

1972

## Book Reviews

Criticism Editors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/criticism>

---

### Recommended Citation

Editors, Criticism (1972) "Book Reviews," *Criticism*: Vol. 14: Iss. 1, Article 7.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/criticism/vol14/iss1/7>

## Book Reviews

*Literature as System: Essays Toward the Theory of Literary History* by Claudio Guillén. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1971. Pp. vii + 528. \$15.00.

A decade ago, literary theory and literary history seemed dead things. Practice was enough, at least in the English-speaking countries; perhaps only practice was possible. Yet now we have a number of journals devoted to criticism, to "new" literary history, to comparative criticism to genre, to fiction studies, and to much else. One of Claudio Guillén's distinctions is that for more than the last decade he has swum like Beowulf, victorious in the wide sea of literary theory in a number of European currents. Another, evident throughout his book, is his ability to maintain a constellation of critical principles without forfeiting the concerns, or the practice, of literary analysis, literary history, and literary theory. His immersion in Iberian literature and European theory does not incapacitate him, partly because of his ability to draw careful larger inferences, and partly because he recognizes with sure instinct those points at which other literatures and other views of literature might modify his own conclusions. His book is none the worse for being made up of hitherto published essays. Their developmental evidence, and the author's capacity, his clear sense of responsibility, to alter his opinions, make his book something of a counterpart of Wordsworth's modern epic. In a very attractive sense, *Literature as System* might have been given the subtitle, "The Growth of the Critic's Mind."

The growth of the particular critic's mind probably possesses a greater importance to his friends than to the world at large. That is, to all but a handful of us readers the chronology of the essays and their revisions holds far less importance than the quality of that mind. Princeton University Press deserves our thanks, especially in these lean times, for putting such handsome effort into a book of essays published over a span of years. Princeton Press has shown a faith that other presses could well attend to: the trust in intellectual quality rather than in the usual formal definitions of a book.

All that is not to suggest that Mr. Guillén's essays are a gathering of *opuscula*. If we ignore the chronology of composition, as really we must, what we have is something like an ambitious piece of cubist criticism. Out of the brilliant blues and reds of planes, Mr. Guillén plans a total canvas of literature. The essays range (in one sense) from a "Stylistics of Silence," or the so-to-speak interior, unstated but operative implicities of details at one end, to a "Literature as System" at the other. The ground between is covered in some measure by generic study ("Toward a Definition of the Picaresque," "On the Uses of Literary Genre," "Genre and Counter-genre: The Discovery of Picaresque," and another essay of mannered title, "Literature as Historical Contradiction"). In this part of the book, which is perhaps the most creative and satisfying, I found myself finishing one essay with questions answered in the next. Above all, two qualities deserve to be singled out. For one thing, the four

essays mentioned show that literary history remains possible, that if our time possesses importance for us, so do the times of other human beings. And for another (as has perhaps been implied), history is valuable when it reveals humanity. The discussion of the Moorish novel, and of *El Abencerraje* in particular, is profoundly moving. This, one feels, is what history and literature are centrally about: human beings in time, aesthetic values giving life to moral values, the life of the mind as senator in the parliament of life.

Another part of Mr. Guillén's scheme moves toward the larger context. A very long essay "On the Concept and Metaphor of Perspective" possesses that detailed possession of several literatures and critical modes that makes one kind of European literary study at once broadly European and, by the logic that individual quality becomes a universal possession, something that all can share. The last three essays have the titles "Literature as System," "Second Thoughts on Literary Periods," and "On the Object of Literary Change." The first of these properly gives the title to the whole book, even if a systematics is hardly the dress most appealing to the empirical Anglo-Saxon mind. Still, from the stylistics of silence to literary period and system represents an enormous range, a very impressive achievement in detail and intellectual capacity.

"Our joys are not sincere," as was said long ago; there is always some mixture. Like the French Structuralism, or *la nouvelle critique*, Guillén's "system" has a dark side to its bright moon. Very late, too late, in the book (p. 487) we are given definitions of the terms, "system" and "structure."

There is . . . a useful distinction between "structure" and "system" which one may wish to retain. "Structures," according to this conception, designate especially the interrelations (of mutual and meaningful dependence) between constituent units. "Systems" denotes either the set which is "held together" by these relations or the larger configuration which embraces one set after another in historical time. Thus system is the broader term; structure, the more precise one.

On the next page, Mr. Guillén remarks, "'Poetry-prose-prose poem' is a subsystem, while the relation between the three is a structure." The terms "constituent units" and "set" require as much definition as "structure" and "system." Most readers are likely to take for their model of the former the parts of a literary production, and for the latter a genre. In the ensuing pages, Mr. Guillén does not make clear to one reader whether he would admit such glossing or whether he has in mind a more Structuralist and ambitious meaning: that is, whether "structure" is a generative, transformational conception and "system" a total "language" in the sense made familiar by Lévi-Strauss. Or indeed whether both the smaller and the larger senses are intended, since examples seeming to support either are given. The reader of so long a book deserves greater clarity, especially when the definitions are so late in appearing.

At the conclusion of his very important essay on "Literature as System" Mr. Guillén had skirmished the same country of the mind. He distinguished there (pp. 418-19) two "ways of confronting the problems of literary history with which I cannot concur." One "consists in dissolving the processes of literature into 'general history.'" This seems (it is not altogether clear) to raise the fundamental philosophical problem of cognition. What is the relation of perception to the actual, objective (or imagined, depending on the philosopher)

world lying outside the sentient, subjective observer? Mr. Guillén appears to accept the belief of Jorge Luis Borges, "that there is no universe in the organic, unitary sense of this ambitious word." Because Mr. Guillén does not seem to accept on the other hand the idealist hypotheses of Berkeley, Kant, and others, it would seem that he must affirm a phenomenological view of ascertainable reality. More of that in a moment. The other view he rejects "consists in seeking meaningful connections between the single literary work and entire social, economic, or intellectual systems." He concludes

My interests (to propose one more triad) lie somewhere between these two opposites. Literary systems, like social or linguistic ones, exist; whereas the "universe," as Borges quietly suspects, may not. Our task, I think, is to identify the careers of these different systems in historical time, to discover those that prevailed, and to listen to the dialogue between them.

That is well said, but what is said?

Systems exist, but not the universe? Each of us must necessarily choose his own most fruitful level of abstraction, and we can never prove the existence of our chosen levels, or hypotheses, without resort to the concurrence of others. In airing such fundamental problems Mr. Guillén does us service, but the service would be greater if the meaning were clearer. What he *seems* to be arguing in such passages is a group of middle-level (of abstraction systems that are generated from the individual's phenomenological experience into "structures" and "systems" that depreciate both the microscopic detail and the macroscopic totality. If that is what is meant, Mr. Guillén certainly belongs to our time. Such is the doubtful position occupied by many of us, including Northrop Frye and, above all, the so-called French Structuralists and the so-called Geneva School. That position holds to a middle-range epistemology, superior to detail but doubtful of any sense, or any existence, derivable from a totality. It is a *Weltanschauung* without metaphysics, a world-view unable to accept Kant's strenuous efforts to create a total view without usual metaphysics. Remarkable on such a position held by proponents of *la nouvelle critique*, Robert Ellrod said with considerable wit that, in his view, "avec hostilité mais sans ironie," it was for him "un beau système." Many of us would have to admit that our critical practice leads us into what seems to be Guillén's corner. And as we stand there, all of us are equally likely to feel shame-facedly that the world or the universe *does* exist, and that our systems are the orphans of unknown philosophical parents.

Given the absence of philosophical knowledge, much less of commitment, in our usual literary discourse, we can only be grateful for Mr. Guillén's teasing us on. It would be madness to expect him to solve questions that the structuralists evade and the rest of us seldom trouble ourselves over. But it does not seem unreasonable that one who skirmishes the area as he does should report his findings more clearly. Perhaps he will in later essays. But as of this moment, we can be deeply grateful to Claudio Guillén for bringing together and revising his long-pondered, very sensitive observations on literature and criticism.

EARL MINER

*University of California, Los Angeles*

*Victorian Novelists and Their Illustrators* by John R. Harvey. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1970. (New York: New York University Press, 1971). Pp. xi + 240. £3.50. (\$13.50).

John Harvey's subject is the special status of illustrations in the English novel published in parts, between 1836 and about 1860. The importance of this book for the history of the novel, literary criticism, and the history of artistic modes is considerable; Mr. Harvey writes engagingly, and the volume is handsomely produced and copiously (though not always appropriately) illustrated. It almost deserves the position it shall undoubtedly be accorded, as the standard introduction to the subject.

Mr. Harvey's central, brilliantly presented thesis is that both the frequency and significance of illustrations in early Victorian novels derive from the relation of the parts-novel to the earlier traditions of English caricature. As caricatures were displayed in the windows of print-shops in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, so the etched plates to the novels of Dickens, Thackeray, and a host of lesser writers were displayed in Victorian booksellers' windows for the delectation of the populace and as an enticement to buy. But Harvey goes beyond economic parallels to demonstrate that the styles of an illustrator like Cruikshank and a novelist like Dickens had common roots, most immediately in Hogarth and Gillray, and ultimately in the schools of Breughel and Bosch.

Chapter 2, "Gillray to Cruikshank: Graphic Satire and Illustration," reproduces previously unpublished letters which substantiate George Cruikshank's much-ridiculed claims to have originated certain of Ainsworth's novels. But Mr. Harvey is not satisfied simply to present this material; he argues convincingly that Cruikshank demanded such dominance over the novelist because he saw himself as being in the line of Hogarth and Gillray—which indeed he was, having worked for more than two decades as a caricaturist. The third chapter demonstrates Hogarth's influence upon both Cruikshank and Dickens, while the fourth places Thackeray in the tradition, both as novelist and self-illustrator.

The most extensive treatment of a single novelist and artist is reserved for Chapters 5 and 6, which deal with Dickens and his main illustrator, Hablot K. Browne ("Phiz"). In the short space of fifty-seven pages (approximately nineteen of which are taken up with illustrative plates), Mr. Harvey, tracing the collaboration from *Pickwick* through *Little Dorrit*, can discuss only a few illustrations from each novel, and yet he brings out varied and significant points. I find myself most impressed with his detailing of the different tasks allotted to Phiz and Cattermole in illustrating *The Old Curiosity Shop* and *Barnaby Rudge*, the revelation of Daumier's influence upon Phiz's conception of Mrs. Gamp, and the astute explication of six plates from *David Copperfield*. A strong case is made here for Browne's importance as an artist whose methods complement Dickens' own.

The chapters on Dickens and Browne also prompt several objections, which are particularly serious in regard to a work which will probably be accepted as authoritative for some time to come. Harvey hints that Browne may have originated ideas without Dickens' specific directions, but rather than face the question directly, he refers to details with which "one might also credit

Browne," and then points out that they in fact derive from the text; and he cites a detail which is in a final etching, but not in an extant drawing for it, concluding that Dickens must have suggested that detail to the artist. This latter is uncertain proof in the one case, and no proof at all of Browne's and Dickens' general practices; much evidence—none of it cited by Harvey—exists for Browne's originality of invention (see my article, this journal, Summer, 1969). One may also question the finality with which Harvey asserts that Dickens had left Browne "far behind" by the time of *Little Dorrit*, and that the years following were a period of accelerating decline for the artist; a case can certainly be made for all eight of the "dark" plates to *Little Dorrit*, as well as the significantly paired frontispiece and title-page vignette, as on a level with the best of Browne's work. And although a decline does become evident in the 1860's, his "dark" plates to Augustus Mayhew's *Paved With Gold* (1857-58) are new and striking accomplishments.

An irritating tendency in this book emerges in the chapters on Browne, where six large illustrations are used to demonstrate the advances in Browne's style between the earlier and later versions of some of the *Pickwick* plates; the very brief accompanying text is a superficial, "appreciative" sort. And two more full pages are wasted upon reproducing the *Pickwick* frontispiece and Onwhyn's frontispiece to *Valentine Vox*; although the latter is obviously based on the former, two facts that Harvey ignores are much more interesting: Browne's frontispiece was derived from one by Seymour, and the convention of the stage as a frame—common to all three of these etchings—derives from illustrations in sub-literary novels of the period (see Louis James, *Fiction for the Working Man, 1830-1850*). There is a related kind of waste in Harvey's devoting a full page to a plate from Cruikshank's *Table Book* in order to demonstrate that Thackeray could have got his pictorial conception of the Fool in *Vanity Fair* from this source; in fact, Thackeray's Fools have a long and varied ancestry, including Quarles's *Emblemes*, with which Thackeray was familiar, as he was with Alciati (as can be seen from letters of 1831 and 1852, respectively). Indeed, the importance of emblem books as a contributing factor in the traditions of these novelists and illustrators is cavalierly dismissed by Harvey, although it can easily be demonstrated that Browne and Dickens, as well as Thackeray, made use of an extensive knowledge—both direct and indirect—of the emblem-writers. Another surprising omission is the matter of Hogarth's and Cruikshank's direct influence upon Browne: Harvey makes no mention of Browne's use of earlier graphic satirists as sources for details and for entire illustrations.

Some of the above are perhaps minor weaknesses, though together they seem to evince a rush for publication; but Harvey's totally misleading assertion about the typical method of etching is inexcusable. Mr. Harvey correctly dismisses a late-Victorian writer's suggestion that Browne and others etched directly upon the steel, simply copying their drawings; but in refutation he then cites another late-Victorian writer's account of Cruikshank's practice of making pencil tracings and transferring them to the steels, as though it can be taken as the universal method. Actually, Browne rarely used this method, for his final etchings are usually reversed from the drawings (as Cruikshank's and Seymour's are not); and Edgar Browne's description (in a 1913 book Mr.

Harvey lists in his bibliography, but must not have read very carefully) of his father's very different method (sanguine-covered paper, chalk-side down on the ground of the steel, drawing face up on this, the drawing then traced over with a blunt point) makes it clear why this is so. This may seem an excessively pedantic point, but in fact the question of Brown's method can be significant when one is attempting to discover sources: the pawnbroker's shop scene in *Martin Chuzzlewit* can clearly be seen to be imitated from Cruikshank's in *Sketches by Boz*, when one realizes that the original drawing, unlike the final plate, has the same left-to-right orientation as Cruikshank's etching. That Mr. Harvey should have missed the significance of Browne's reversals from drawing to plate is surprising, since he examined large numbers of Browne's original drawings.

The omissions, superficialities, errors, and superfluous inclusion of well-known materials (for instance, the directions for a plate in *Martin Chuzzlewit* which have been printed previously in 1899, 1938 and 1961) are irritating just because this is basically so excellent a book. Mr. Harvey has made an important contribution in establishing once and for all the importance of Victorian illustrations, and their place in the Hogarth tradition; but he has done a disservice to future unsuspecting novices, in this field where there are few experts, by failing to adhere to a consistently high standard of scholarship.

MICHAEL STEIG

*Simon Fraser University*

*Literature and Responsibility: The French Novelist in the Twentieth Century*  
by Rima Drell Reck. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969.  
Pp. xvii + 306. \$8.50.

In many ways, despite moments of insight, this study is disappointing. The title, *Literature and Responsibility*, suggests that a significant contribution to our awareness of twentieth-century literature in France is to be made: an attempt, perhaps a little unfashionable but nevertheless of the greatest importance, to reaffirm the link between fiction and ethics and politics. But the subtitle gives the reader pause: *The French Novelist in the Twentieth Century*—a very broad claim which, as it turns out, is not substantiated.

Mrs. Reck argues that "the period from after the First World War to the early 1960's has been a time of engaged literature, as the subject matter of fiction has tended to deal with political and social actuality in more obvious fashion, as novelists have grown more conscious of their role as shapers of national morality and guides of conscience" (p. xi). This is hardly true; and, moreover, it is misleading. "Engaged literature" scarcely existed before the late '20's or early '30's; and it had pretty well run its course by the early '50's, when it was gradually displaced by Beckett and the *nouveau roman*, which dominated fiction, being paralleled on the stage by the Theater of Nothingness (sometimes referred to as Theater of the Absurd.) Mrs. Reck explains, in an

awkward sentence, that Gide and Proust are excluded "since their major works were neither conceived under the reign (*sic*) of the attitude described here or expressive of a reaction to it" (p. xii). That means playing cat-and-mouse with the chronology; and in any case, it certainly rules out the *subtitle* of the study. But the introductory argument is further weakened by statements such as this one:

My aim here is not to demonstrate that all the novelists under consideration were primarily concerned with the question of engaged literature. This would be difficult to prove in the instance of Mauriac during his major fictional period, of Green during all his work, of Malraux even when his novels appeared most rooted in recent history. Rather, I wish to examine the validity of the extraliterary criteria for fiction which became dominant after 1944 for about fifteen years. (p. xiii)

In other words, the writers chosen don't all fit the argument equally well (as it turns out, some of them don't fit the argument at all).

But Mrs. Reck's stated objective is the writer's responsibility, a term which is broader than "commitment." "I hope . . . to measure with objectivity the extent to which the criteria for responsible literature popular after 1944 can be applied to the novelists who preceded Sartre, Camus, and Beauvoir. I wish to examine how fiction as an art form is always to some degree concerned with the issue of responsibility" (p. xiii). On the one hand, this sounds plausible; on the other, one wonders about the relationship between the "extraliterary criteria for fiction" mentioned above and "fiction as an art form." Thus, the problem converges on Mrs. Reck's definition of responsibility, which turns out to be flat and uncritical:

Artistic responsibility should be conceived in its broader sense as the authenticity of a writer's expression of his individual needs and his response to the world in which he lives. In this light, members of the post-1944 generation can be seen as the inheritors of tradition which they brought to a climax. (p. xxi)

I wonder whether a tradition can ever be "brought to a climax"; and authenticity is too weak and imprecise as a criterion, since it might very well be argued that authenticity is precisely the quality that characterizes Proust's and Gide's fiction (why not also Breton's? or Duras'? or Sarraute's? or even Beckett's?).

Nevertheless, on this feeble framework the author builds a number of chapters of undeniable merit. The sequence of chapters is as follows: Sartre, Camus, Beauvoir, Bernanos, Green, Mauriac, Céline, Aragon, Malraux. In view of the declared scope of the study (1920-1960), the informed reader may wonder about certain omissions: why, for instance, is there no chapter on Martin du Gard, no mention even of Saint-Exupéry or Giono, no reference whatsoever to the Surrealist novel (no matter how abortive) nor to Beckett? These omissions are doubly irritating in view of the fact that among the novelists treated in this study, Julien Green most certainly does not qualify; and Céline and Mauriac (as *romancier*) are certainly marginal cases.

Setting these objections aside, I should like to say that Mrs. Reck was wise to begin with the triad Sartre-Camus-Beauvoir, all of whom are well discussed

(But why neglect to discuss Camus' *L'exil et le royaume*, which is so important for Mrs. Reck's thesis? and why slight Simone de Beauvoir's *L'invitée*, a better novel than the lengthily discussed *Les mandarins*?). Of the remaining essays, the ones on Céline, Aragon and Mauriac strike me as being the best; the Bernanos and Malraux chapters attest to a weakness of conceptualization, which points up a major flaw in Mrs. Reck's overall approach to the problem of responsibility and commitment: her inability to come to grips with the theological basis of Bernanos' thought and with the political complexities and contradictions of Malraux' writing.

This brings me to final but essential query: for whom, after all, was this book written? It floats uneasily between popularization (and therefore simplification) and seriousness. The specialist will not find enough to satisfy his curiosity; the general reader is likely to find the study informative, provided that he is interested in the authors treated. But since a number of these novelists are already receding into a limbo of (at least partial) oblivion, why take all this trouble, especially since the central issue, that of fiction and responsibility, is left dangling?

WALTER A. STRAUSS

Case Western Reserve University

*Poetry in East Germany: Adjustments, Visions, and Provocations, 1945-1970* by

John Flores. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1971. Pp. xiv + 354. \$12.50.

Professor Flores' study—originally a Yale dissertation—is meticulously researched, his arguments are carefully reasoned, and his style is in general superb. Furthermore, the organization of the book is admirably suited to the author's goal. The study consists of an introductory chapter and three main sections. In the first of these the development of poetry in East Germany from 1945 to 1960 is illustrated by means of detailed analyses of the works of Stephan Hermlin and Franz Fühmann. The second examines the poetry of Huchel and Bobrowski in considerable detail, and the final section discusses the work of four younger poets: Kunert, Braun, Mickel, and Biermann. An appendix follows, in which the texts of inaccessible early poems of Bobrowski and Fühmann are given, and the volume also has an extensive bibliography and a thorough index. The only serious flaw is the deplorable number of misprints and textual inaccuracies, especially in the quotations of poetry.

The author skillfully combines perceptive interpretations of poems with a discussion of the artistic development of individual poets as well as the evolution of themes and techniques in East German poetry. Especially welcome is the awareness of the importance of a poet's development. Unlike many critics of contemporary literature, Flores does not regularly attempt to prove his points by quoting out of context and without distinction from early poems, late poems, letters, and essays. Good use is made of previous research (another virtue shared by few critics writing about contemporary literature), without detracting from the originality of the study. While the author is too generous in praising certain

critics, he convincingly points out many misconceptions and misinterpretations, including my own reading of a key passage in Bobrowski (pp. 223-24).

The style and critical stance are unpretentious and refreshing. The awkwardness and dullness common to much scholarly writing in English are avoided by various means, such as the tasteful use of colloquialisms. Most significantly, the author is not afraid to make a value judgment on a poet or an individual poem, clearly label it as such, and then support his statement. (These judgments are aesthetic, in the broad sense; never does the political bias of the author intrude on the discussion.)

The first value judgment can be found in the selection of the poets to be discussed. Hermlin and (especially) Fühmann are chosen more to illustrate historical phenomena than because of the quality of their poetry, and they certainly are the best examples to illustrate the problems of years 1940 (or 1945) to 1960. (Erich Arendt is another older poet who might have been included here, to show the development of one who, unlike Hermlin and Fühmann, continued to write into the 1960's.) Huchel and Bobrowski are, of course, necessary choices. Only in the final section can serious objections be raised concerning the selection. In my opinion, Kunert's poetry is deserving of more extensive treatment than it receives, and one very promising young poet—who is not mentioned even briefly in the entire book—is worthy of a detailed investigation: Reiner Kunze.

The introduction, subtitled "The Literary Order: Policies and Poets," succinctly traces the political and cultural development in East Germany. It is not, however, an isolated compendium of background information, but is written from the perspective of the later chapters of the book. The reader is here, as always, continually reminded where he is going and the theme of the book is never forgotten and seldom pushed too far into the background. To quote from the final pages of the introduction: "My study, then, is organized in such a way that its three parts correspond to three phases in the development of East German poetry: Part One to the literary 'adjustments' characteristic of the early 1950's, Part Two to the growing diversification of literary techniques and the deepening of poetic vision in the later 1950s, and Part Three to the emergence of a critical, specifically East German poetry in the 1960s. . . . The overall reason for this three-part organization is to suggest that there is a discernible evolution in the situation and quality of poetry in the DDR. . . ." (pp. 23-24).

In Part One, "Adjustments," the author describes the rise and fall of Hermlin and Fühmann, dividing the work of each into three periods, 1940-45, 1945-50, and after 1950. The promise and weaknesses of Hermlin's early verse are pointed out; his best work, of the years immediately following the war, is discussed at length; and his artistic decline in the 1950's is traced. Flores clearly shows how Hermlin was unable to adapt his style to the demands made on all artists by the state. The poet's achievement is succinctly formulated: "Hermlin is at his best a versatile eclectic and a skillful adapter . . . at his worst he is a slave to the outworn tones and techniques of earlier poets" (p. 28). Fühmann, in contrast to Hermlin, was a Nazi when he wrote his first poems and his development was accordingly quite different. He at first had little difficulty adjusting to the demands of the official East German aesthetics; since his natural style was quite appropriate, only his political convictions had to be changed. Flores

describes Fühmann's political conversion and proceeds to analyze his fairy tales of the 1950's. He praises "Die Richtung der Märchen" and in a lengthy analysis demonstrates affinities between Fühmann and Ernst Bloch. He then goes on to demonstrate that Fühmann was unable to make a second successful adjustment in the late 1950's, when "the days of enthusiastic optimism and revolutionary fairy tales were over, and a new mood of apprehension and ironic sobriety was in order" (p. 116).

The chapter on Huchel is in my opinion the best in the book. It represents the longest study on Huchel to date, and Flores is able to avoid the oversimplifications which have characterized most articles on this complicated poet. Read this chapter; it cannot be summarized briefly.

The section on Bobrowski is likewise thorough and carefully argued. Flores arranges his discussion around three themes: the landscape of "Sarmatien"; "Bobrowski's notion of poetic language"; and the "concept of 'Nachbarschaft'" (p. 208-09). The discussion of time in Bobrowski is especially good, and the author tackles several difficult poems and offers tentative answers to complex problems of interpretation. Not surprisingly several of the interpretations are open to question and I would like to question two of them. In discussing the third and fourth stanzas of "Pruzzische Elegie" Flores maintains: "The times when the Old Prussians still existed are recalled as the joyous days of childhood, and the speaker sees himself among them, partaking of their games and sacred rituals" (p. 213). The text would seem rather to indicate that these times were recalled *during* childhood, and that the speaker did not imagine himself as partaking of the rituals. The poem, on the contrary, expresses a feeling of distance, accompanied by a tremendous reverential awe. The line "wie hing Gerücht im Geäst ihr!" probably refers simply to the general mood and contains no specific connotations of "evil forebodings" or "presentiment of doom," except insofar as would be present in viewing the remains of any ancient civilization. Flores later observes that the "closing simile [of the poem] probably refers to an ancient legend about Perkun." These lines would seem to be better understood as a simple contrast: an old man near a natural death after a lifetime of hard work, as opposed to the premature, violent end of the Old Prussians (not forgetting the Christian associations of "Fischer" in relation to the poem).

The discussion of the difficult poem "An Klopstock" is original and thought-provoking, but contains some very questionable aspects. Most prominently, the interpretation of "der Vergesslichen Sprache" as the language of "mortal human beings, who characteristically forget that they are immortal" (p. 242). These words should rather be interpreted in accordance with the poem "Holunderblüte" (cf. p. 241), and mean "the German language"—which Klopstock used ("du führtest sie"), and which Bobrowski now "trusts" as a vehicle of reconciliation, in spite of the guilt of the German people and the corruption of the German language by the Nazis (interesting in this regard is the removal of the poem "Pruzzische Elegie" from the West German edition of *Sarmatische Zeit* because of the publisher's misgivings about the often-repeated word "Volk"). Bobrowski's famous credo, "Mein Thema," mentions "German poetry" in close connection with Klopstock, and the same association is present here. Much remains to be said about "An Klopstock."

In the final chapter, Flores discusses the poetry of recent years. The discussion is more superficial than that of the previous chapters, but for a non-German audience it is still quite useful, especially on Biermann. The author seems to rate Kunert too low and Volker Braun too high. I do not share his high opinion of the latter's poem "Jugendobjekt." But even in the instance of Braun, Flores tempers his praise by referring to aspects in the poet's work which he considers to be weaker. It would be difficult to disagree with the conclusion, toward which the argument of the entire book has been smoothly and systematically moving: "'Adjustments' by East German writers to political demands were usually unfortunate in the 1950's, but they were understandable because their society was undergoing significant changes at all levels of life. . . . But the poetry of Johannes Bobrowski and Peter Huchel, and the example set by Brecht, have initiated a trend which is irreversible in its implications, a climate marked not by empty affirmations but by shadings of critical negation" (p. 316).

Unfortunately, the lack of attention to accuracy in the quotations is such that it can only be described as appalling. There are dozens of instances of discrepancies between the quoted text of a poem and the text found in the stated source. Many are relatively insignificant, but others (some 20) are important. To complicate the matter, not all are simple misprints. A line from Huchel's "Späte Zeit," for example, is quoted as follows: "Still das Laub am Baum verklagt" (p. 150), whereas in his stated source (the first edition of *Die Sterneneuse*) the line is "Still das Laub am Boden verklagt." In earlier printed versions of the poem the reading "Baum" was used, so here Flores is guilty of giving the incorrect source rather than of misquoting (this example is especially significant since Flores speaks of the "perfectly regular four-beat trochaic meter," which, of course, is not accurate if the revised reading is retained—a fact which could have been used to support his thesis regarding Huchel's development). The discrepancies—which I hesitate to label "misprints"—are accordingly especially disconcerting. The following are among the most significant:

- P. 100, Flores: "trockener Acker"; source: "trockener Ocker."  
 P. 187, Flores: "Nicht angewandt"; source: "Nicht abgewandt."  
 P. 190, Flores: "aus dem Schutt"; source: "aus dem Staub."  
 P. 269, Flores: "schön bleibt"; source: "schön belebt."  
 P. 305, Flores: "schon einfach schön"; source: "schon nicht mehr schön." And, most important, in the appendix, where accuracy is indispensable:  
 P. 325, Flores: "gezackt, sich dort"; source "gezackt, sieh dort."  
 P. 327, Flores: "und es wächst der/Regen"; source: "und es wäscht der/Regen."

Furthermore, the heading "Nowgorod 1943" above the poem "Steinkreuz" has been omitted (p. 326). The sources of the Fühmann poems in the appendix were not accessible to me; how many misprints are to be found there?

*The Heirs of Donne and Jonson* by Joseph H. Summers. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1970. Pp. 198. \$6.00.

In the *Heirs of Donne and Jonson*, Joseph H. Summers undertakes to describe distinctive qualities and particular debts as well as the literary relations of the lesser non-dramatic poets of the seventeenth century. In preferring the word "heirs" to Douglas Bush's word "successors," Summers might have noted that "heir" is a literary metaphor used by the seventeenth century poets themselves. But his reason for choosing the term was to find one more viable and useful than Metaphysical—a term which Summers finds objectionable because of the looseness with which it came to be used in the earlier twentieth century. Grierson, Eliot, and Leavis, however, whose seventeenth century criticism is regularly questioned in Summers' allusions, all had doubts about the descriptive value and the common use of the term Metaphysical. Yet the earlier critics gave greater weight than Summers does to the critical tradition represented classically in Dr. Johnson's use of the term. Eliot's essay on "The Metaphysical Poets" appeared in *The Times Literary Supplement* for October 20, 1921, as a review of Grierson's anthology, *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century*. Soon after completing his article (September 16, 1921), Eliot wrote a letter to Richard Aldington of his own dissatisfaction with what he had written: "The only point made is that the metaphysicals are not, as a group, metaphysical at all, but a perfectly direct and normal development. . . ."<sup>1</sup> Eliot seems troubled that an important point had to be made in such limited and negative terms. In *Revaluation*, Leavis finds the term Neoclassical for Jonson just as misleading as Metaphysical for Donne. He calls the tradition of verse which derives equally from Jonson and Donne, "The Line of Wit." Although Summers recognizes the debt to both poets, especially in Carew and Marvell, he tends to find in most of the poets whom he examines a dominant presence of either Jonson or Donne. The kinds of debt which he describes are principally verbal and thematic echoes, and parodies. A result is to place an undue emphasis on Suckling, and to find Herbert almost independent of the main currents in seventeenth century poetry.

Summers' book is a set of academic lectures delivered at Oxford in 1967. Though revised for publication the book retains some unfortunate marks of its original purpose. Its critical language is not unfairly suggested by the repeated use of "good fun," "finely witty," "very funny," "delightfully absurd." These terms of praise are balanced by "brilliant gymnastics," "overly finespun ingenuities," "grotesque lapses." The more original judgments often seem unduly influenced by a moral or didactic bias. Summers does not value wit, like Eliot, as a complex balance of feelings. He finds Tobie Matthews' answer to Suckling's "Out upon it" "quite as good as the original." Carew's reply to Aurelian Townshend's "Elegiacal Letter" requesting a poem on the death of the Protestant hero Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, is read by Summers with emphasis on the lines which suggest to him a "smugly insular assumption of prosperity and an eternal party." Instead of being, as Summers implies, a blind refusal to

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by permission of Mrs. T. S. Eliot from a letter in the Library of the University of Texas at Austin.

write a serious, i.e. heroic, poem, Carew's poem is a thoughtful reply to Townshend's particular request. Carew was writing shortly after writing his elegy on Donne, whose true praise seemed to require poetry, not prose. In reflecting on the death of a military hero, Carew has an opposing thought: that the true praise of militant action requires not poetry, but prose ("let him in prose be prais'd, / In modest faithfull story, which his deedes / Shall turn to Poems . . ."). A degree of irony in Carew's praise may suggest distrust of heroic poetry, if not of heroic action. Voices of poetry, instead of blowing heroes' names to Heaven and filling Fame's trumpet with their breath, ought rather to celebrate love, either celestial or earthly. Though such poetry seeks to give pleasure, Carew does not think it trivial, or unrelated to truth. The phrase describing the power of the poet's voice recalls the language which praises Donne. To hear the poet's voice is "To heare those ravishing sounds that did dispence, / Knowledge and pleasure to the soule and sense."

Summers' chapters on the poets are guided in some degree by his observation that the ideal of the gentleman changed significantly in the early seventeenth century. Unlike Eliot, he emphasizes a continuity between the earlier and the latter part of the century. The earlier poets in his reading seem less complex in thought and feeling, and less serious, than twentieth century readers after Eliot have found them to be. The strongest voices, for Summers, are expressing a traditional wisdom, whether directly like Herbert in "The Church Porch," or indirectly, like Marvell in "The Garden." He finds Marvell saying in the end, or in the poem as a whole, that the garden "may provide truly sweet and wholesome hours—and a marvellous occasion for a poem—but not a way of life." This is the way he warns us not to take Marvell's argument too solemnly. Marvell is a poet who is indeed, according to Summers, heir of both Donne and Jonson, but also "of almost everybody else too"—Suckling, Lovelace, Herrick, Vaughan, Denham, Waller, Davenant, Cowley, "and especially Cleveland." Summers' book, an academic performance dedicated to his principal mentors Douglas Bush and Helen Gardner, offers some fresh and provocative judgments, but it is far from being the reevaluation needed to place in a modern perspective the major work on the seventeenth century poets which was done by the earlier twentieth century critics.

ALEXANDER SACKTON

*University of Texas at Austin*

*The Art of Thomas Middleton: A Critical Study* by David M. Holmes. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1970. Pp. xix + 235. \$9.00.

This first book length study of Middleton's drama to appear since R. H. Barker's *Thomas Middleton* (New York, 1958) comes at an appropriate time, for Middleton's status among readers has never been higher. Modern critics praise Middleton's ability to create with remarkable wit and vitality frighteningly realistic portrayals of sin and folly, but questions continually arise concerning the didactic nature of his satire. Indeed some readers have argued that Middle-

ton's portrayal of sin is so realistic and his manipulation of irony is so complex that he ultimately fails to provide any satisfactory model for reform. Although twentieth century critics have not gone as far as some of their nineteenth century predecessors who labeled Middleton's plays immoral, debate continues over the nature of the moral vision offered in his drama and the degree to which Middleton, like Swift, removed himself from the diseased and corrupt world he dramatized. In this book David Holmes addresses himself to these questions by offering, as he says, "an appreciation of Middleton's art and of the point of view and feeling that underlie it." The result is quite a useful study of Middleton's growth as a dramatist but a somewhat less satisfactory account of Middleton's moral stance.

The method Holmes employs in this book owes its genesis to W. D. Dunkel's *The Dramatic Technique of Thomas Middleton in his Comedies of London Life* (New York, 1925), which examined six of Middleton's comedies and showed that Middleton tended to repeat with some variation certain themes, characters, plots and dramatic situations. Noting the repetition of these dramatic elements, Holmes extends Dunkel's thesis by going through almost the entire Middleton canon in chronological order beginning with the early poems and ending with *A Game at Chess*. In the progress through the canon he offers critical discussions of major plays while at the same time he tries both to assess a shift in Middleton's moral views and to mark the stages of sophistication in Middleton's growth as a dramatist.

The strongest aspect of the book is the identification and analysis of characters, situations and themes which Middleton repeatedly employed throughout his dramas. For instance, a reader sees how such a character as Isabella in *Women Beware Women* is a descendant of Roxana in *The Mayor of Queenborough*, Aurelia in *More Dissemblers Besides Women*, Maria in *The Family of Love* and Violetta in *Blurt the Master Constable*; or similarly a reader learns how the theme of chastity threatened by brutality which underlies Middleton's youthful piece, *The Ghost of Lucrece*, appears with considerable variation in *The Phoenix*, *A Fair Quarrel*, *Women Beware Women*, *The Changeling* and *A Game at Chess*. What emerges from this identification and analysis is a strong sense of the manner in which Middleton developed as an artist, particularly as he manipulated and reshaped those situations, themes and characters with which he worked most frequently to reflect an increasingly complex portrayal of the varieties of sin and folly in the world.

Holmes argues that Middleton's youthful poetry, tedious though it may be, not only reveals an early preoccupation with characterizing sin, particularly sexual depravity, but it also shows a poet who assumes a clearly defined role of both moral spokesman and public reformer. Moreover in his early poems and plays, Middleton moved to an authorial position that made him denounce that form of satire which depends on excessive exaggeration. He endorsed the subtler means of a realist who finds human depravity shocking enough in its natural state not to require exaggeration, and he sought to present this behaviour from an objective point of view. It is this point of view, Holmes maintains, which Middleton employed throughout his dramatic career. He insists that to accuse Middleton of being unfeeling or cynical is to misunderstand the author's mode of presentation.

The implication in this book is that we can see Middleton's development as a moralist as clearly as we can see his development as a dramatist. The truth is, however, that we cannot. For example, Holmes finds that in Middleton's early drama such as *The Phoenix* or *Michaelmas Term* virtuous characters are so innocent that they are constantly and unknowingly threatened with corruption. In the later plays, he argues, Middleton seems to be interested in the nature of positive virtue, and he creates characters who are not nearly so helpless nor naive. A reader is hard pressed, however, to find in such a play as *Women Beware Women*, written late in Middleton's career, any such strength of the virtuous characters. In fact, *Women Beware Women* seems to present a moral world very much like that of Middleton's early comedies in which evil operates with almost overwhelming power, and good survives only by the sheerest luck. In order to deal with the moral vision in *Women Beware Women* or, for that matter, with the moral vision in any of Middleton's more mature dramas a reader must address himself to Middleton's use of irony.

By its very nature, the critical approach in this book does not allow for any satisfactory treatment of Middleton's use of irony. Holmes is able to argue that Middleton's point of view was always objective, because the method of analysis in this book is one of isolating characters, themes and situations in order to identify their respective antecedents and to chart the growth of Middleton's dramatic art. Since the irony emerges from the total interrelationship of the dramatic elements, Holmes can neither discuss the rich ironic texture of Middleton's mature comedies nor can he see moral ambiguities in the plays, both of which points have been the subject of much of the criticism on Middleton. Perhaps the clearest example of the kind of difficulty that this approach creates is seen in the treatment of Sir Walter Whorehound of *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*. Holmes identifies Whorehound as a descendant of such a semi-enlightened figure as Lactantio of *More Dissemblers Besides Women* or Follywit of *A Mad World, My Masters* and as a forerunner of such a figure as the Colonel in *A Fair Quarrel*, a man fully possessed by the force of conscience. He finds no irony in Whorehound's fifth act confession and cites Whorehound's claim that he sees now with "eyes of shame" as indicating that Sir Walter has become Middleton's moral spokesman. Surely Whorehound cannot be Middleton's moral spokesman! Sir Walter does speak against his former sins, but he does it in such a way that he tries to place the full force of blame on Allwit, the wittol, who theoretically perceived his master's sin but sounded no warning. Moreover, Whorehound self righteously refuses to look at those bastard children he has fathered, for they now stand between him and his "sight of heaven." His failure to accept responsibility for his past actions indicates that he is still morally blind, misled now by a perverse kind of moral self indulgence. As R. B. Parker notes in his introduction to the Revels edition of *A Chaste Maid* (London, 1969), "The ignobility of Sir Walter's collapse, his repentance for reasons which merely confirm his blindness, is as searingly worded as any passage in Middleton." It is only by looking at entire passages, observing the interplay between character and situation through language and action, that a reader can share Middleton's moral vision, refracted as it is by the ironist's perspective.

*The Art of Thomas Middleton* offers a reader a number of insights into Middleton's development as a dramatist, but it fails finally to deal as satisfyingly with the ironies and ambiguities that arise from the total dramatic vision. In the process of getting at the source of Middleton's dramatic brilliance, Mr. Holmes has unfortunately cut away those facets that reflect so richly the dramatist's art.

LEONARD TENNENHOUSE

Wayne State University

*Blake's Illustrations to the Poems of Gray* by Irene Tayler. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971. Pp. 169 + 118 plates. \$25.00.

William Blake's three largest sets of pictures are his illustrations to Young's *Night Thoughts*, to Dante's *Divine Comedy*, and to Gray's *Poems*. Of these, only the Dante series has up to now been the subject of a book-length study—*Blake's Illustrations to the Divine Comedy* by Albert S. Roe (Princeton, 1953). Mrs. Tayler's work is thus the first extensive survey of one of Blake's most important pictorial series. As the author says in her Introduction, "Even the greatest of Blake scholars, and even those most concerned with his visual art, are generally either unaware of the Gray illustrations or not greatly concerned with them."

There might be said to be one exception to this last statement in that three years after the pictures were re-discovered, H. J. C. Grierson reproduced the entire series in a folio volume, *William Blake's Designs for Gray's Poems* (London, 1922), with an introduction. However, Grierson's belle-lettristic discussion gives little attention to the pictures themselves, even though in his last few pages one finds insights that could have been carried much further.

He is trying to use the forms of 'vegetative' nature to express thoughts that transcend nature. Like the poet he transfigures his representations to make them the vehicle of his emotions. . . .

The whole bent of Blake's imagination was to personify. For him every poignant expression became a spiritual person. Blake's imagination communicates an intenser life to Gray's half-conventional personifications. (pp. 16-17)

Yet Grierson's essay ends where it should have begun. Sharing the assumption of his age that Blake was a lapsed lyricist who stumbled into the epic, Grierson could not connect the symbols and themes of the Gray illustrations with those of the illuminated books, as Roe was to do so illuminatingly three decades later with respect to the Dante drawings. Mrs. Tayler, taking up where Grierson leaves off, provides us with a perceptive and informative picture-by-picture commentary and thus fills an important gap in Blake studies.

"Gray's metaphors and personifications," Mrs. Tayler writes, were written to be visualized; Blake complied—and then used this very visualizing capacity in Gray's language to go beyond it, to make connections and arouse feelings

only dimly present in some of Gray's figures of speech" (p. 45). Her method of analysis is first exemplified in a discussion of the illustrations to "Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College," one in which both text and pictures are treated with considerable subtlety, as in the author's remarks on illustration 9:

Pestilence flung onto a sporting boy epitomizes the argument of Gray's poem: yet in Blake's design it is not "human fate" or some similar figure that flings the pestilence, but rather a vision of that very ignorance which Gray maintains is the only (though temporary) escape from the pestilence. Gray's cure is Blake's cause. (p. 39)

The remainder of the text is divided into three parts and then a concluding chapter in which Blake is finely placed in relation to the "Romantic Classicism" of his time. Of the three chapters about the pictures themselves, perhaps the strongest is Chapter II, "Early Poems." Here we have, among other things, a brilliant discussion of the "Ode on the Death of a Favourite Cat," once more casting light not only on Blake but on Gray as well. At a time when some Blake criticism has taken on the cast of an initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries, it is refreshing to encounter a critic who recognizes the existence of Samuel Johnson and William Empson, not to mention Edmund Gosse! The "Ode to Adversity" is also the subject of a superb exposition, bringing out fully Blake's subversive intentions toward this particular poem:

The six designs to this poem are, then, united in their one aim: to argue against the notion that adversity in itself has any constructive effects. . . . In each of these illustrations Blake may be seen to take Gray's figurative language and build it out visually, making it reveal not only Gray's paraphrasable meaning and the less easily paraphrased suggestions that surround it, but also certain congruent suggestions not actually present in Gray and not necessarily noticeable to someone who did not know Blake's other work and some of his other opinions. (pp. 79-80)

The next chapter, "Later Poems," and the succeeding one, in which the "Elegy" is the subject, continue, for the most part, to advance persuasive and illuminating interpretations. Although no book on these pictures could be expected to address itself to the general reader, as to some extent "the vocabulary of Blake's language must be explicated from his other works" (p. 159), anyone interested in Blake, in Gray, in the literature and painting of the period, or in the general subject of the inter-relationship of the two arts will find much to be grateful for in Mrs. Tayler's study.

A few omissions should, however, be remarked on as minor shortcomings of a fine book. Among these is the failure to reproduce any pictures by other illustrators of Gray for purposes of comparison, although such comparison is frequently made in the text. The work of Richard Bentley, Gray's original illustrator, is discussed in connection with no less than five poems, and much is made of the difference between Bentley's method and Blake's. For example, with reference to the "Ode on the Death of a Favourite Cat," we are told that "Bentley, perfectly catching Gray's stylish irony, returns the poem all the more forcefully to the public world of its social and literary context; we are

safely located in time and space," while in Blake's counterpart "Gone is the picture frame, gone even the social frame of the parlor, and we are alone among those shifting shapes whose continued metamorphoses suggest that whatever reality is, it is no matter of stable physical structure" (p. 60). This is well observed, and yet the reader has no way of comparing the pictures himself, unless he can find a copy of Bentley's 1753 *Designs*; although in this one case he will find the Bentley picture reproduced to much advantage with Mrs. Tayler's essay in the recent *Blake's Visionary Forms Dramatic* (eds. David V. Erdman and John E. Grant, Princeton, 1970, pl. 70). It is a pity that no comparison plates are provided for the other Bentley illustrations or for Fuseli's illustrations to Gray, which are discussed on pp. 15-16. Again, when Blake's fourth design for "The Descent of Odin" is compared to its anonymous parallel in the 1790 *Poems*, we are told that "By comparison the tone is open and gentlemanly, the total effect almost gracious, whereas Blake's vision is dim and forboding"; and again we wish for a reproduction to look at, sensing that this would make Mrs. Tayler's argument all the more effective. Nor is there any list of illustrations in the book, a point which might at first appear superfluous but isn't: Blake provided individual titles for the pictures, and some of these titles are not to be found in Gray's text. Therefore the reader returning to the plates to look at "A Muse" or at "The liberal man inviting the traveller into his house," unless possessed of total recall, will find himself leafing through the entire series of plates. The scanty three-page index is little help; to choose a few random examples, there are no entries for Odin, Sigurd, Lok, or Serpent—all these subjects of at least one picture.

The exposition itself has a few lapses. It is a question of sins of omission rather than of commission—there are no howling errors but sometimes a dimension of Blake's meaning is left out. For example, in discussing the illustrations to "The Bard," the author astutely points out that the last picture, "A Poor Goatherd in Wales," is not to be found anywhere in the text itself, but the implications of this interesting departure are limited to a sort of generalized libertarianism and literary pastoralism: "As oak, cave, and torrent are nature deprived of human voice and song, so he is mankind 'asleep' like Arthur and Albion, mankind after the time of the 'naked heroes' and before the time of the great bardic return, weary of war but not yet at peace. When the goatherd is ready—and able—to raise the musical instrument at his side and use it for prophetic song, he will awake from sleep and return to life; and in his individual existence, his own variation of the 'eternal story,' the renaissance will have come, and nature around him will spring to life because he sees the life in it. . . ." (p. 109). Yes, but to Blake the Welsh goatherd must have had a concrete existence as well. As an admirer of Thomas Johnes of Hafod (see *Blake Newsletter*, II [1969], 65-67), Blake must have been aware of Johnes's attempts to improve the miserable condition of the peasants and herdsmen in Cardiganshire; the Poor Goatherd in Wales is in part a symbolic figure but he is a real goatherd too.

At a few points there is a puzzling inattention to important analogues in Blake's other works. That this is not owing to lack of knowledge Mrs. Tayler demonstrates by her frequent comparisons with the *Nights Thoughts* illus-

trations. Yet one would expect some striking resemblances to be noted—that of illustration 6 to “The Progress of Poesy” to illustration 6 to *L’Allegro* (“The Great Sun”) for example; or that of illustration 5 to “Ode for Music” to illustration 2 to *Il Penseroso* (in which Milton is shown “in his character as a Cambridge student”). In at least one instance, such an omission affects interpretation. “The Descent of Odin” series begins and ends with an enormous serpent, first uncoiling, then coiled. Mrs. Taylor does call this “a grander and more terrible version of the serpent of *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*” (p. 116), but curiously she does not compare the much more similar and more pertinent serpent on the title-page of *Europe*; nor does she allude to the frequency of occurrence of Blake’s serpent symbol elsewhere. This limitation may be a deliberate one, but here one of the book’s major virtues—its refusal to be caught up in an unending series of comparisons—becomes a defect, for the apocalyptic meaning of these two pictures is lost; no interpretation of the first serpent is offered, and only a slight and unconvincing comment on the second one. One would like to see a fuller treatment of such symbols in a book which has so many strengths that it is bound to be considered the definitive study of its subject for a long time to come.

MORTON D. PALEY

*University of California, Berkeley*