse grew younger'.

Macneice has several times occasion to compare Yeats's development with that of other influential figures of our time, notably Rilke and especially T. S. Eliot, who is found to be less satisfying. The reader can to some extent judge for himself, as the latter [10] has edited a small volume of selections from his own prose essays, including *The Idea of a Christian Society* (1939). These excerpts were all written before the *East Coker–Little Gidding* period, but if they still enjoy their author's approval—and he has decided to reprint them—they represent a virtuoso more interested in intensity of feeling than of theme; deriving his emotions not out of living through the subject but from the ardours of composition; combining these emotions in peculiar and unexpected ways, till he discovers something in himself which he had never before experienced. As a result the poet finds that a new pattern of poetry has arranged itself. Such is the explanation of the so-called revolutions in poetry, ruptures with tradition, formation of new schools. The old hereditary creativeness works as before, and in the same spirit, but each living personality through which it passes slightly redirects its scope, thereby enlarging its function and adapting its manner. Thus with every fresh masterpiece, however un-iconoclastic, the tradition acquires a fresh significance for readers as much as for writers. The student will probably decide that this explanation is Eliot's chief contribution to the literary thought of his age—or will he decide that these 'points of view' are ephemeral, and that on closer inspection their author says too little with too much authority?

Possibly a side-light can be derived from *A New Anthology of Modern Verse*.[11] The two editors in their spirited introduction (in dialogue) explain that their volume is not a substitute but a continuation to Sir Algernon Methuen's *Anthology*, which stopped short at 1920; and they claim that they have a distinct 'period' to represent. The representation leaves the reader with a sense of tension or confusion—poems that voice a state of

[10] *Points of View*, by T. S. Eliot. Faber and Faber. pp. 158. 3*s*. 6*d*.

[11] *A New Anthology of Modern Verse, 1920–40*, ed. by C. Day Lewis and L. A. G. Strong. Methuen. pp. xxxiii + 221. 6*s*.

spiritual and sensuous excitement, urges, and appetencies which seek satisfaction or at least expression in terms of thought—but rarely the detachment and mastery of one who has hit the mark. At first one is tempted to wonder why the sentiment is often so elusive and the style so difficult to interpret. The editors reply that on the contrary the whole tone is dominated by the qualities of Yeats's later work—passion, music, and precision—but the thought and diction seem unfamiliar because the poets actually are living in an unfamiliar world. For instance, they are unaccustomed to the recent evolutions of the country landscape (pylons, telephone-booths on the village green, aeroplane in the sky), and this multiplication of sense-data complicates their verses; they are likewise unaccustomed to live without some common religious and social beliefs, now discredited for them by science, hence their preoccupation with politics or economic theory, involving satire, controversy, or propaganda. This sense of personal isolation in a machine-made world has led on to the 'anarchist irresponsible quality'; hence the attraction of surrealism. Thus the critic of modern verse is tempted to forget that the heart of poetry is not to be found in its theme or in its argument; it is a record, not a communication (as de la Mare once said); an appeal to the ear much more than to the eyes. What the poet is 'getting at' is simply the heart of the listener; nothing else. The qualities of passion, music, and precision are there, if he will *listen* instead of trying to guess a riddle.

As England becomes more and more cosmopolitan-minded, criticisms on continental literature become more and more important. So R. A. Gettman's essay on Turgenev, the first modern Russian novelist, is well worth studying.[12] He shows us how this foreigner began to attract attention because of the Crimean War and then because of the political tension with Russia in the eighties, but that meanwhile, in the seventies, English culture was seeking an enlargement of the Victorian tradition, and began to be interested in un-English methods of presenting life. So both Americans and Britons found in the Russian novel a realism which was more spiritual than the French insistence on

[12] *Turgenev in England and America.* By R. A. Gettmann. Univ. of Illinois Press (Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit.). pp. 196. $1.50.

externalities, and a technique which was more artistic: the creation of the *dramatic* novel, that is to say, the novel which tells its story through the behaviour of its characters, the author keeping himself out of the way—the method of *rendering* rather than explaining and relating. The first discussion of Russia from this point of view appears in *The British Quarterly Review* in 1869.

Since then Turgenev has had to compete with Tolstoi and Dostoevsky whose works are more expansive and penetrating, more crowded with the 'multitudinousness' of life. But despite his trimness and sympathy he is likely (in Gettmann's opinion) to outlive his rivals. His influence is particularly strong on Howells, who first appreciated his artistry; Henry James, who imitated his craftsmanship and truthfulness; George Moore, who discarded Zola to cultivate his insight (witness *The Untilled Field*, 1903); and Galsworthy, who might never have written novels, but for his example and appeal.

By Frederick S. Boas

Fifty years, almost to a day, after the publication, on 4 July 1891, of the first instalment of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* in *The Graphic* there appeared in *T.L.S.* on 5 July 1941 a striking article entitled *Adventures of a Novel: 'Tess' after fifty years: Thomas Hardy and the public outcry.* The *T.L.S.* writer describes how *Tess*, after being refused for serial publication by Murray and Macmillan, was revised by Hardy and accepted by *The Graphic.* An account is given of the altered or omitted episodes; two of the latter appeared separately in *The Fortnightly Review* and *The National Observer.* They were restored when *Tess* was published in book form in November 1891, and though there was an outcry, 'the public was led captive. It scolded, it sneered; it sniggered; but it surrendered, as it had never surrendered to Hardy before.'

The article further illustrates the 'richly English' quality of the novel, which was not appreciated by many of its urban critics. And it explains and defends Hardy's claim, made in all good faith, that Tess was a pure woman.

Continuing his studies of aspects of Hardy's work (see *Y.W.* xix.

247, and xx. 191) Carl J. Weber in *Ainsworth and Thomas Hardy* (*R.E.S.*, April) discusses and illustrates the influence of the former on the latter. Hardy as a boy delighted in Ainsworth's fiction, which had won instant popularity with the publication of *Rookwood* (1834). Weber prints side by side the descriptions of the storm in *Rookwood* and *Far from the Madding Crowd*, and points out their kinship not only in sequence of events but in their phraseology. Two other favourites of Hardy were *Old St. Paul's* and *Windsor Castle*. From these and other novels of Ainsworth Hardy appears to have taken hints for the nomenclature of some of his characters. Weber also detects their influence in the more stilted features of Hardy's style. Though Ainsworth's tales are now mainly valued for the accompanying illustrations by Cruickshank, the shadow of their author, Weber concludes, falls across many pages of the Wessex novels.

In an article in *P.M.L.A.*, June 1939 (see *Y.W.* xx. 191) Helen Sandison had suggested that the *First Countess of Wessex* in *A Group of Noble Dames* was based not only on the eighteenth-century marriage of Stephen Fox and Betty Homer but on the earlier Elizabethan romance of Arthur Gorges and Douglas Homer.

In *An Elizabethan Basis for a Hardy Tale?—An Addendum* (*P.M.L.A.*, June), Weber throws new light on the origin of the story, inconsistent with Miss Sandison's hypothesis, from an annotated copy of *A Group of Noble Dames*, now in the library of Colby College, Waterville, Maine, U.S.A. This volume belonged to Miss Rebekah Owen of New York, who was resident in Dorchester soon after its publication, and who recorded in it details told to her by Hardy. He had embodied in the stories of the 'noble dames' traditions handed down by 'family servants of the great families'. The Countess, Betty Homer, born 1723, was the daughter of Squire Homer of Mells Park, Somerset, whom Hardy calls Squire Dornell. When *The First Countess of Wessex* was originally published in *Harper's Magazine*, in December 1889, among the accompanying illustrations was one by Alfred Parsons entitled 'Falls—Park', which was easily identified as a likeness of Mells. Miss Owen notes that Hardy had told Parsons '*not* to draw the house exactly, nor indeed, at all'. She also writes down the text of a ballad dated 1740, re-

lating to Betty and her husband, which she had found, and which had escaped the notice of Hardy.

S. in Ph. (Oct.) contained an article by J. O. Bailey on *Poe's Stonehenge* showing that certain merits of form and style attributed to Poe by James A. Harrison in the Introduction to his edition of the complete works of Poe were actually borrowings from Rees's *Cyclopaedia.*

In *A Source for the Conclusion of 'Moby Dick'* (*N. and Q.*, July 26) T. O. Mabbott traced to a passage in Southey's Commonplace Book (*A Coffin used as a Boat*) the concluding episodes in Melville's novel: but E. T. Visiak rejoined (Aug. 9) that this might have been a parallel rather than a source. William White in *Herman Melville, a New Source* (*N. and Q*, June 7) had suggested a less dignified origin—*Harry Martingale, or the Adventures of a Whaleman in the Pacific*, by Louis A. Baker, a 'penny dreadful' published at Boston in 1848.

More important than either of these speculations was *Melville's Contribution to English* by J. M. Purcell (*P.M.L.A.*, Sept.), noticed in Chap. II, pp. 41–2.

In *N. and Q.*, May 24, under the heading *Queries from Anthony Trollope's Notes on English Drama* R. G. Dick made the somewhat unexpected announcement that he is collaborating in the preparation for publication of Trollope's extensive notes and criticisms on the English drama to 1642 from the collection of his annotated books now in the Folger Shakespeare library. Dick asked for information on some points, which produced a comment by W. Jaggard on 14 June.

R. W. Chapman in a series of articles and letters has done yeoman's service in the cause of the textual emendation of Anthony Trollope's published works. His first article deals with *The Text of Trollope's 'Autobiography'* (*R.E.S.*, Jan.). In a copy of the 1883 edition he had preserved a letter of the novelist, dated 19 February 1870, which revealed 'a rapid and excessively current hand', difficult to decipher. In the printed edition of the *Autobiography* Chapman detected about a dozen passages where correction was needed. On reference to the novelist's MS., now in the British Museum, Chapman's proposed emendations proved in nearly every case to be right.

The wider problem of *The Text of Trollope's Novels* is discussed in *R.E.S.* (July). Statistics are given of the number of suspected passages in twenty-five novels, from *The Warden* (1855) to *An Old Man's Love* (1884). Errors are ascribed to the following main causes, confusion of letters, omissions, doublets, transposition, and assimilation, of which examples are given. Far the largest proportion of queried passages are in *The Text of 'Phineas Redux'* to which Chapman had devoted a previous article in *R.E.S.* (April). The MS. of this novel had been completed when Trollope sailed for Australia in May 1871. After his return towards the end of 1872, in addition to other literary labours and to hunting thrice a week, he published *Phineas Redux* in *The Graphic* in weekly instalments from 19 July 1873 to 10 January 1874. These circumstances, Chapman holds, account for the large number of doubtful readings of which he gives a list, with his own conjectures. A number of these are queried by Gavin Bone in *A Rejoinder* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.).

Under the heading *The Text of Trollope* (*T.L.S.*, Jan. 25 and March 22) Chapman suggested a number of emendations in *An Old Man's Love*, published posthumously in 1884, and in *Ralph, The Heir*.

The former article provoked a challenging letter from Simon Nowell-Smith (Feb. 8), to which Chapman replied (March 1). On June 11 in an article on *Trollope's 'American Senator'* he discussed the significance of some of the unusual names in that novel (1877). See also letters by Chapman in *T.L.S.*, July 5 and 12.

A centenary article in *T.L.S.* (Nov. 9) on William Black, the novelist, of whom it is too summarily said that 'nobody reads him now', raised incidentally another Trollopian problem. It identified Black with Spratt, one of the six novelists mentioned in *John Caldigate*, whom M. Oliphant had claimed to be Hawley Smart (see *Y.W.* xxi. 244). In *T.L.S.* (Nov. 22) S. Nowell-Smith, under the heading *Caldigate Novels*, asked for Michael Sadleir's view. Sadleir replied (Dec. 20) with a third suggestion that Spratt was Joseph Hatton and that his *Clytie* was *The Heartbroken One*.

To *U.T.Q.* (Jan.) Leon Edel contributes an intimate account of *Henry James: The War Chapters, 1914–16*. He describes the

feelings of the novelist when at the outbreak of hostilities in August 1914 he found himself in his retirement at Rye suddenly living under 'the funeral pall of our murdered civilization'. Edel then follows him to London where he came into contact with some of the leading personalities in the conduct of the war, and where his position as officially a neutral became so unreal that in July 1915 he applied to be naturalized as a British subject. His appreciative attitude towards the English during this hectic period has its record in the essays 'Within the Rim' and 'The Question of the Mind', which Edel briefly summarizes. Some reminiscences and a novel were taken in hand but uncompleted at his death on 28 February 1916.

Gaylord C. LeRoy has an informative and thoughtful article in *P.M.L.A.* (Sept.) on the Victorian essayist, *Richard Holt Hutton*. Born in 1826, of Unitarian stock, Hutton, after holding various educational and journalistic posts, became in 1861 co-editor of the *Spectator* till his death in 1897. By his articles in that periodical and elsewhere he made important contributions both to religious controversy and to literary criticism. LeRoy gives an account of Hutton's attacks on the one hand upon the materialist doctrines of the period, and on the other upon the untenable position between belief and doubt adopted by Carlyle, Matthew Arnold, and others. LeRoy emphasizes his 'intellectual toughness' and 'fine contempt for compromise'.

It was upon these controversial essays that Hutton set most store, and they have historic value, but with the passage of time they have become of secondary interest to his literary criticism. This is restricted in range, confined almost entirely to English and American authors of the nineteenth century. But within these limits it is remarkably penetrating and illuminative. 'The greatest value of Hutton's criticism lies in a vast number of detailed literary perceptions. The best essays were the product of a slow maturation, during which the critic formed impressions, modified, corrected, and amplified them, and finally sought to give them exact embodiment in words.' LeRoy illustrates distinctive features of Hutton's critical method, such as his mastery over extended comparison and the precision of his analysis of style, and he cites examples of his 'critical finality' from the essays on Wordsworth and Arnold's

poetry. Appended to LeRoy's article is a useful bibliography of Hutton's publications.

In *The Yale Review* (winter) Leonard Bacon in *An Eminent Post-Victorian* analyses in arresting, if somewhat controversial, fashion, the work of Lytton Strachey. He estimates his literary insight as much above his historical. 'He always illuminated books and the personalities behind them. But when he turned the same ray upon events and the personalities behind them, or involved in them, his particular radiation often failed to light up what was actually there.' Thus he thinks that *Landmarks in French Literature* and *Books and Characters* will have more enduring value than the trio which won him most contemporary fame, *Eminent Victorians*, *Queen Victoria*, and *Elizabeth and Essex*.

Harry M. Ayres writes (*H.L.Q.*, Oct.) on *Lewis Carroll and 'The Garland of Rachel'*. *The Garland* contains eighteen original poems by friends of Dr. Daniel of Worcester College, Oxford, greeting the first birthday of his daughter, Rachel, 27 September 1881. Among the contributors were Austin Dobson, Andrew Lang, J. A. Symonds, Robert Bridges, Edmund Gosse, W. E. Henley, Margaret L. Woods, and Lewis Carroll (C. L. Dodgson). Only thirty-six copies were printed at Daniel's private printing-press, and the title-page of each copy bore the name of one of the authors. Thus the Huntington Library copy is entitled *The Garland of Rachel By Lewis Carroll and Divers Kindly Hands*. Inserted in this copy are two hitherto unpublished letters from Dodgson to Daniel. In the first he declares that he is 'profoundly puzzled to know what the subject is to be. . . . Is it the Old Testament Rachel—of whose infancy nothing is known? Or is it the actress—of whose infancy nothing is known either?' But when informed who the Rachel was he declared in the later letter that he would 'see if any happy thought occurs'. The result was the poem in seven four-lined stanzas, the proof of which with Lewis Carroll's final corrections in violet ink Ayres reproduces in facsimile.

To *N. and Q.* (Nov. 29) William White contributes a note, *A. E. Housman on Blunt and Kipling*. In a 1936 catalogue by a San Francisco bookseller there were reproduced two bits of

characteristic occasional criticism by Housman. On the half-title of Wilfrid Blunt's *Love Sonnets of Proteus* he had pencilled

> If boots were bonnets,
> These might be sonnets,
> But boots are not;
> So don't talk rot.

On the last page of Kipling's *The Seven Seas*, opposite the line,

> Shall draw the Thing as he sees it for the God of Things as They Are.

he had pencilled

> The God of Things as They Are is never the God for me,
> For He is the God of Things as They Did not Ought To Be.

In an article on *The New Realism and a National Literature* (*P.M.L.A.*, Dec.) Benjamin T. Spencer discusses the relation during the 1870's and 1880's of two literary tendencies in the U.S.A., towards realism and nationalism. He takes as the central figure of the period W. D. Howells, who while practising realism and advocating independence declared that it was as absurd to ask Americans 'to have a literature wholly their own as to ask them to have a language wholly their own'. He held that the U.S.A. consisted of diverse sections, each with its own *genius loci*. While, therefore, American novels should aim at being national, yet the vastness of the field enforced provincialism and, as an ideal, 'fidelity to our decentralized life'.

Spencer gives examples of the diffusion of this conception of 'regional realism' in the literature produced in different parts of America. It led especially to the development of a school of domestic fiction, the indigenous product of the soil. In turn there came a reaction, led by Julian Hawthorne, 'who argued that the realists could never write the great American novel because they treated life in its lesser manifestations'. And Whitman in his last days continued to call for something more than realism, a 'home-born, transcendental, democratic literature'.

XV

BIBLIOGRAPHICA

By JOHN SOUTHGATE

ALTHOUGH the importance of N. R. Ker's *Mediaeval Libraries of Great Britain*[1] is primarily historical, it will also be useful to students of pre-Renascence English literature and scholarship. The natural difficulty of the subject, which was not diminished by the results of the dissolution of the monasteries, was only partially eased by Leland's royal collection, the only systematic attempt to preserve books at that time, and the great Elizabethan and seventeenth-century collectors. The intention of Ker's work is to provide a guide to the printed catalogues of modern libraries and to the books themselves. It is a list of manuscripts and printed books which belonged to religious houses and their members, cathedral and collegiate churches, universities, colleges, and other corporate bodies in England, Scotland, and Wales. The lowest date is about 1540 for England and Wales, and a little later for Scotland. Books belonging to the better preserved cathedral and college libraries are not listed if they are still in the modern libraries of the institutions. The list is an alphabetical register of medieval libraries with entries under each for the books known to have belonged to it. Each entry gives a summary description of the book, a note of its present position, evidence of provenance, date, and medieval press-marks. The preface concludes with some notes on the interpretation of the evidence of provenance, discussed under the headings 'ex libris' inscriptions, 'ex dono' inscriptions, press-marks, medieval catalogues, script, and binding.

There has recently been some revival of interest in the Gothic novel, but the subject is still confused and obscure; Gothic novels are hard to obtain and are often absent from the largest libraries; the bibliography of several of the most important authors has been wholly or almost wholly neglected. In his

[1] *Mediaeval Libraries of Great Britain: A list of surviving books*, ed. by N. R. Ker. Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks, no. 3. pp. xxiii + 168. 7*s*. 6*d*.

Gothic Bibliography[2] Montague Summers has included the names of several authors and many titles which have not been noticed in critical works and which are not even to be found in bibliographies or the catalogues of the great libraries. Several anonymous authors have been identified and many erroneous dates and mistaken ascriptions have been corrected. Authors of whom standard bibliographies already exist have been for the most part omitted. The bibliography presents a representative list of the romances which led up to the Gothic novel, of the prolific period of its greatest vogue, and of the large number of later romances and novels which were influenced by, or even modelled on, the no longer fashionable Gothic tale. The earliest entry belongs to 1728, the latest to 1916. Certain French and German novels are included either because they were translated into English or because they influenced the development of the Gothic novel in England. Dramatizations are also noticed, and there are entries for chapbooks based on Gothic novels and for the sixpenny 'blue books'. But the entries for such secondary works are intended to be rather representative than exhaustive. About one third of the text is occupied by an index of authors, with a list of their works. These entries are only duplicated in the main bibliography or the title index if the books are directly connected with imaginative writing. Brief biographical notes on the obscurer authors precede the lists of their works. The difficulty of using the greater libraries in war time has increased the list of addenda to about 50 pages. The work concludes with a brief note on the circulating libraries and the French and German booksellers.

The following articles appeared in *The Library*.[3] Giles E. Dawson (June), as more briefly noted in Chap. VII, p. 104, has examined 74 copies of the first folio of Shakespeare in the Folger Library in order to supplement J. Quincy Adams's explanation of the bibliographical irregularities of the part containing *Troilus and Cressida*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Timon of Athens*.

Adams suggested that the gathering gg was originally in-

[2] *A Gothic Bibliography*, by Montague Summers. Fortune Press. pp. xx + 620 + pl. xxi. £2. 2*s*.

[3] *The Library* (*Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*), New Series, vol. xxii, nos. 1–3. O.U.P.

tended to contain five pages of *Romeo* and seven of *Troilus*. But when it was partly printed, the printing of *Troilus* was delayed or suspended, and the printers began the next play, *Julius Caesar*, on sig. kk1 (p. 109), leaving a space for the rest of *Troilus*. But since *Troilus* could still not be printed, as the printers approached the end of the volume they decided to print *Timon* in place of *Troilus*. Sigs. gg and gg2 containing part of *Romeo* were used, but gg3 containing the end of *Romeo* and the beginning of *Troilus* had to be wasted. A new gathering Gg, gg2, gg3 contained the last page of *Romeo* and the first eleven pages of *Timon*. The difference in length between *Timon* and *Troilus* accounts for the gap of eight numbers in the pagination and the absence of a signature ii. Before the volume was published *Troilus* was printed and included at the beginning of the tragedies. The innermost sheet of the original gg gathering contained the last page of *Romeo* and the three first pages of *Troilus*. The second half of this sheet could be used, but the first half would have to be cancelled. The first page of *Troilus* was therefore reset and printed on a single half-sheet, which was followed by the original gg4 (pp. 79–80). But in five known copies the cancelled leaf gg3 is still extant and in each the last page of *Romeo* has been struck out with a pen.

Dawson believes that this theory is inadequate only in its explanation of the original state of the gathering gg. If gg4 was used, what happened to gg5 and gg6? E. E. Willoughby's solution[4] requires gg2 and gg3 to be conjugate. But in a copy at the Folger Library the original gg3, with the crossed-out page of *Romeo*, is visibly conjugate with gg4; in thirteen other copies gg1 and gg2 can be seen to be conjugate. Modern bindings make it impossible to examine the state of these leaves in the other copies. But since the rules and running titles of all 74 copies are identical it can be assumed that the leaves are conjugate in all copies. Dawson concludes that the printing of the projected gathering gg began on the inner sheet as soon as some seven or eight pages were in type. The printing of *Troilus* was stopped when the inner sheet was completed or nearly completed. Meanwhile the composition of pp. 81–4 of *Troilus* had probably been completed, but the type was kept aside. The

[4] In *The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, no. 8), 1932.

four pages of *Romeo* already in type (pp. 73–6) were printed on a single sheet. Thus when *Troilus* was finally printed pp. 79–80 were used and only the original gg3 was wasted.

For his essay on *The Different States of the First Edition of 'Paradise Lost'* James H. Pershing (June) examined 115 copies. He distinguishes six different title-pages, two of 1667, two of 1668, and two of 1669. The first title-page of 1668 has initials instead of the author's name, and occurs in two forms distinguished by a difference in punctuation. All the issues with titles later than the third have seven extra leaves containing 'The Printer to the Reader', 'The Argument', 'The Verse', and the 13 'Errata'. The original and ungrammatical form of 'The Printer to the Reader' was altered during the first printing of the extra leaves, and copies of the first issue of 1668 and the second issue of 1669 may contain either the original or the emended form. But the extra leaves were reset, and 72 variants, mainly in spelling and printing, have been noted. The extra leaves seem to occur only in re-bound copies with the first three titles, and the reprint of the extra leaves seems to occur only in copies with the sixth title. It is inferred that the first printing of the extra leaves was exhausted by purchasers of the earlier issues before the entire edition was completed and a reprinting was required for the sixth issue. Exclusive of defective letters and faulty impressions there are 53 variants in the text on sigs. A–Tt, which in Pershing's opinion were only printed once. The true variants, as distinguished from faults in the printing, were apparently introduced intentionally by Milton or the printer. A few examples are given, but the author rigidly refuses to engage in textual criticism and does not even give a list of the variants. This is regrettable, as few people can expect to have either the time or the opportunity to consult so many copies of the first edition. The last gathering Vv was reset and reprinted, and the reprinted sheets occur, as far as the author knows, only in the second issue of 1669. It contains 38 variants. It is apparently impossible to fix the date of the variants in the text as the sheets seem to have been bound and stored haphazard, and the date of issue determines only the latest date at which the sheets may have been printed. The article is illustrated by seven facsimiles of the title-pages.

Somewhat similar conclusions, though with more detailed discussion of some points, are reached by Helen Darbishire in *The Printing of the First Edition of 'Paradise Lost'* (*R.E.S.*, Oct.). Though only six title-pages are now known, she distinguishes eight because Lowndes describes a fifth and a sixth. After dealing with the different states of the preliminary matter, she concludes that the whole of the text of the poem itself was 'printed off at one time, the sheets stacked, and afterwards bound up with successive title-pages, and in 1668 and 1669 with additional leaves of preliminary matter, as each new batch of copies was called for. . . . The clinching evidence will be found (1) in the watermark of the paper used, (2) in the presence in every copy of corrected and uncorrected sheets bound up haphazard. . . .' Miss Darbishire gives detailed illustrations of these two types of evidence. The only two sheets set up afresh were Z and the final half-sheet Vv (in some, though not always the same, copies of the eighth issue). Her general conclusion from the minute variants, e.g. 'yee' for 'ye', 'Sons' for 'sons', is that Milton vigilantly supervised the progress of the text through the press.

In *Sir Hans Sloane's Printed Books* Jeremiah S. Finch (*The Library*, June) relates the discovery that the third of the so-called catalogues of Sloane Manuscripts in the British Museum (Sloane MS. 3972. A.B.C.) is really a catalogue of some of his printed books. The investigation was prompted by the examination of the Museum's copy of the Browne *Sale Catalogue*, January 1711. The copy is marked and it was found that the markings relate to books in the Sloane Collection. The *Sale Catalogue* and other books placed near it bear the pressmarks of the Collection. The Manuscripts in the Sloane library have always been kept together, but the printed books, numbering about 40,000, have been dispersed.

Frank Mott Harrison (June) in *Editions of 'The Pilgrim's Progress'* summarizes the results of examining more than 1,300 editions and reprints of part I of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. A general classification is followed by brief notes on the more important editions, and on the abbreviations, adaptations, and selections.

Manuscript Printer's Copy for a lost Early English Book, by H. C. Schulz (Sept.–Dec.) is a description of a Huntington Library MS. (HM 130) of *The Prick of Conscience*. If this work was ever printed before Morris's edition of 1863 no copy has apparently survived. HM 130 apparently served as printer's copy; for the pages and signatures are marked off in red crayon and ink, and several leaves are disfigured by finger-prints and smudges of printer's ink. The author concludes that the poem was printed between the end of the fifteenth and the middle of the sixteenth centuries. The printer cannot now be identified; but it may be significant that Worde and Rood were the only English printers who printed works by Richard Rolle (to whom *The Prick of Conscience* was commonly attributed) before 1640.

William H. Bond (Sept.–Dec.) points out that a printer's error in the second edition of Thomas Churchyard's *Chippes* (1578), a page for page reprint except for a few minor variations of the edition of 1575, demonstrates the process of imposition by half-sheets in books of octavo (or smaller) format. McKerrow had asserted the practice, but had been unable to produce examples.

In *Some Additional Poems by George Chapman*, Jean Robertson (Sept.–Dec.) publishes two occasional pieces omitted from R. H. Shepherd's edition of the *Poems and Minor Translations*. Attention has been drawn to this important article in Chap. IX, p. 143.

It is regretted that it is impossible under present conditions to give an accurate account of accessions to the British Museum Library and the National Library of Scotland during 1941.

The Bodleian has acquired a number of autograph letters, including 24 letters written between 1742 and 1767 by Henry Fox, first Lord Holland, to Etheldreda Lady Townshend, and a letter from Macaulay to Rice, Lord Melbourne's Chancellor of the Exchequer, dated from Calcutta, 8 February 1836. Accessions of rare printed books include *The whole booke of Psalmes Collected into Englishe metre* by Thom. Sternhold, John Hopkyns and others, 1577, an unrecorded edition printed by John Day; and *The Newe Testament in English and in Latin of Erasmus transla-*

tion, W. Powell, 1549, a very rare edition of Tindale's version. The library has also obtained a copy of Johnson's *Rambler*, Edinburgh, 1750–2; *The Student*, Oxford, 1750, containing the rare three numbers of *The Inspector*; and *The Adventurer*, London, 1752–4.

Most of the interesting books which changed hands during the year seem to have come into the American market, but a few important English works sold in this country may be mentioned here.

Lydgate's *Siege and Destruction of Thebes*, a vellum MS. of the fifteenth century which presents textual differences from Erdmann's edition and was apparently unknown to him, was bought by Robinson at Sotheby's for £230.

Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, Richard Pynson, 1494, a very rare work, was bought by H. Davis for £880. A volume containing Sir Thomas More's *A dyalogue . . .*, 1530 [1531], *The Second part of the confutation of Tyndal's answere 1533*, *The Supplycacion of Soulys; A newe boke of purgatory*, 1530, was sold by Sotheby to McLeish for £40. Maggs bought Ascham's *Scholemaster*, 1571–7, with *Toxophilus*, 1571, and a *Report and Discourse of the affaires and State of Germany* for £40. Copies of Chapman's translation of Homer *c.* 1610 and 1616 were sold for £64 and £68.

The autograph manuscript of *Isabella*, the first six stanzas, was bought at Sotheby's by Elkin Matthews for £300. Naval MSS. of Samuel Pepys, about 1662, were sold by Sotheby to H. Davis for £220.

The following poetical and dramatic works, which are arranged in rough chronological order, are selected from the more interesting books that changed hands during the year: Gavin Douglas's *Aeneid*, 1553, £40; Speght's *Chaucer*, 1602, £2. 5*s.*; Jonson's *Volpone*, 1607, £8; Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*, 1622, £4; Chapman's *The Conspiracie . . . of Charles Dvke of Byron*, 1625, £6; *The Widdowes Teares*, 1612, £36; Dryden's *Religio Laici*, 1682, £2; *The Hind and the Panther*, 1687, £2; *An Evening's Love*, 1671, £3; *Alexander's Feast*, 1697, £37; Wycherley's *Plain Dealer*, 1677, with *The Rehearsal*, 1683, £24; Ovid's *Epistles* translated by Dryden and others, 1680, £2. 2*s.*; Pope's *Works*, 1717, £3. 5*s.* and £1. 10*s.*; Gay's *Beggars' Opera*, 1728, £4. 15*s.*;

Polly, 1729, £5; *Fables*, 1727–38, £18. 10*s.*; Johnson's *Irene*, 1749, £4. 5*s.*; Gray's *Odes*, printed at Strawberry Hill, 1757, £8. 10*s.*; Shelley's *Rosalind and Helen*, 1819, £12. 10*s.*, and *Works*, 1876–80, £5. 12*s.* 6*d.*

The following is a similar list of prose works: Sidney's *Apology for Poetry*, 1595, £60; various early editions of Holinshed's *Chronicle*, £3–£8. 10*s.*; *Purchas his Pilgrimage*, 1613, £3. 10*s.*; Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 1624, £11. 10*s.*; Bacon's *Apophthegmes*, 1625, £13; *A briefe Discourse, touching the Happie Union . . .*, 1603, £26; *Essais*, 1612, £1. 10*s.* to £28; Browne's *Hydriotaphia*, 1658, £5. 10*s.*; *Certain Miscellany Tracts*, 1683, £22; *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, 1646, £3; Glanvill's *The Vanity of Dogmatizing*, 1661, £4. 10*s.*; Fuller's *Worthies*, 1662, £2. 12*s.*; Dryden's *Of dramatick Poesie*, 1668, £10; *Cudworth's True Intellectual System of the Universe*, 1678, £10. 10*s.*; Defoe's *Madagascar*, 1729, £1. 10*s.*; Johnson's *Dictionary*, 1755, £9; *Journey to the Western Isles*, 1775, £1. 5*s.*; Gibbon, 12 vol. edition of the *Decline and Fall*, 1788, £15; Landor's *Imaginary Conversations*, 1824–9, £5. 5*s.*; Garnett's edition of Peacock's Novels, 1891–2, £3.

INDEX

Aaron, R. I., *The 'Autobiography' of Edward, First Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, 157.
Adams, P. G., *How Much of Shakspere did Voltaire Know?*, 115.
Adams, R. P., *The Philosophic Unity of More's 'Utopia'*, 91.
Adler, M. J., *How to Read a Book*, 11.
Allen, D. C., *Jaques' Seven Ages and Pedro Mexia*, 107; *Renaissance Remedies for Fortune: Marlowe and the Fortunati*, 124; *The New Atlantis*, 148; *Donne's Suicides*; *Donne and the Bezoar*, 153.
Allen, N. B., *A Note on Wilson's 'Hamlet'*, 111.
Allen, R., *Life in Eighteenth Century England*, 187.
Alspach, R. K., on *'Making the Green One Red'*, 113.
Altick, R. D., *R. O. Cambridge: Belated Augustan*, 184.
Anderson, G. K., *Notes on the Language of Ælfric's English Pastoral Letters, &c.*, 48.
Anderson, O. S., *The English Hundred-Names: The South Eastern Counties*, 31.
Angus, D. R., *The 'Immortality' Ode and Ruskin's Theory of the Infinite in Art*, 199.
Archer, C., *A Line in Keats* (also Binyon, L., King, R. W., Meyerstein, E. H. W., Garrod, H. W.), 205.
Ariail, J. M., *In Defence of Bassanio*, 107.
Armstrong, M., *This was a Man* (Trelawney), 202.
Armstrong, R. L. (ed.), *The Poems of James Shirley*, 150.
Ashton, J. W., *The Fall of Icarus*, 85.
Askwith, B., *Keats*, 204.
Ault, N., *Pope and Addison*, 191; *Pope's 'Lost' Poems*, 191, 192.
Austin, W. M., *The Etymology of English 'big'*, 29.
Ayres, H. M., *Lewis Carroll and 'The Garland of Rachel'*, 226.

B., E. G., *Notes on the Letters of C. and M. Lamb*, 201.
Babb, L., *The Physiological Conception of Love in the Elizabethan and Early Stuart Drama*, 120; *Melancholy and the Elizabethan Man of Letters*, 136.
Bacon, L., *An Eminent Post-Victorian*, 226.
Bailey, J. O., *Poe's Stonehenge*, 223.
Baker, C., *Spenser and the 'Witch of Atlas'*, 203.
Baker, S. J., *New Zealand Slang*, 39.
Bald, R. C., *Shakespeare on the Stage in Restoration Dublin*, 114, 171.
Baldwin, T. W., *Perseus Purloins Pegasus*, 109; *A Line in Gabriel Harvey*, 123.
Ball, A. M., *Compounding in the English Language*, 21.
Barbour, A. B., *Browning Vindicated*, 207.
Barker, A.; *The Pattern of Milton's Nativity Ode*, 158.
Barkley, W., *The Two Englishes*, 20.
Barnard, E. A., *Cowper's Mr. Gregson*, 191.
Bartlett, A. C., *Full-Word Compounds in Modern English*, 36.
Bartlett, P. B. (ed.), *The Poems of George Chapman*, 141; *The Heroes of Chapman's Homer*, 143; *Chapman and Phaer*, 144.
Bateson, F. W., *Ambrose Philips*; *The Game of Ombre in the 'Rape of the Lock'*, 191.
Battenhouse, R. W., *Tamburlaine, the 'Scourge of God'*, 124; *Chapman's The Shadow of the Night: An Interpretation*, 143.
Baum, P. F., *Chaucer's 'The House of Fame'*, 63.
Bayley, A. R., *Actresses as Helena in 'All's Well'*, 106.
Beer, E. de, *'Absalom and Achitophel': literary and historical notes*, 169; on *'The taking of Ramme by Leiftenant General Rumny'*, 172.
Benham, A. R., *The Myth of John Donne the Rake*, 152.
Benham, W. G., *Mourners at Sir P. Sidney's Funeral*, 146.
Bennett, J., *An Aspect of the Evolution of Seventeenth-Century Prose*, 157, 170.
Bennett, J. W., *Early Texts of Two of Ralegh's Poems*, 137.
Bennett, L. C. (ed.), *A Selection from the Letters & Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 158.
Bennett, R. E., on *use of 'Puritan'*, 137; *Donne's Letters to Severall Persons of Honour*, 153.
Bentley, G. E., *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Dramatic Companies and Players*, 117; *Seventeenth-Century Allusions to Ben Jonson*, 131.
Berrey, L. V., *Newly-Wedded Words*, 37.

Beyer, W. W., *On the Date of Keats's First Letter* (also Forman, M. B.), 205.
Biese, Y. M., *Some additions to the Oxford Dictionary*, 28; *Neuenglisch ticktack und Verwandtes*, 37.
Bishop, O. H., *The Origin of the 'Prelude'*, 198.
Blair, S. M., *The Succession of Lives in Spenser's Three Sons of Agape*, 138.
Blanchard, R., *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*, 176; *Pope's 'Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day'*, 190.
Boas, F. S., *Elizabethan Plays in Germany*, 119; *A Line in Gabriel Harvey*, 123.
Bodleian Library (Accessions), 233.
Bodleian Library Record, *Pepys designs a Book-Plate*, 170.
Bolinger, D. L., *Among the New Words*, 28; *Word Affinities*, 37.
Bond, W. H., on *A printer's error in second edition of Churchyard's 'Chippes'*, 233.
Book Sales, 234.
Booth, B. A., and Jones, C. E., *A Concordance of the Poetical Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, 212.
Bowers, F. T., *Thomas Nashe and the Picaresque Novel*, 149.
Boys, R. (ed.), *Grongar Hill*, 181.
Bradbrook, M. C., *Authority, Truth, and Justice in 'Measure for Measure'*, 107; *Marvell and the Poetry of Rural Solitude*, 156; *Joseph Conrad: Poland's English Genius*, 216.
Braddy, H., on *'I know a hawk from a handsaw'*, 112.
Bradner, L., *Musae Anglicanae*, 15.
Brecker, M. L., *Introducing Charles Dickens*, 207.
Brentnall, H. C., *Wiltshire Place-Names*, 34.
Briggs, H. E., on *The Birth and Death of Keats*, 205.
Brittain, R. E., *Christopher Smart in the Magazines*, 190; *An Early Model for Smart's 'A Song to David'*, 191.
Brodribb, C. W., *A Neglected Correction in Milton*, 162.
Brooke, Tucker, *Some Pre-Armada Propagandist Poetry in England (1585–6)*, 137.
Brookes, B. G., *The Young Wordsworth*, 200.
Broughton, L. N., *Wordsworth and de Quincey in Westmorland Politics*, 199.
Brown, C., *Three Notes on the Text of the 'Canterbury Tales'*, 55.
Brown, D., *What Shakespeare learned at School*, 102.
Bryan, W. F., and Dempster, G. (ed.), *Sources and Analogies of 'Chaucer's Canterbury Tales'*, 51.
Bryant, M. M., and Aiken, J. R., *Psychology of English*, 18.
Bryner, C., *Shakespeare among the Slavs*, 115.
Buell, L. M., *A Prose Period in Shakespeare's Career?*, 105.
Bühler, C. F. (ed.), *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*, 76 (see also 82); *Sir John Paston's 'Grete Booke'*, 81; *Note on Stanza 24 of Lydgate's 'The Churl and the Bird'*, 82; *Astrological Prognostications in MS. 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library*, 83.
Burns Chronicle and Club Directory, vol. xxi, 189.
Bush, D., *The Renaissance and English Humanism*, 85; *Two Roads to Truth... in the Early Seventeenth Century*, 151.
Butterworth, C. C., *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible*, 150.

Camden, C., *The Mind's Construction in the Face*, 105.
Cameron, K. W., *Authorship and Sources of 'Gentleness and Nobility'. Together with Text of the Play; John Heywood's 'Play of the Wether'; The Background of John Heywood's 'Witty and Witless'*, 98–9; *A New Source for Shelley's 'Defence of Poetry'*, 203.
Campbell, L. B., *Richard Tarlton and the Earthquake of 1580*, 119.
Carleton, P. D., *John Donne's 'Bracelet of bright hair about the bone'*, 152.
Carr, C. T., *Some Notes on German Loan-Words in English*, 35.
Carver, P. L., *Collins's 'Young Damon of the vale is dead'*, 190.
Casady, E., *The Neo-Platonic Ladder in Spenser's 'Amoretti'*, 139.
Cawley, R. R., *Burton, Bacon, and Sandys*, 147; *Milton's Literary Craftmanship: A Study of 'A Brief History of Muscovia'*, 164.
Cecil, Lord David, *The English Poets*, 8; *The Author in a Suffering World*, 9.
Chadwick, H. M., *The Study of Anglo-Saxon*, 43.
Chapman, R. W., *Baretti's 'Carmen Seculare'*, 192; *Jane Austen's Back*, 194; *Jane Austen's Letters*, 195; *The Text of Trollope's 'Autobiography'*, 223; *The Text of Trollope's Novels*; *The Text of Trollope* (also Nowell-Smith, S.); *Trollope's 'American Senator'*; *the Text of 'Phineas Redux'* (also Bone, G., in *A Rejoinder*), 224.
Chappell, E., *The Likeness of Samuel Pepys*, 170.

Chaytor, H. J., *The Medieval Reader and Textual Criticism*, 81.
Chicoteau, M., and Urwin, K. (ed.), *Comparative Literature Studies, vol. ii*, 189.
Church, R., *The Poet and the Novel*, 12; *Eight for Immortality*, 215.
Clark, D. L., *What was Shelley's Indebtedness to Keats?*, 203.
Clark, E. G., *Ralegh and Marlowe: A Study of Elizabethan Fustian*, 127.
Clark, E. M., *A Restored Reading in the Towneley Purification Play*, 80.
Clifford, J. L., *Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale)*, 183; *Thomas Coxeter the Younger to Dr. Johnson*, 190.
Clines, C. L., *Disraeli and J. G. Lockhart* 197; *The Correspondence of Robert Southey and Isaac D'Israeli*, 201.
Cluck, J., *Elinor Wylie's Shelley Obsession*, 204.
Coffin, C. M., *Ignatius His Conclave*, 153.
Coffman, G. B., *The Miracle Play: Notes and Queries*, 78.
Combs, H. C., and Sullens, Z. R., *A Concordance to the English Poems of John Donne*, 154.
Coon, A. M., *Izaak Walton a Stationer*, 157, 172.
Copeland, T., on *'A woman wailing for her demon-lover'*, 200.
Corbin, J., *Ophelia against her Critics*, 111.
Cox, E. H., *Another Medieval Convention in Shakspere*, 115.
Craig, A., *A Gothic Bibliography*, 192.
Craigie, J., *Sidney's 'King James of Scotland'*, 146.
Craigie, Sir W., *Completing the Record of English*, 28; and Hulbert. J. B., *A Dictionary of American English, Parts X and XI*, 40.
Criswell, E. H., *Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers*, 41.
Crundell, H. W., *The Episode of the King's Ring*, 106; *Actors' Parts and Elizabethan Play-Texts*, 120; *The Authorship of 'The Spanish Tragedy' Additions*, 122; on *The phrase 'pride and prejudice'*, 194 (also H., R.).
Cundiff, P., *The Dating of Browning's Conception of the Plan of 'The Ring and the Book'*, 207.

Daiches, D., *The King James Version of the English Bible*, 148.
Dale, D., *S. Pepys and Tangier; Pepysiana and the bombed city of London; The early life of Pepys; The likenesses of John Oldham*, 170.
Daniells, R., (ed.), *A Serious and Pathetical Contemplation of the Mercies of God, by Thomas Traherne*, 156.
Darbishire, H., *The First Edition of 'Paradise Lost'*, 164, 232.
Darwin, B. (ed.), *At Odd Moments. An Anthology*, 13.
Davies, G., *The Character of James VI and I*, 148.
Davis, H. (ed.), *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, vols. x and xi*, 173.
Dawson, G. E., *A Bibliographical Problem in the First Folio of Shakespeare*, 104, 229.
Dean, L. F., *Sir F. Bacon's Theory of Civil History-writing*, 147.
Dennis, L., *The Progressive Tense, &c.*, 27.
Dick, R. G., *Queries from Anthony Trollope's Notes on English Drama*, 223.
Dickhoff, J. S., *A Note on 'Comus'*, 159.
Dobson, E. J., *The Etymology and Meaning of 'Boy'*, 30.
Dodds, J. W., *Thackeray: a Critical Portrait*, 209.
Dodds, M. H., *Songs in Lyly's Plays*, 122, 147; *Mourners at Sir P. Sidney's Funeral*, 146; on *Gentlewomen of the Jane Austen period* (also C., C. T.), 194.
Doran, M., *That Undiscovered Country*, 110.
Dorian, D. C., *Milton's Sonnet on the New Forcers of Conscience*, 159.
Dowlin, C. M., *Plot as an Essential in Poetry*, 148.
Draper, J. W., *Shakespeare's Orlando Innamorato*, 106; *Et in Illyria Feste*, 109; *The 'Gracious Duncan'*, 113.
Driburg, T., *Faithful Teate: Forgotten Poet*, 172.
Dunlap, A. R., *'Vicious' Pronunciations in Eighteenth-Century English*, 42.
Dunlap, R., *Thomas Carew, Thomas Carey and 'The Sovereign of the Seas'*, 156.
Duthie, G. I., *The 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet'*, 110.

Eliason, N. E., *The Short Vowels in French Loan Words*, 22; and Davis, R. C., *The Effect of Stress upon Quantity in Dissyllables*, 22.
Edel, L., *Henry James: The War Chapters, 1914–16*, 224.
Eliot, T. S., *A Choice of Kipling's Verse*, 214; *Points of View*, 219.
Ellinger, J., *Die mit Präpositionen zusammengesetzten Adverbien, &c.*, 36.

Elmquist, K. E., *Observation on Chaucer's 'Astrolabe'*, 65.
Elwin, M., *Savage Landor*, 205.
Emsley, B., *Progress in Pronouncing Dictionaries*, 39.
Ennis, L., *Margaret Bellasys' 'Characterismes of Vices'*, 149.
Erdman, D. V., *Lord Byron and the Genteel Reformers*, 202.
Ericson, E .E., *Observations on New English Syntax*, 27.
Esdaile, K. A., *The Real Thomas Amory*, 188.
Essays and Studies, vol. xxvi, 188.
Essays by Divers Hands, vol. xviii, 12, 187.
Evans, W. McC., *Henry Lawes: Musician and Friend of Poets*, 167.

Falk, R. P., *Emerson and Shakespeare*, 115.
Faverty, F. E., *The Sources of the Jules–Phene Episode in 'Pippa Passes'*, 207.
Finch, J. S., *Sir Hans Sloane's Printed Books*, 190, 232.
Fink, Z. S., *Political Implications of 'Paradise Regained,'* 162; *Milton and the Theory of Climatic Influence*, 163.
Fletcher, H. F., *A Note on Two Words in Milton's History of Moscovia*, 160; (ed.) *Milton's Complete Works*, 164.
Flom, G. T., *The Old English Herbal of Apuleius Vitellius C III*, 50.
Flower, R., and Smith, H. (ed.), *The Parker Chronicle and Laws*, 45.
Forse, E. J. G., on *St. Maronoch*, 196.
Förster, M., *Der Name Edinburgh*, 35.
Frampton, M. G., *The York Play of 'Christ led up to Calvary'*, 79.
Freeman, R., *George Herbert and the Emblem Books*, 155.
French, J. M., *John Milton, Scrivener, The Temples of Stowe, and Sir John Lenthall*, 158; *The Burning of Milton's 'Defensio' in France*, 160.
Fries, C. C., *On the Development of the Structural Use of Word Order in Modern English*, 27.
Funke, O., *Ben Jonson's English Grammar*, 25.
Fynmore, A. H. W., *On Charles Lamb's Grave*, 201.

Galbraith, V. H., *John Seward and his Circle*, 91.
Galway, M., *Geoffrey Chaucer, J.P. and M.P.*, 67.
Gardiner, A. H., *The Theory of Proper Names*, 19.
Garrod, H. W., *Matthew Arnold's 1853 Preface*, 209.
Gettmann, R. A., *Turgenev in England and America*, 220.
Gilbert, A. H., *The Ladder of Lechery, 'The Faerie Queen' III, 1, 45*, 138.
Gilbert, F., *Political Thought of the Renaissance and Reformation*, 88.
Gill, W. W., *Somerset Dialect Words and Provincialisms; Wiltshire and Somerset Words; Cheshire and Dorset Words; Manx Dialect Words and Phrases*, 38.
Glasheen, F. J., *Shelley's Use of Gray's Poetry*, 204.
Gordon, D. J., *'No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's,' and Della Porta's 'La Sorella,'* 133.
Gordon, I. A., *Three New Letters of Matthew Arnold, 1881–2*, 209.
Gove, P. B., *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction*, 188.
Graham, C. B., *The Jonsonian Tradition in the Comedies of John Dennis*, 132.
Graham, W. (ed.), *The Letters of Joseph Addison*, 175.
Grant, W., *The Scottish National Dictionary, vol. ii, Part III*, 39.
Gray, H. D., *'The Taming of a Shrew'*, 108; *Shakespeare, Southampton, and Avisa*, 114.
Gray, L. H., *Foundations of Language*, 18.
Gray, W. F., *Burns's Clarinda*, 192.
Greg, W. W., *McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered*, 104; *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, 112; *Jonson's Masques—Points of Editorial Principle and Practice*, 130.
Groom, B., *The Unity of Literature and its Place in Education*, 11.

Hallett, Mgr. P. F. (ed.), *St. Thomas More's History of the Passion, &c.*, 92–3.
Halstead, W. L., *New Source Influence on 'The Shoemaker's Holiday'; Dating . . . in 'The Whore of Babylon'*, 132.
Hamer, D., *Some Spenser Problems*, 137.
Hamilton, M. P., *Credentials of Chaucer's Pardoner*, 58; *Clerical Status of Chaucer's Alchemist*, 59.
Hangen, E. C., *Concordance to Complete Poetical Works of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 98.
Hankins J. E., *The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays*, 110.
Hannigan, J. E., *Which Daniel?*, 107.
Harbage, A., *Shakespeare's Audience*, 101; *A Contemporary Attack upon Shakespeare?*, 116; *Elizabethan Acting*, 119.
Harris, B., *The Ape in 'Mother Hubbard's Tale'*, 139; *Charles Sackville,*

Sixth Earl of Dorset: Patron and Poet of the Restoration, 165.
Harrison, E., *Gibbon's Syntax*, 191.
Harrison, F. M., *Editions of 'The Pilgrim's Progress'*, 232.
Harrison, G. B., *A Jacobean Journal*, 149.
Hart, A., *Did Shakespeare produce his own Plays?*, 102; *Once More the Mouse-Trap*, 111.
Havens, R. D., *The Mind of a Poet; a Study of Wordsworth's Thought*, 198.
Hazen, A. T., *The Cancels in Johnson's 'Journey' 1775*, 191.
Heffner, R.-M. S., *A Note on Vowel Length in American Speech*, 40; and Locke, W. N., and Lehmann, W. P., *Notes on the Length of Vowels*, 40.
Hendrickson, G. L., *Milton, Salmasius —and Synezesis*, 160.
Henkin, L. J., *Apocrypha and Chaucer's 'House of Fame'*, 64.
Herford, C. H., and Simpson, P. and E. (ed.), *Ben Jonson, vol. vii*, 128.
Hibernicus, *A Critic of Wordsworth*, 199.
Highet, G., on *The Dunciad*, 190.
Hilbish, F. M. A., *Charlotte Smith*, 185.
Hill, A. A., *The Early Loss of [r] before Dentals*, 21.
Hill, M. V., *'Pearl': Inlyche and Rewarde*, 75.
Hill, T. W., *Dickens Dietary*, 208.
Hillyer, R. S. (ed.), *Poetry and Selected Prose of J. Donne; Poetry of W. Blake*, 164.
Hippocleides, on *St. Maronoch: Scott and Campbell's 'Hybrias the Cretan'*, 196 (also Duffy, C.).
Hixson, J. C., and Colodny, I., *Word Ways*, 19.
Hoadley, F. T., *The Controversy over Southey's 'Wat Tyler'*, 206.
Hodges, J. C., *William Congreve the Man*, 166.
Holbrook, W. C., *The Adjective 'Gothique' in the XVIIIth Century*, 190.
Holmes, S. W., *Browning's 'Sordello' in the Light of Jung's Theory of Types*, 206.
Holstein, M., *The Shakspere-Bacon-Oxford-Whoozis Mixup*, 106.
Horn, W., *Vom Einfluss des Schriftbildes auf die Aussprache im Englischen*, 21.
Hornstein, L. H., *A Folklore Theme in the 'King of Tars'*, 72; *Analogues to the 'King of Tars'*, 73.
Hotson, L., *Not of an Age*, 102.
House, H., *The Dickens World*, 208.
Howard, C. (ed.), *The Poems of Sir John Davies*, 144.
Howard, E. J. (ed.), *The Defence of Good Women*, 94.
Hughes, M. Y., *The Theme of Pre-existence and Infancy in 'The Retreate'*, 155.
Hull, V., *Edmund Spenser's 'Monashul'*, 139.
Hultzén, L. S., *Seventeenth-Century Intonation*, 25.
Hunt, C., *The Elizabethan Background of Neo-Classic Polite Verse*, 146.
Huppé, B. F., *The Date of the B-text of 'Piers Plowman'*, 74.
Hussey, R., on *Sonnet 64 and Gower's 'Vox Clamantis'*, 113.
Hutchinson, F. E. (ed.), *The Works of George Herbert*, 154.
Hutton, J., *Analogues of Shakespeare's Sonnets 153–164*, 114; *Cupid and the Bee*, 145.

Irwin, W. R., *An Attack on John Fielding*, 190.

Jaggard, W., *Actresses as Helena in 'All's Well'*, 106.
Jameson, T. H., *The 'Machiavellianism', of Gabriel Harvey*, 137.
Jenkins, H., *Chettle and Dekker*, 123; *Cyril Tourneur*, 133.

K., H. G. L., on *Authorship of the Waverley Novels* (also J., W. H., and T., St. V.), 195; *Walter and Reginald Scott; Sir W. Scott's Nephew*, 196; *Lockhart's Novels*, 197.
Kahin, H. A., *Spenser and the School of Alanus*, 139.
Kelley, M., *Lycidas: 'the two-handed engine'*, 159; *This Great Argument*, 161.
Kennedy, A. G., *Recent Trends in English Linguistics*, 20.
Ker, N. R., *Mediaeval Libraries of Great Britain*, 228.
Kerr, W. S., *Swift's Secret*, 192.
Kilby, C. S., *Horace Walpole on Shakespeare*, 115.
King, R. H., *George Fox and the Light Within: 1650–1660*, 152.
Kirk, W. H., *A Note on the Verb 'Wage'*, 29.
Knowles, E. B. Jr., *Allusions to Don Quixote before 1660*, 147.
Knight, G. W., on *Eighteenth-Century Nationalism*, 189; *The Starlit Dome*, 193.
Knights, L. C., *The Ambiguity of 'Measure for Measure'*, 107.
Kocher, P. H., *Backgrounds for Marlowe's Atheist Lecture*, 123; *François Hotman and Marlowe's 'The Massacre at Paris'*, 125.
Kökeritz, H., *The Place-Names of the*

Isle of Wight, 32; *The Jute-Kentish Dialect Boundary*, 33; *Alexander Gill (1621) on the Dialects of South and East England*, 38.
Kreider, P. V., *Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays*, 104.
Kuhl, E. P., *Shakespeare's 'Rape of Lucrece'*, 114.
Kuhn, S. M., *The Gloss to the Vespasian Psalter: Another Collation*, 47.
Kurath, H. (ed.), *Linguistic Atlas of New England*; *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England*, 39.

Lamborn, E. A. G., *Descendants of Chaucer*, 68.
Landrum, G. W., *Images in 'The Faerie Queene' drawn from Flora and Fauna*; *Imagery of Water in 'The Faerie Queene'*, 138.
Lang, V., *Character in the Elia Essays*, 200.
Larrabee, S. A., *Byron's Return from Greece*, 202.
Law, R. A., *Shakespeare in the Garden of Eden*, 114.
Leavis, F. R., *The Greatness of 'Measure for Measure'*, 107.
Leech, C., *The Caroline Audience*, 121; *Catholic and Protestant Drama*, 122; *A Speech-Heading in 'The Revenger's Tragedie'*, 133.
Legge, M. D., *Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions*; *Anglo-Norman and the Historian*, 71.
LeRoy, G. C., *Richard Holt Hutton*, 225.
Lewis, B. R., *The Shakespeare Documents, &c.*, 101.
Lewis, C. D., and Strong, L. A. G. (ed.), *A New Anthology of Modern Verse, 1920–1940*, 219.
Lewis, W. S., *Walpole on Several Characters of Shakespeare*, 115; *Three Tours through London*, 186; and Brown, R. S. Jr. (ed.), *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with George Montagu*, 179.
Lievsay, J. L., *Braggadocio: Spenser's Legacy to the Character-writers*, 140; *Greene's Panther*, 146.
Livingston, C. H., *English 'funk'*, 29.
Leane, G. C., *Chapman's Compounds in the N.E.D.*, 28, 144; *Some Notes on the Twickenham Pope*, 190.
Logan, C. T., *The Plural of Uncountables*, 28.
Loomis, L. H., *Chaucer and the Breton Lays of the Auchinleck MS.*, 60.
Loomis, R. S., *The Spoils of Annwn*, 72.

Lotspeich, C. M., *Old English Etymologies*, 50.
Lucas, M., *Imagery in George Herbert's Poetry*, 155.
Lumiansky, R. M., *Blair's Edition of 'The Unhappy Favourite'*, 171.

Mabbott, T. O., on *'pajock' or 'peacock'*, 112; *A Source for the Conclusion of 'Moby Dick'* (also Visiak, E. T.), 223.
MacCarthy, D., *Drama*, 10.
McCloskey, J. C., *Hamlet's Quest of Certainty*, 111; *The Motivation of Iago*, 113.
McColley, G., *Milton and Moses Bar-Cepha*; *Milton's Battle in Heaven and Rupert of Saint Heribert*, 160.
McCrail, T. H., *Sir W. Alexander*, 164.
McDavid, R. I., *Low-back Vowels in the South Carolina Piedmont*, 40; *'Ivanhoe' and Simms' 'Vasconselos'*, 195.
Macdonald, A., *The Place-Names of West Lothian*, 33.
Macdonald, H., *Some Poetical Miscellanies, 1672–1716*, 188.
McIntosh, A., *M. E. 'Gannokes' and some Place-Name Problems*, 34.
Mackie, W. S., on *Beowulf*, 47.
McKnight, G. H., Haber, T. B., and Hatfield, W. W., *A Grammar of Living English*, 19.
McLachlan, H., *The Religious Opinions of Milton, Locke and Newton*, 163.
McMillan, J. B., *Vowel Nasality . . . in Southern American*, 40.
Macneice, L., *The Poetry of W. B. Yeats*, 217.
McNeir, W. F., *Gayton on Elizabethan Acting*, 120.
McPeek, J. A. S., *Shakespere's Chameleons and Salamanders*, 115.
Malone, Kemp, *Grundtvig as a 'Beowulf' Critic*; *Hygd*, 46.
Manch, J., *Jonathan Swift and Women*, 181.
Manly, J. M., and Rickert, E., *Text of the Canterbury Tales*, 54.
Marchand, H., *Syntaktische Homonymie: Das umschreibende 'do'*, 26.
Marchand, L. A., *The Athenaeum*, 193.
Marshall, M. H., *The Dramatic Tradition established by the Liturgical Plays*, 74.
Martz, L. L., *Tobias Smollett and the 'Universal History'*, 190; *Smollett and the Expedition to Carthagena*, 191.
Masefield, J., *In the Mill*, 216.
Mathews, E. G., *Gil Polo, Desportes, and Lyly's 'Cupid and my Campaspe'*, 123; *John Donne's 'Little Rag'*, 154.
Matthews, W., *South-Western Dialect in the Early Modern Period*, 38.

Maxwell, B., *'The Two Angry Women of Abington' and 'Wily Beguiled'*, 132.
Menner, R. J., *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, 44.
Metzdorf, R. F., *A New Landorian Manuscript*, 206.
Meyerstein, E. H. W., *Chatterton's Last Days*, 192; *Wordsworth and Coleridge*, 199.
Milford, Sir H. (ed.), *Robert Browning: Poetry and Prose*, 206.
Mill, A. J., *Noah's Wife Again*, 79.
Miller, W. H., *The Authorship of 'A General View of the Stage'*, 190.
Mitchell, A. G., *The Pronunciation of English in Australia*, 39; *A Newly Discovered MS. of the C-Text of 'Piers Plowman'*, 74.
Mizener, A., on *Though Phyllis your prevailing charms*, 172.
Montgomery, F., *The Birth and Parentage of William Combe*, 190.
Moore, J. R., *Defoe and the Eighteenth Century Pamphlets on London*; *A New Source for 'Gulliver's Travels'*; *Defoe's Religious Sect*, 191; *Defoe and Scott*, 195.
Morrah, D., *The Game of Ombre in the 'Rape of the Lock'*, 192.
Mroz, Sister M. B., *Divine Vengeance, &c.*, 105.
Muir, P. H., *A Chatterton Edition*, 192.
Munce. T. E. Jn., *Southey and Marston*, 201.
Mundy, P. D., *Cope, Dryden, &c., families*, 169.
Murray, H. J. R., *The Medieval Game of Tables*, 82.
Musgrove, S., on *'Julius Caesar'*, 112.
Myers, E. D., *The Foundations of English*, 19.
Myrick, K. O., *The Theme of Damnation in Shakespearean Tragedy*, 109.

Neff, E., *A Revolution in European Poetry, 1660–1900*, 15.
Ness, F. W., *The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays*, 102.
Newdigate, B. H., *Michael Drayton and his Circle* (see also under Tillotson, K.), 140.; *Mourners at Sir P. Sidney's Funeral*, 146; *Some Notes on the Twickenham Pope*, 190; on Bodleian Shelley relics, 204.
Niblett, W. R., *Hazlitt's Contribution to Literary Criticism*, 201.
Nichols, B. (ed.), *Words and Days*, 13.
Niemeyer, C., *A Misdating of 'A Ballade upon a Wedding'*, 156.
Nolte, F. O., *Lessing's 'Laokoon'*, 9.
Norwood, L. F.. *The Authenticity of Smollett's 'Ode to Independence'*, 191.
Notopoulos, J. A., *Shelley's Translation of the 'Ion' of Plato*, 203.
Nowell-Smith, S., *The Text of Trollope*; *Caldigate Novels*, 224.
Noyes, G. E., *Interrelations of English Dictionaries of the Seventeenth Century*, 29; *The Development of Cant Lexicography in English*, 37, 171.
Nye, R. B., *Lowell and American Speech*, 42.

Olson, C. C., *Chaucer and the Music of the Fourteenth Century*, 65; *The Minstrels at the Court of Edward III*, 82.
Onions, C. T., *Middle English 'wrabbe', 'wrobbe'*, 80.
Orwen, W. R., *Spenser and the Serpent of Division*, 139.
Osborn, J. M., *Macdonald's Bibliography of Dryden*, 169.
Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, 14.

Pace, G. B., *Sir Thomas Elyot against Poetry*, 94.
Padelford, F. M., *Spenser's Use of 'Stour'*, 29, 139; *Aspects of Spenser's Vocabulary*, 139.
Palmer, H., *A Brief History of the Poetry of Despair*, 10.
Parker, W. M., *Scott's prologue to 'Helga'*, 195.
Parrott, T. M., *Comedy in the Court Masque*, 130.
Pascal, R., *On the Origins of the Liturgical Drama of the Middle Ages*, 77.
Penzl, H., *'Kompromissvokal' und Lautwandel*; *The Vowel-Phonemes &c.*, 22.
Pershing, J. H., *The First Edition of 'Paradise Lost'*, 164, 231.
Pettitt, H., *Coleridge's 'Mount Abora'*, 200.
Phillips, L., *questions on Waverley Novels and answers by correspondents*, 195–6.
Philoscotus, *Scott and Rowe's 'Fair Penitent'*; *W. Scott and the Unseen World*, 196.
Pitcher, S. M., *Some Observations on the 1663 editions of 'Faustus'*, 126.
Pope-Hennessy, Dame U., *Durham Company*, 193, 198.
Potter, G. R., *A Protest against the Term 'Conceit'*, 157.
Pottle, F. A., *The Dark Hints of Sir John Hawkins and Boswell*, 190.
Powell, W. C., *A Note on the Stage History of Beaumont and Fletcher's 'Love Pilgrimage' and 'The Chances'*, 134.
Price, H. T., *Grammar and the Compositor in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 26; *'Like himself'*, 28; *Shakespeare as a Critic*, 103.

Price, L. M., *Holland as a Mediator of English-German Literary Influence*, 171.
Prouty, C. T., *Whetstone, Peter Beverly and the Sources of 'Much Ado about Nothing'*, 108.
Purcell, J. M., *Melville's Contribution to English*, 41, 223.
Putney, R., *'Venus and Adonis': Amour with Humor*, 114.

Quennell, P., *Byron in Italy*, 202.

R., V., *Johnson: A Slip in Latin Poetry; Johnson, Boswell and Grattan*, 191; *A Botanical Point in 'Emma'* (also W., E. J. and Harcourt-Bath, W.), 194.
Race, S., *The Diary of John Chapman*, 210.
Randolph, M. C., *Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory*, 87, 136; *Thomas Drant's Definition of Satire*, 88.
Ratchford, F. E., *The Brontës 'Web of Childhood'*, 209.
Read, A. W., *The Motivation of Lindley Murray's Grammatical Work*, 26; *Notes on 'A Dictionary of American English, Parts I–VI*, 41.
Reynolds, G. F., *Aims of a Popular Elizabethan Dramatist*, 132.
Rhys, E. (ed.), *John M. Synge*, 217.
Richards, G., *Housman 1897–1836*, 213.
Roberts, M., *The Dignity of English Thought*, 12.
Robertson, D. W., *Sidney's Metaphor of the Ulcer*, 146.
Robertson, J., *Some Additional Poems by George Chapman*, 143, 233; *Nicholas Breton's Authorship of 'Marie Magdalens Loue', &c.* 144; *Pasquils Mistresse, &c.; Breton and 'The Vncasing of Machivils Instructions to his Sonne'; Breton's 'Honest Counsaile'; A Poem by Breton*, 145.
Robertson, S., *British-American Differentiations in Syntax and Idiom*, 42.
Rolfe, F. R., *Additions to the Nonesuch Edition of Dickens's Letters*, 208.
Rositzke, H. A., *Vowel-length in General American Speech*, 40.
Routh, H. V., *The Diffusion of English Culture outside England*, 11.
Rubel, V. L., *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance from Skelton through Spenser*, 96.

Sadleir, M., *Caldigate Novels*, 224.
Sale, A. (ed.), *Every Man in his Humour*, 131.
Sam, H. W., *Dual Time-Scheme in Chaucer's 'Troilus'*, 61.
Sampson, G., *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*, 7.
Samuel, Viscount, *On Style*, 9.
Sanderlin, G., *Liberum Arbitrium in C-text of 'Piers Plowman'*, 74.
Sandmann, M., *On Linguistic Explanation*, 18.
Sayers, D. L., *The Mind of the Maker*, 14.
Schabel, F., *Zur neueren englischen Dialektforschung*, 37.
Schlauch, M., *An Old English Encomium Urbis*, 49.
Schmitz, R. M., *Scottish Shakspere*, 115.
Schultz, H., *An Early 'Hamlet' Allusion*, 111.
Schulz, H. C., *Manuscript Printer's Copy for a lost Early English Book*, 233.
Schuster, M. L. (ed.), *A Treasury of the World's Great Letters*, 13.
Schütte, G., *Relations between English and Jutlandic*, 36.
Segar, M. G., *Ambrose Philips*, 191.
Selincourt, E. de, *Wordsworth and Coleridge*, 200.
Sells, A. L., *Oliver Goldsmith's Influence on the French Stage*, 189.
Sensabaugh, G. F., *John Ford and Elizabethan Tragedy*, 134.
Sewall, S., *The Relation between 'The Merry Wives of Windsor' and Jonson's 'Every Man in his Humour'*, 107.
Shaaber, M. A. (ed.), *New Variorum edition of '2 Henry IV'*, 109.
Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 101.
Shudofsky, M. M., *Sarah Bernhardt on Hamlet*, 111; *An Early Eighteenth-Century Rhymed Paraphrase of 'Paradise Lost', II*, 190.
Simpson, E., *Jonson's Masques: A Rejoinder*, 130; *The Text of Donne's 'Divine Poems'*, 153.
Simpson, P. and E., and Herford, C. H. (ed.), *Ben Jonson, vol. vii*, 128.
Sitwell, Sir O., on *the 'sole Arabian tree'*, 200.
Sleeth, C. R., *Friendship of Chaucer's Summoner and Pardoner*, 59.
Small, S. A., *Hotspur and Falstaff*, 109.
Smalley, B., *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 69.
Smith, D. N., *The Early Version of Shenstone's 'Pastoral Ballad'*, 191; and McAdam, E. L. (ed.), *The Poems of Samuel Johnson*, 179.
Smith, M. E., *The Lunatic, The Lover, and the Poet*, 103.
Smith, N. K., *The Philosophy of David Hume*, 182.
Smith, R. J., *A Translation of Essays by Saint-Évremond*, 169.

Smyser, H. M., *Chaucer's Two-Mile Pilgrimage*, 64.
Southern, R. W., *St. Anselm and his English Pupils*, 70.
Spencer, B. T., *This Elizabethan Shakespeare*, 103; *The New Realism and a National Literature*, 227.
Spielmann, P. E., *The Effect of Scientific Thought on the Arts and Literature*, 12.
Starkie, E., *A Line in Baudelaire* (also M., J. N., and Swanzy, T. E.), 194.
Starr, H. W., *Gray as a Literary Critic*, 181; *Sources of 'Mustapha, a Tragedy'*, 191.
Stauffer, D., *The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England*, 185.
Steele, R. (ed.), *The English Poems of Charles of Orleans*, 75.
Stenton, F. M., *The Historical Bearing of Place-Name Studies*, 34.
Stewart, B. T., *A Borrowing from Spenser by Phineas Fletcher*, 140.
Stilwell, G., *'Wynnoure and Wastoure' and the Hundred Years' War*, 75.
Stone, G. W., *Garrick's Handling of 'Macbeth'*, 113.
Strathmann, E. A., *The Textual Evidence for 'The School of Night'*, 107.
Stratton, C., *Handbook of English*, 42.
Strong, L. A. G., *Reading for Pleasure*, 10.
Strout, A. L., *Lockhart and Croker; Lockhart and John Scott; James Hogg's 'Spy'*, 197; *the Review 'On Hogg's Memoirs' in Blackwood; Letters to . . . J. Hogg; The Ensign's Tear*, 198.
Studies in English, Univ. of Texas, 16.
Stuart, D. M., *Landscape in Augustan Verse*, 188.
Sullivan, F., *Cyme, a Purgative Drug*, 113.
Summers, M., *The Game of Ombre in the 'Rape of the Lock'*, 192; *A Gothic Bibliography*, 229.
Summerson, J., *The Monuments in the Church of St. Nicholas, Deptford*, 170.
Super, R. H., *Extraordinary Action for Libel: Yescombe v. Landor*, 206.
Sutcliffe, E. G., *Psychological Presentation in Reade's Novels*, 210.
Sutherland, J. R., *Wordsworth and Coleridge*, 199.
Swayne, M., *Shakespeare's King Henry IV as a Pacifist*, 109.

Tait, J. G. (ed.), *Sir W. Scott's Journal, vol. ii*, 195.
Tannenbaum, S. A., *'Hamlet' and the Gonzago Murders; Ophelia lies*, 111; on *The Fencing Bout in 'Hamlet'*, 112 (also Gilbert, A. H.); *An Emendation in 'King Lear'*, 113.
Tanner, L. E., *MS. of 'Sapientia Salomonis'*, 100.
Tatlock, J. S. P., *People in Chaucer's 'Troilus'*, 62.
Taube, E., *German Influence on the English Vocabulary in the Nineteenth Century*, 36.
Taylor, G. C., *Two Notes on Shakespeare*, 108.
Taylor, W., *The Uses of Shakespeare*, 103.
Tengstrand, E., *A Contribution to the Study of Genitival Compounds in Old-English Place-Names*, 30.
Thielke, K., *Neuenglische Kose- und Spitznamen auf -s*, 37.
Thomas, C. K., *American Dictionaries and Variant Pronunciations*, 39.
Thomas, H. F. S., *Nahum Tate, Laureate*, 172.
Thomas, S., *The Elizabethan Idea of Melancholy*, 136.
Thompson, B. H., *Anthony Munday's Journey to Rome*, 96.
Thompson, E. N. S., *R. Hooker among the Controversialists*, 147.
Thompson, S., *Folklore and Literature*, 14.
Thornton, R. H., *An American Glossary* (ed. L. Hanley), 41.
Tillotson, G., *Some Notes on the Twickenham Pope*, 190; *The Game of Ombre in 'The Rape of the Lock'*, 192.
Tillotson, K., and Newdigate, B. H., (ed.), *The Works of Michael Drayton, Vol. V*, 140.
Tillyard, E. M. W., *The Causeway from Hell to the World*, 162.
Times Literary Supplement, *Thomas Dekker and the Underdog*, 122, 147; *Ben Jonson's Masques*, 130; *Juliana Ewing's World*, 210; *Adventures of a Novel: 'Tess' after fifty years*, 221; *William Black*, 224.
Todd, R., *William Blake*, 192.
Traversi, D. A., *The King in 'Henry the Fifth'*, 109.
Troubridge, St. V., *Notes on the Oxford English Dictionary*, 28; *Some Additions to the Slang Dictionaries*, 37; *The Spelling of Shakespeare's Name*, 102; *Actresses as Helena in 'All's Well'*, 106.
Tuell, A. K., *John Sterling: A Representative Victorian*, 210.

Vince, J. H., *A Passage in Gibbon*, 191.
Vinnent, H. P., *Henry Fielding in Prison*, 190.
Vogel, B., *The Dialect of 'Sir Tristrem'*, 72.

Walker, J. H., *'The Faerie Queene': Alterations and Structure*, 138.
Wallace, K. R., *Bacon's Contribution to the theory of Rhetoric*, 150.
Wallis, N. H., *'Fugitive Poetry'*, 187.
Walz, J. A., *The Interjection 'Hurrah'*, 29.
Wanklyn, C., on *A Tangier Document*, 170.
Wasserman, E., *Moses Browne and the 1783 edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher*, 190.
Watson, C. B., *Shakespeare's Dukes*, 115.
Webb, H. J., *Elizabethan Translation of Vegetius' 'De Re Militari'*, 95.
Weber, C. J., *Hardy of Wessex*, 211; *Ainsworth and Thomas Hardy*; *An Elizabethan Basis for a Hardy Tale?*, 222.
Wecter, D., *Dr. Johnson, Mrs. Thrale and Boswell*, 190.
Weekley, E., *Jack and Jill*, 35.
Weiss, R., *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*, 88; *Leonardo Bruni Aretino and Early English Humanism*, 90.
Wellek, R., *The Rise of English Literary History*, 168.
Wells, J. E., *Thomson's Subscription 'Seasons'*, 190.
Welply, W. H., *Some Spenser Problems*, 137; *John, Baron Lumley*, 138.
Wentworth, H., *The Allegedly Dead Suffix -dom in Modern English*, 36; *Mr. Horwell and American Language Levels*, 42.
Whitbread, L., *The Third Sector of 'Deor'*, 47.
White, N. I., *Life of Shelley*, 203 (also Jones, F. L.).
White, W., *Herman Melville, a New Source*, 223; *A. E. Housman on Blunt and Kipling*, 226.
Whitehall, H., *Middle English ū and Related Sounds*, 23; *The Quality of the Front Reduction Vowel in Early American English*; *Historical Status of Modern English*, 24; *The Etymology of 'Lad'*, 30; *Interim Etymologies*, 80; and Fein, T., *The Development of ME. ŭ, &c.*; *An Elusive Development of 'short o', &c.*, 25.
Whittaker, V. K., *Shakespeare's Use of his Sources*, 105.
Wilcox, J., *Putting Jaques into 'As You Like It'*, 106.
Wilde, H.-O., *Aufforderung Wunsch und Möglichkeit*, 26.
Williams, A., *The Two Matters: Classical and Christian in the Renaissance*, 86; *Renaissance Commentaries on 'Genesis' and some Elements of the Theology of 'Paradise Lost'*, 161.
Williams, C., *Wordsworth and Blake*, 199.
Williams, F., *Mr. Shakespeare of the Globe*, 102.
Williams, H., *Swift's Secret*, 192.
Wilmart, A., *Thomas Bekynton's 'Florilège'*, 71.
Wilson, F. P., *Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life*, 29, 104; *Ben Jonson and Ralph Crane*, 130.
Wilson, J. H. (ed.), *The Rochester Savile Letters, 1671–1680*, 166; *Rochester's Buffoon Conceit*, 172.
Wilson, R. M., *Some Lost Saints' Lives in Old and Middle English*, 48.
Wimstatt, W. K., *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson*, 183.
Withington, R., *Which Daniel?*, 107.
Wolfe, D. M., *Lilburne's Note on Milton*, 160; *Milton in the Puritan Revolution*, 164.
Wolff, S. L., *Milton's 'Advocatum nescio quem': Milton, Salmasius, and John Clark*, 159.
Woodhouse, A. S. P., *The Argument of Milton's 'Comus'*, 158.
Workman, S. K., *Versions by Skelton, Caxton, and Berners of a Prologue by Diodorus Siculus*, 94.
Wright, H. G., *Elizabethan Translation of the Questioni d'Amore in the 'Filocolo'*, 95.
Wright, L. B., *Introduction to a Survey of Renaissance Studies*; *Renaissance Conference at the Huntington Library*, 84.
Wright, W. F., *George Eliot as an Industrial Reformer*, 210.
Wyld, H. C., *Some Aspects of Style and Idiom in Fifteenth-Century English*, 81.

Yocom, H. W., *Some Additional Sources of Browning's 'Saul'*, 207.
Young, K., *Maidenly Virtue of Chaucer's Virginia*, 60.

Zimmerman, J. D. (ed.), *Phonetic Transcriptions from 'American Speech'*, 39.

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

Four New Volumes in Everyman's Library

CHINESE PHILOSOPHY IN CLASSICAL TIMES

Edited, annotated, and newly translated into English by E. R. HUGHES, M.A., Reader in Chinese Philosophy and Religion in Oxford University. (No. 973)

A PASSAGE TO INDIA

By E. M. FORSTER. With an Introduction by PETER BURRA, and some notes by the Author. (No. 972)

CAMBRIDGE LECTURES

By Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH. A selection from Q's well-known books on literature. (No. 974)

THE EXPEDITION OF HUMPHRY CLINKER

By TOBIAS SMOLLETT. Introduction by PROFESSOR HOWARD MUMFORD JONES, and thirty-two pages of Notes by CHARLES LEE. (No. 975)

Each 3*s.* net

DENT

Some Oxford Books edited by the late
ERNEST DE SELINCOURT

THE LETTERS OF WILLIAM AND DOROTHY WORDSWORTH

(*Early Letters; Middle Years; Later Years.*) Six volumes. £6. 6*s.* net

'With this edition of the letters, and with his life of Dorothy Wordsworth, and his great edition of the *Prelude*, Dr. de Selincourt has made contributions to the study of Wordsworth with which the labours of no other scholar can stand in comparison.' Professor B. IFOR EVANS in the *Observer*.

THE POETICAL WORKS OF WILLIAM WORDSWORTH

(*Oxford English Texts*)

POEMS WRITTEN IN YOUTH AND REFERRING TO THE PERIOD OF CHILDHOOD. 21*s.* net.

POEMS FOUNDED ON THE AFFECTIONS: POEMS ON THE NAMING OF PLACES: POEMS OF THE FANCY: POEMS OF THE IMAGINATION. (*Shortly*)

'It is safe to prophesy that when this edition is complete it will take its place once and for all as the definitive edition of Wordsworth's poems.' *Scotsman.*

WORDSWORTH: THE PRELUDE

(*Oxford English Texts.*) 31*s.* 6*d.* net.

'A book like a landmark not hereafter to be removed.... The whole is a masterpiece of minute and exhaustive editing.' *Observer.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

WINTER SOLSTICE

By Gerald Bullett

This poem has all the still and light-containing qualities of Mr Bullett's best work, the poignant beauty made to consort with a gentle inflexible integrity. It is a poem of the dark time in which men live, but also of all time; a question of the meaning of existence, stated, widely probed; and a mystical direction towards an answer that can be found though never formulated. 1*s*. net.

[*Ready shortly*]

LANDMARKS

By G. Rostrevor Hamilton and John Arlott

This anthology presents a picture of England and Wales—in the particular town, village, landscape—seen through the eyes of many writers of English verse. One hundred and eighty poets are quoted, ranging in date from Chaucer to the present day. About 10*s*. 6*d*. net.

THE FORTUNES OF FALSTAFF

[*Ready shortly*] *By J. Dover Wilson*

Professor Dover Wilson finds, in the pages of Shakespeare himself, a new Falstaff, as fascinating as Bradley's, certainly quite as human, but different. This book contains the working out of the new portraits of Falstaff and Prince Hal. About 6*s*. net.

THE DAILY PRESS

By Wilson Harris

"Mr Wilson Harris sets out with intimate knowledge almost every essential fact about our newspapers." *John O'London's Weekly.*

Current Problems, No. 18. 3*s*. 6*d*. net.

THOMAS BARNES

[*Ready shortly*] **of *The Times***

By Derek Hudson and Harold Child

A life of Thomas Barnes, editor from 1817–1841, has been long overdue. Mr Hudson, who has had all facilities at his disposal at *The Times* office, has now filled this want. Selections from Barnes's own writings have been made by Mr Child. 8 plates. About 8*s*. 6*d*. net.

LYTTON STRACHEY

A personal portrait

By Max Beerbohm

This is the Rede Lecture for 1943. It is a personal portrait, a literary assessment and appreciation, and a lecture made of light, judgment, kindliness, and wit. 1*s*. 6*d*. net.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS