

1969

Book Reviews

Criticism Editors

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

Recommended Citation

Editors, Criticism (1969) "Book Reviews," *Criticism*: Vol. 11: Iss. 2, Article 6.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/criticism/vol11/iss2/6>

Book Reviews

Music in English Renaissance Drama edited by John H. Long. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968. Pp. xvi + 184. \$7.50.

The book is in the nature of a compendium of papers elicited by Long from Nan Cooke Carpenter, Ernest Brennecke, Ian Spink, R. W. Ingram, MacDonald Emslie, Willa McClung Evans, and Vincent Duckles. Despite the general editor's claim that "underlying and linking the apparently disparate essays in this symposium are a unifying theory and traditional practices that this collection may place in sharper focus as general principles are followed by practical applications" (Introduction, p. xi), the general title *Music in English Renaissance Drama* leads one to expect a good deal more than specific attention to such little-known entertainments as those at Elvetham in 1591 and Brougham Castle in 1617, and to the much worked-over Milton-Lawes, and Cartwright-Lawes connections. The essays are largely disparate and only kept together in a very loose way. For the most part they have little "new" information to report, and concentrate on reviewing, listing or cataloguing work which has been done by others in the field.

Nan Cooke Carpenter's "Music in the English Mystery Plays" is an able review of readily accessible material which does a splendid job of sending readers to the recognized authorities—Chambers, Stevens, Reese, Wright, Salter, Smith, Craig etc., especially Stevens as Carpenter's long footnote 146 on p. 170 makes clear. It is a pity, however, that when so little of the actual music for the plays has proved extant, Mrs. Carpenter is not precise enough in her description of it. The two secular songs "Lully, lulla, thow littell tine child" (the famous Coventry carol available to all in the *Oxford Book of Carols*) and "As I out rode this enderes night" were copied from an original MS (since lost by fire) and included by Thomas Sharp in his *A Dissertation on the Pageants or Dramatic Mysteries Anciently Performed at Coventry* (Coventry, 1825). Sharp's careful copy of "Lully" presented no editorial difficulties. The carol was published, became popular, and is today as Mrs. Carpenter says "one of the best known of all medieval songs," but the other carol "As I out rode" suffered a vastly different fate. It was copied down by Sharp in an inaccurate form and split up to look like two separate songs (Sharp indeed called it two songs "As I out rode" and "Down from heaven"), and it remained in this chaotic state until 1957. At this time the first stanza "As I out rode" and the second stanza "Down from heaven" were recognized as parts of the same song, and the music was not "transcribed" as Mrs. Carpenter says (p. 169 under footnote 138) but emended, edited, and presented in a possible workable state. It is dramatically important to know what "kind" of music was employed by shepherds in the field by night since the situation in which they found themselves listening to announcements of the birth of Christ was much more frequently resorted to than the lamentation over the slaughter of the Innocents which the first Coventry Carol records.

Brennecke's essay does a remarkably good job of introducing a little-known entertainment at Elvetham in 1591. His historical and narrative approach and

the excellent use of the original illustration of the Great Pond at Elvetham for a pictorial guide within his text and an enlargement of certain parts of it for illustration on the dust jacket give a verve and quality to his essay which is only slightly offset by occasional romantic imaginings that it was "not unlikely, as we shall see, that among the guests and observers was a young playwright named William Shakespeare" (p. 35) on the basis of the notorious passage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* of 1595—"a faire Vestall, throned by the West." No fewer than six pages of the Variorum edition of the play are devoted to examining the political-allegorical implications of the little western flower (Countess of Essex), the "faire Vestall" (thought to be Elizabeth), the mermaid (Mary Queen of Scots), and Cupid (Leicester). Brennecke's hypothesis makes as much sense as do any of the theories hitherto advanced, but it still demands too much of Shakespeare's audience that they would recall an esoteric entertainment of four years before.

Brennecke's assertion that the two songs "Elisa is y^e fayrest quene" and "Com agayne" extant in British Museum Add. MSS. 30480-84 are "both signed 'E. Johnson'" (p. 52) is understandable in the light of similar information promulgated elsewhere (Grove's *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, London, 1955, IV. 646, and Denis Stevens' *Music for Queen Elizabeth*, *Musical Heritage Society Recording* 884, Side 2, Band 7), but is the result of his not working with the MSS as a whole. The B.M. Catalogue ascribes "Elisa is ye fayrest quene" to "R." Johnson on the basis of an annotation in the manuscript stated in a later hand to be "Chaplain to Quene Anne Bullen," and "Com agayne sweet naturs treasur" to "E." Johnson, pointing out, however, that the tenor part of this latter song bears the annotated ascription to "Phillypes." Close scrutiny of the music manuscript's annotations, however, casts the ascriptions to R. Johnson and to E. Johnson very seriously in doubt.

The Johnson most likely to be the author of the two songs is *John* Johnson, who is already known to have taken part in the entertainment given by Leicester at Kenilworth in 1575, and who is credited largely with the success of music at that entertainment. At that time he had been specifically lent by the Kytsons of Hengrave Hall in whose service he was.

The underlaid text which Brennecke gives for both songs is not the music MSS' texts, but that of the printed Quarto. The vexed problem of authorship of the entertainment is summarily dismissed by Brennecke (p. 34). The standard works of reference on English Drama (the Harbage-Schoenbaum *Annals of English Drama*, etc.) list this entertainment under Breton, not Lyly. I feel, however, that Brennecke is right in claiming that Bond's assertion that Lyly was the author "has not been seriously disputed." I have elsewhere tackled the claim for Breton and found it totally specious (see *Studies in Medieval Culture*, IV [1968]).

Spink's essay is a gallant attempt to draw attention to a little-known entertainment at Brougham Castle in the summer of 1617 and to associate Campion's name with it. His discussion of the original documents relating to this entertainment leads to the reasonable conclusion that Campion "seems to have remained associated in some capacity" (p. 58) and that Campion did not himself set the songs but dispatched them to the Earl's musician, George Mason, who was joined by John Earsden in composing the music. Spink makes no mention of the fact that Walter Davis's *The Works of Thomas Campion*, 1967, pp. 463-471, provides

the complete verbal text of the entertainment under the heading of "Doubtful Poems."

This entertainment has very few of the lavish features displayed by the Elvetham one, and Spink, therefore, is obliged to comment on the quality of the music which has survived and which had been printed as long ago as 1812, though without the original lute part and with other "deficiencies," by Stafford Smith in *Music Antiqua* (London, 1812), pp. 150-165. Spink's claim that the songs are "not unimportant when considered as a representative and remarkably complete example of Jacobean masque songs" (p. 74) is in sharp contrast to Warlock's assertion that they "contain no music of any particular interest except one very robust tune, 'Dido was the Carthage Queen.'" These Brougham Castle Ayres are certainly "anti-lyrical," but whether they fall into the category of attempts at the "declamatory style" listeners will have to judge for themselves. It is surely a gross exaggeration to claim that in these Ayres "more so perhaps than in any previous surviving masque music we find an attempt at musical characterization and a sense of dramatic atmosphere conveyed by musical means" (p. 74). Lanier's music for Jonson's Masque *The Vision of Delight*, Christmas 1617, marks a much greater advance in such musical techniques, and Ferrabosco's for *Oberon*, 1611, particularly the setting of "Gentle Knights," has more sense of dramatic atmosphere, in my opinion, than any of the Brougham Ayres except for the "Dido" tune. Spink's discussion of the "Dido" material would have been more adequate had he taken *American Notes & Queries*, I. 9. (May, 1963), 134-136, and I. 10. (June, 1963), 150-152, into account.

Ingram's essay on "Patterns of Music and Action in Fletcherian Drama" is one of the least satisfactory contributions to the book. It affords but a brief and sketchy excursion into *some* of Fletcher's plays and makes no use whatever of the *nature* of the actual music that has survived for quite a number of Fletcher's songs, despite the claim that "no attention will be given here to the poetic merit of such songs as are mentioned. Their musical effect is what is being examined, and it is the sound of music in the dramatic context that if of first importance" (p. 75). One startling omission is *The Mad Lover*, 1617, which uses all kinds of music extensively and for which, fortunately, practically all the original music has survived—a rare enough phenomenon in Renaissance drama to cause it to be singled out for special attention. Students will have to turn to *Studies in the Renaissance*, VIII (1961), 236-248 (nowhere indicated in Ingram's text or footnotes) for a detailed discussion of the pattern of music and action in *The Mad Lover*. Ingram's long footnote 2 and its fellow 3 labor, as if it were a new thesis, what others have been working at pretty consistently, namely the possibility of distinguishing between Shakespeare's handling of music as part of the structural pattern of his plays, and Fletcher's. Ingram does not, for instance, list a detailed article on this very topic with regard to *Henry VIII* as long ago as 1963 in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XCIV. 184-195, but chooses to take a similar article on *The Two Noble Kinsmen* in *English Miscellany*, XXIII (1967) and label it as a "recent" "start" (p. 175). If he were really concerned to review the work that has been done on music in Fletcher, he would surely have to consult an unpublished Birmingham University Ph.D. Dissertation of 1956, which marked a considerable extension on previous such attempts, and contained in particular a long discussion on music in *The Prophetess* that seemed to be Fletcher's adaptation of the techniques of *The Tempest*. A brief look at pp. 126-133 of Duckles'

article on "Music for the lyrics in Beaumont and Fletcher's plays" in this very book under review will do more for the student of music in Fletcher by directing him to acknowledged sources, where music and its dramatic function are discussed, than the whole of Ingram's article.

MacDonald Emslie's very short paper (pp. 98-102) examines the much considered praise by Milton of Lawes's songs as "tuneful" and "well-measur'd." He gives a careful description of Milton's revisions in the Trinity College, Cambridge, MS, and relates them to "contemporary methods of song-making" (p. 96). Inevitably the discussion has to turn to Lawes's "autograph manuscript" B.M. Loan MS. 35, and to examples therein of Lawes's style. Unfortunately Lawes's MS. has only been cursorily studied and is in need of a full bibliographical examination and description. Some of my own preliminary findings have concluded that some of the items in the so-called "autograph" are indeed the work of William Lawes, Henry's brother. I am by no means persuaded that one can suggest dates by reason of the songs' positions in the manuscript as Emslie suggests. There is much work to be done here, and I suggest that no one, as yet, is in a full position to say what Henry Lawes's style is. Most musicologists would agree that, compared with his brother William's work, Henry's music is *not* "tuneful." Study of William Lawes's work, based on William's autograph MS (B. M. Add. MS. 31432), is indispensable for students trying to understand musical style of the 1640s. William Lawes's death at Chester in 1645 robbed music of one of its most promising practitioners, but it gave musicologists a boon, an early *terminus ad quem* for items in William's MS. There is no such certainty of dating when one is dealing with Henry Lawes's MS. The possibility that the "brothers Lawes may have collaborated to a far greater extent than our present knowledge indicates" (Lefkowitz) makes it necessary to proceed very warily with Lawes's settings.

Willa McClung Evans' essay on "Cartwright's debt to Lawes" runs into similar difficulties. In the first place it expands very little upon her disquisition on the subject in her book *Henry Lawes: Musician and Friend of Poets*, 1941. Her discussion this time is improved by the simple expediency of using photographic illustrations of Henry Lawes's "Thou O Bright Sun" (Figure 11), "But Thou O Sun" (Figure 12), and "Good Deedes May Passe"—first and second singing (Figures 13-14)—settings of songs from *The Royal Slave* preserved in the New York Public Library Drexel MS. 4041. What must be decried, however, is her failure to draw readers' attention to detailed descriptions of items 112, 113 and 114 in Drexel MS. 4041 contained in *Musica Disciplina*, XVIII (1964), 191-193, and to the lengthy description there of the manuscript as a whole, pp. 151-202. She ignores settings of songs from *The Royal Slave* in Paris Conservatoire MS. Res. 2489, some of which are attributed there to William Lawes. The Drexel 4041 and Paris Res. 2489 are at considerable and important variance. Before one can afford a really worthwhile discussion of Cartwright's debt to Henry Lawes in *The Royal Slave*, one will have to work at his debt to both Lawes brothers.

The final contribution to this book, Duckles' essay "The Music for the Lyrics in Early Seventeenth-Century English Drama: A Bibliography of the Primary Sources," is by far the most important in the whole book, and I predict that students of music in Renaissance drama will turn to this book principally for what Duckles has assembled in the form of a reference tool.

Though Duckles' listing is incomplete, users will certainly be impressed by the

quantity of dramatic music that has survived in manuscript and early printed sources. In a prefatory section, "Manuscript sources and Related Studies," Duckles is careful to direct students to those studies of the sources which made the initial identification of the settings, and which made it possible to locate relevant items and relate them in the context of the whole manuscript. In this preface I can detect the following omissions:

Birmingham City Reference Library

MS. 57, 316: a fragment containing settings from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Students need to know also that this fragment was originally part of the MS. now known as Edinburgh University Lib. MS. Dc. 1. 69—See *Musica Disciplina*, XIII (1959), and *Musique de scène de la troupe de Shakespeare*. . . .

Tenbury

MSS. 1018 & 1019: two early seventeenth-century sources of English songs and Italian monodies, before 1620. Students need also to consult *Music & Letters*, XXXVII (1956), 221-233, for details of the MSS.

London, British Museum

MS. Add. 29,481: twenty-four songs of the early seventeenth century. Students need also to consult *Music & Letters*, XXXIII (1952), 333-334, and subsequent correspondence for MS. details.

To this list should be added check lists of the dramatic work of John Wilson (*Notes & Queries*, VIII. 10. [October, 1961], 384-387) and of William Lawes (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, XVI. 2. [Summer, 1963], 243-253).

Duckles has conveniently used as the basic framework for his bibliography the Appendix to William R. Bowden's *The English Dramatic Lyric, 1603-1642* (1951), which lists most of the identifiable songs from the drama of the period. There are some significant omissions from Bowden's list, but these obviously cannot be our present concern. I detect the following omissions from Duckles' listing based on Bowden:

p. 123 *Every Woman in Her Humour* See also *Renaissance News*, XVIII. 3. (Autumn, 1965), 209-213 for a very detailed treatment of the music in this play listing even more items. / p. 124 *Vices, Masque of* See also *Notes & Queries*, CXCVII (November, 1952), 192. / p. 128 *The Faithful Shepherdess* The settings of "Come, shepherds, come, come away" and "Sing his praises that doth keep" are printed in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, XVI. 2. (Summer, 1963), 251-252. / p. 130 *The Mad Lover* See *Studies in the Renaissance*, VIII (1958), 236-248 for a detailed discussion of music in this play. / p. 135 *Ulysses and Circe, Inner Temple Masque* See *Notes & Queries*, I. 5. (May, 1954), 194-195. / p. 141 *The Courageous Turk* See *Notes & Queries*, II. 8. (August, 1955), 333-335. / p. 142 *The Rival Friends* See *Notes & Queries*, II. 3. (March, 1955), 106-109. / p. 142 *The Rape of Lucrece* See "Thomas Heywood's 'The Gentry to the King's Head' in *The Rape of Lucrece*, and John Wilson's setting," *Notes & Queries*, VIII. 10. (October, 1961), 384-387. Music and discussion. / p. 146 *The Vision of*

Delight See "Ben Jonson's Masque *The Vision of Delight* 1616/1617," *Notes & Queries*, III. 2. (February, 1956), 64-67. Music and discussion. / p. 148 *Fatal Dowry* See *Musique de scène* . . . pp. 78-80. / p. 151 *The Cid, Second Part* The manuscript source is British Museum Add. MS. 29396, not 28396. / p. 154 One item at least from *The Merry Wives of Windsor* should be listed. See *Shakespeare Quarterly*, XI. 1. (Winter, 1960), 89-92. Music and discussion. / p. 155 *Twelfth Night* See *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, X. 1. (Spring, 1957), 14-24 for the working out of Shakespeare's words to Jones' air. Music and discussion. / p. 156 *The Martyred Soldier* See *Renaissance News*, XII. 4. (Winter, 1959), 251-253 for a detailed treatment. Music and discussion. / p. 158 *The Triumph of Peace* See *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, XVI. 2. (Summer, 1963), 244-253 for detailed discussion and p. 253 for William Lawes' setting of Song 7 "Why doe you dwell."

JOHN P. CUTTS

Wayne State University

The Classic Chinese Novel: A Critical Introduction by C. T. Hsia. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968. Pp. xi + 413. \$9.50.

"The old superstition about fiction being 'wicked,'" Henry James wrote in 1884, "has doubtless died out in England; but the spirit of it lingers in a certain oblique regard directed toward any story which does not more or less admit that it is only a joke." These words aptly describe a comparable situation in China, where before the present century even the novelists themselves did not take seriously their vocation. The Chinese term for fiction, *hsiao-shuo*, means, belittlingly, "small talk." In modern times this situation has been given an ironical twist. The pre-Communist novelists assumed that theirs had really been a worthless tradition to be totally ignored and rejected. The result was that, except for such rare stylists as Lu Hsün and Eileen Chang (both thoroughly conversant with traditional novels), they sometimes were not even masters of their own language. While reading this excellent book, one cannot help remembering the deplorable consequences that ensued from these two Chinese "superstitions," old and new. Examining the classic Chinese novel against the Western novel Professor Hsia demonstrates with discriminating insight that it, though primitive in many obvious ways, deserves serious consideration.

The book consists of eight essays. Aside from the first one ("Introduction") and the last one ("Appendix," on the short story), they deal with the form and function of six major works, i. e. *The Romance of the Three Kingdoms* (*San-kuo yen-i*), *The Water Margin* or *All Men Are Brothers* (*Shui-hu chuan*), *A Record of the Journey to the West* (*Hsi-yu chi*), *Chin P'ing Mei*, *The Scholars* (*Ju-lin wai-shih*) and, of course, *Dream of the Red Chamber* (*Hung-lou meng*). (All are available in English in either complete or abridged form. See "Bibliography," pp. 391-99.) These specific novels have been chosen because they are historically, if not critically, the most important landmarks.

Professor Hsia shows discernment in his examination of the factual and textual aspects of each novel. Especially remarkable are the sections on the comparative

merits of the various editions of *The Water Margin* and the conflicting theories on the authorship of *Dream of the Red Chamber*. The bulk of each essay, however, probes the deeper meanings of the novel concerned. Apparently unimpressed by earlier scholars, Professor Hsia looks at the plethora of characters with an alert, perceptive eye. He notices that although the noble general Kuan Yü became a legendary folk idol thanks to the enormous popularity of *The Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, the novel itself, despite what Hu Shih (1891-1962)—one of the most influential authorities on classic Chinese fiction—has argued, consistently portrays him as an awesome warrior but mediocre strategist who “eventually takes his [formidable] appearance for his reality” (p. 44). His self-conscious arrogance brings about his defeat and death at the hands of the Wu generals and the downfall of the Shu Han kingdom: its founder Liu Pei, heretofore a shrewd, ambitious politician, suddenly disregards every practical consideration and incurs a disastrous rout in avenging his sworn brother. But exactly because of his tragic flaw, Kuan Yü appears to possess more inner complexity than the one-dimensional Wu Sung (*The Water Margin*), “a completely admirable character of simple heroism” (p. 102). The unnatural hero’s code or, rather, the “gang morality which is only a caricature of that code” (p. 93), makes it impossible for not only Wu, but all his fellow rebels to achieve any character development.

Equally revealing are Professor Hsia’s analyses of the women characters. Here, as elsewhere in the book, he has admirably corrected the time-honored superstitions and stock responses of both scholars and reading public. He finds that, among the heroines of *Dream of the Red Chamber*, Precious Clasp and Pervading Fragrance are distinguished for their “sense” and Black Jade and Bright Cloud for their “sensibility.” Contrary to the subjective traditional and Communist reading, Precious Clasp is actually a virtuous, obedient and compassionate girl, the *beau ideal* of Chinese womanhood, whereas the supposedly pure, ethereal Black Jade emerges as something of a neurasthenic. The popular image of the latter, he believes, is “a gross simplification of a complex character” whose “growing emotional sickness in terms of her bodily deterioration” is delineated with “physiological details” (p. 276).

Lotus (in both *The Water Margin* and *Chin Ping Mei*), hitherto habitually taken for a stereotyped, dyed-in-the-wool nymphomaniac, turns out to be a victim-turned-victimizer in a man’s society. Fortune, the adulterous heroine of “The Pearl-sewn Shirt” which Professor Hsia considers the best of the Ming short stories, is in fact—he quotes C. S. Lewis’ words about Criseyde—“a woman by nature both virtuous and amorous, but above all affectionate” (p. 318). A very important point made in this book is that the Chinese practitioners of the fiction genre, such as the creators of Lotus and Fortune, seem ambivalent in their feelings toward society and self. Ostensibly they always pay explicit tribute to the former, and yet they often extend their sympathy, however covertly, to the latter. (A phenomenon not unlike the discrepancy between the heroine’s—actually the author’s—moralizing and her happily ended life of vice in Defoe’s *Moll Flanders*. The difference is that the Chinese novelists make it a rule to have the deviating self “condignly” punished by society.) This fact, along with their “uncritical ideological syncretism” (p. 20) (Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism) and “indiscriminate fascination with life” (p. 22), indicates that the Chinese novelists are depictees of the “whole truth” (a phrase Professor Hsia borrowed from Aldous Huxley).

As in his stimulating first book *A History of Modern Chinese Fiction, 1917-1957* (Yale, 1961), Professor Hsia pays great attention to textual details; his meticulous interpretive care reminds one of the approach of the New Criticism. He points out, for instance, that no full treatment is given to a potential major scene of confrontation between Hsi-men Ch'ing and Lotus when, after his newborn son has been scared to death by her cat trained solely for that diabolic purpose, the furious Hsi-men storms into her apartment, to do nothing but destroy the cat. The author's "quiet handling of the present scene," he goes on to explain, "may imply that Hsi-men is now too much aware of Lotus' power over him to want to challenge it" (p. 193). In his essay "Techniques of Fiction" Allen Tate complains about Thackeray's skipping over an analogous major scene when, after Rawdon Crawley has unexpectedly returned home to find Becky alone with Lord Steyne, the old man departs, leaving husband and wife confronting each other. Professor Hsia's pertinent explanation serves as an interesting reminder that the unidentified author of *Chin P'ing Mei*, probably the crudest among the six novels, at least on one occasion bears comparison with a great British novelist three centuries later. The exegeses of passages from the Chinese works are invariably helpful to a fuller appreciation of the works themselves—see the pages (294-95) on *Dream of the Red Chamber* and those (317-20) on the short story mentioned above. The explication of the paragraphs that start the story proper of *The Scholars*, the most astute I have ever read about that novel, recalls Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* and Martin Turnell's *The Novel in France*.

The comparisons with Western counterparts throw a great deal of light on the works under investigation. Particularly illuminating are the resemblances between the Ming stories and the *Decameron*, *The Water Margin* and *Njal's Saga*, *Journey to the West* and *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Unlike Kenneth Rexroth who enthusiastically hails *Dream of the Red Chamber* and *The Tale of Genji* as "the two greatest works of prose fiction in all the history of literature," Professor Hsia states, in a more circumspect manner, that the supreme Chinese masterwork "is artistically contemporaneous with, if not ahead of, the Western novels of that [eighteenth] century" (p. 15). "For social realism and psychological insight," he adds, "*Dream of the Red Chamber* is a work to be placed alongside the greatest novels in the Western tradition" (p. 17). (However, I find myself in disagreement with him when he maintains that "Certainly, the prose of no other classic novel, *Dream of the Red Chamber* not excepted, is as pure and functional" as that of *The Scholars* [p. 205]. While I admit that the conscious use of *kuo-yü* or a national vernacular in *The Scholars* is masterful, I doubt whether its prose could be purer and more functional than that of *Dream of the Red Chamber*. As a prose writer Ts'ao Hsieh-ch'in has remained, after all, the most "perfect" of all the Chinese novelists.)

The Chinese novelists, Professor Hsia discovers, tend to employ trite, ready-made verse descriptions that "add little to one's visual knowledge of the scene considered" (p. 100). But even when they are not resorting to that rather convenient device, they frequently fail to present a graphic picture to modern readers, what with their archaic stylisms and, in cases like *The Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, their semi-literary language. It is, therefore, all the more satisfying to read the superb passages rendered by Professor Hsia from all but one (*The Scholars*) of the six works. Some of them appear even better than the

original, e.g. the touching pathos of Liu Pei's death scene (pp. 59-61) and the comic exuberance of the episode in which Monkey obligingly lets himself be swallowed by a giant serpent, and then indulges in his famous monkey business until the poor devil is tortured to death (p. 153).

In his review of Dorothy Van Ghent's *The English Novel*, David Daiches writes that it is "both a thoroughly illuminating study of some important novels and at the same time an exciting invitation to the reader to re-read and re-consider these novels with heightened interest and awareness." This is exactly what I think of *The Classic Chinese Novel*. Professor Hsia's book is, like Mrs. Van Ghent's, not only a useful, reliable handbook for students of literature, but also a critical masterpiece.

H. C. CHUANG

University of California, Berkeley

The Eloquent "I": Style and Self in Seventeenth-Century Prose by Joan Webber.

Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968. Pp. xii + 298. \$8.50.

Much seventeenth-century prose shares with the poetry of the period a sense of the intersection of tradition with the private self; the Senecan style—loose or curt—replaces the Ciceronian oratorical style to foster individual exploration of thought and feeling. Morris Croll, in his classic analysis of the asymmetry and appearance of improvisation of baroque prose, summed up the purpose of the newly emergent, or re-emergent, style, in a famous phrase: "to portray, not a thought, but a mind thinking." The formula of process replacing product and of private response replacing public wisdom is now customarily applied both to poetry and to prose that we think of as peculiarly 'seventeenth century.' It is with considerations like these in mind that one comes to Joan Webber's *The Eloquent "I,"* a study of literary self-consciousness in the seventeenth century. Miss Webber assumes that her readers are familiar with Morris Croll's contributions to historical stylistics and with the development of prose from the Ciceronian to the Senecan to the plain style, as related in George Williamson's *The Senecan Amble*. Her purpose is to strike out in a fresh direction.

As her principle of selection and approach Miss Webber posits two opposed kinds of literary self-consciousness: Anglican, which she calls "conservative," and Puritan, which she calls "radical." Though long applied to the two sermon styles and the general habits of religious discourse in the age, these terms, of course, are only peripherally literary. They spring from the century's most basic split of opinion and of sensibility in religion and in politics. As such, the terms Anglican and Puritan may seem almost too fundamental and too pervasive to be of very specific critical use at this stage of seventeenth-century studies. Moreover, since Donne and Milton, Browne and Bunyan are major sources for the literary definition of these contrasting outlooks, to apply traits commonly induced from them as instruments for analyzing their forms of self-consciousness is to engage, it might seem, in a kind of circularity that demonstrates in one set of terms what is already assumed in another.

Miss Webber establishes the boundaries of literary self-consciousness as "very carefully limited to works which partake of the nature of confession, and display in varying degrees a specific set of literary characteristics" (p. 4). By seventeenth-

century literary self-consciousness the author means "the writer's crucial and unremitting awareness that he is the subject of his own prose, whether or not he is literally writing autobiography" (p. 4). This accounts for the omission of Bacon, Hobbes, Lancelot Andrewes, and Jeremy Taylor, while John Lilburne and the anti-prelatical tracts of Milton—historical documents that are by-products of their authors' opinions and commitments to particular causes—have whole chapters devoted to them.

The conservative Anglican "I" is "meditative, anti-historical, obscure, ambiguous, symbolic. . . . Time for him is an aspect of eternity; there is nothing new under the sun; every man is like Adam, who contained all" (p. 7). "The complexity of his style imitates the complexity of his sense of himself, both in his use of such metaphysical figures as optical illusion, paradox, and word play, and in stylistic shifts from one point to another in his prose" (p. 8). The Puritan "I" is "active, timebound, as simple and visible as possible, desirous of being taken literally and seriously as a man living in a hostile world" (p. 8). Accordingly, the Puritan writes not of Man but of himself, begins with concrete details rather than generalizations, prefers history to poetry, fact to symbol. His concern for fact and his role in history "in the fulfillment of God's purpose for England" does not encourage a very complex or very objective view of the self and results in a prose "less volatile and less resonant than that of the Anglican" (p. 8).

Following these preliminary definitions, Miss Webber, in a chapter devoted to Donne's *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions* and Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*, sets forth the two styles in their most clear-cut opposition. While both men voice "intellectual doubts, and both resolve their doubts in emotion rather than reason" (p. 16), their narratives are profoundly different:

Donne's prose is mannered, witty, and cryptic; his art, which for him is a higher form of life, centers itself on the showing forth of his symbolic "I." Bunyan uses his book to send a message to or sermon to his "children," who constitute his life. He too lives in his work, but as a remembrance of God's work upon him, as example (or exemplum) more than as symbol. (p. 23)

The six subsequent chapters deal with Lilburne's political tracts, Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Baxter's *Reliquiae*, Browne's *Religio Medici*, Milton's five anti-prelatical tracts, and Traherne's *Centuries of Meditations*. Miss Webber points out that each writer exhibits different facets of the Anglican or the Puritan pattern of self-expression and within this framework achieves his individual accent. The discussion of Lilburne's political tracts concentrates on the mentality and motives of the great Puritan radical and inevitably approaches his writings as vehicles for this delineation of the man. Burton's *Anatomy* is an outstanding example of a man's life becoming art—of the complexly shifting view of himself, of his book, and of his audience resulting in a *persona* that is fragmented among the limited sheltered scholar, the coolly detached but knowledgeable observer of human frailties (Democritus), and the cosmic self that reaches out to become symbolically all men.

With Richard Baxter, Miss Webber turns to a Puritan who was moderate rather than radical, who sought conciliation and unity rather than the separation of his exclusive truth from other men's errors, and who suffered the torment

of a self-divided yet deeply committed mind in an age when controversy was too often marked by fanatical certitude. His style accordingly has neither the straightforward assertiveness of the radical Puritan nor the elaborate artifice of the Anglican. "Baxter's oppositions and ambiguities are likely to be half-underground. . . . His style is less interesting as art than as the portrayal of an interesting, impressive man" (p. 116).

No work treated in this book is more heavily weighted to its concern with examination and communication of the self than *Religio Medici*. Critics have long emphasized that Browne explores and expresses his selfhood through the collision of his own attitudes with the leading religious and philosophic questions of the day. Miss Webber, however, addresses herself to what might be called the rhetoric of the *persona* that unfolds in the *Religio*. She also deals with Browne's egotism and his self-celebration as a method of universal human celebration. If Browne is the most obvious author to include in this study, the most daring selection is Milton's anti-prelatical tracts. These sharp polemics against the soon-to-collapse episcopal form of church government have been viewed most charitably in the larger context of Milton's lifelong championing of liberty. Miss Webber's discussion stresses that amidst the fierce assault tactics of the Puritan activist the mentality of the traditional humanist is also exhibited in Milton's "belief that only through action and warfare can he arrive at a place where contemplation and poetry can again become possible" (p. 200).

Traherne, the final and youngest writer treated, has since his discovery in our own century come to be regarded as summarizing the characteristic modes and motifs of seventeenth-century religious meditation on the things of the Cross, nature, and the self. The fusion of these elements, which Miss Webber stresses as inseparable from one another in Traherne, along with a distinctly non-Augustinian concept of creation as a continuous process, is the main line of interest pursued in this chapter.

The dimension of these eight prose writers that Miss Webber takes up is certainly basic and well worth attending to. But somehow the results—what the reader takes away after finishing the book—are not commensurate with the expert and sympathetic learning that the author brings to bear on these writers. In detailed analysis of particular passages and in individual observations the author makes her freshest contribution, though some of the verbal patterns and stylistic habits traced out lack the cogency and centrality of application the author intends. *The Eloquent "I"* is not, I believe, as successful a book as Miss Webber's superlative study of Donne's prose style, *Contrary Music*. The difficulty is that her unexceptionable thesis of the Anglican and Puritan selves does not generate the kind of inquiry that significantly repays its extended pursuit through these writers and their works.

LEONARD NATHANSON

Vanderbilt University

Carlyle and the Idea of the Modern: Studies in Carlyle's Prophetic Literature And Its Relation to Blake, Nietzsche, Marx, and Others by Albert J. LaValley.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968. Pp. xii + 351. \$8.50.

The trouble with the idea of the modern is that everybody knows what it is but nobody can explain it. Even the redoubtable Northrop Frye in his recent *The Modern Century* does little more than make darkness visible when he seeks to illuminate what "modern" is. Thus it comes as no surprise that Albert J. LaValley's *Carlyle and the Idea of the Modern* casts more light on Carlyle than on the elusive idea of the modern. Still, half a candle is better than none, and at times LaValley's short taper casts a radiant beam.

The point of Professor LaValley's study is to see Carlyle in a new light, to see him not as the systematic Victorian philosopher but as an artist and a highly problematic one (indeed "problematic" is the most overused word in the book and comes as close as any to LaValley's definition of the modern). The trend toward viewing Carlyle primarily as an artist, and certainly a problematic one, has been the most notable single feature of recent criticism and scholarship on Carlyle. The distinction of LaValley's critical rather than scholarly book is the scope of his endeavor, which includes nothing less than the whole span of Carlyle's gargantuan output, whereas other studies have concentrated on fewer works and generally on the earlier ones for evidences of Carlyle as artist rather than philosopher. Not that LaValley actually covers every one of those thirty massy volumes, but he does consider the major works of Carlyle's long creative life, with here and there the elevation of a neglected work to major status, such as *The Life of John Sterling*, and a demotion in rank of a hitherto highly regarded work, such as *On Heroes and Hero-Worship*. It is therefore the ambitious scope of LaValley's treatment of Carlyle as modern artist that initially distinguishes his book from other recent studies of Carlyle. On closer inspection one sees that LaValley's book is also distinguished by its approach to the subject, which is not so literary as at first appears.

LaValley's leading idea is that Carlyle's works in their entirety represent an attempt to come to grips with some uniquely modern problems, an attempt that takes various forms, not all of them successful or even admirable but all of them arresting. But the critical basis for "the modern" would seem to reside more in matter than in manner, although presumably some of Carlyle's literary characteristics can be traced precisely to the demands of the new and modern subjects he was coping with. LaValley is in truth less concerned with the way in which Carlyle wrote than with the way in which he responded to certain stresses and tensions in the world of the nineteenth century. His study of Carlyle as artist is thus not a study of Carlyle's artistry but more a study of Carlyle as the idea of an artist. In his first section, to be sure, LaValley treats Carlyle's manner in some detail and finds many of the features noted by other recent commentators on Carlyle; later he makes passing reference to Carlyle's peculiarities of manner, and often to the most obvious ones, such as capitalizations, or Carlyle's truncated subjectless sentences, or his idiosyncratic punctuation, but these are always pointed out as support for some other more important thesis, not infrequently a psycho-social one (he attributes, for example, a "skipping and light style" in Carlyle's treatment of Voltaire in *Frederick the Great* to Carlyle's having projected himself onto Voltaire who then, as literary man, "conquers Frederick.")

The controlling points of LaValley's presentation are set forth in his introduction where he lists four characteristics of the modern that apply with special force to Carlyle (and also to the three authors of the subtitle). They are: "a concern with the unconscious"; "an exploration of alienation in self and society"; "the awareness of multiplicity"; and "the urge to unify these concerns through mythmaking activity." It is clear from this list that the emphasis is psychological and social; Carlyle's literary artistry is included only insofar as it illuminates his activity in one or more of these spheres. I dwell on this at such length because of the possibility of making false assumptions about what the author is trying to do. For all his literary sensitivity Professor LaValley in this book makes more of a contribution to the intellectual history of the nineteenth century than to its literary history. It is a study of the psycho-social stresses of the Victorian age as reflected in the work of Thomas Carlyle. True, this interpretation involves downplaying some of LaValley's initial contentions about his concern with Carlyle's aesthetics, but I find it possible, using LaValley's own methods of interpretation, to attribute these to his imperfectly understood impulses, much as he attributes many of Carlyle's open professions of intent and conviction to a kind of residual piety in which Carlyle *really* no longer believed. If we must honor LaValley's early declarations of literary intent, it becomes necessary to pronounce them only dimly realized in the book as a whole, while his professions of social analysis are quite extensively realized.

As LaValley views the grand sweep of Carlyle's literary life he discerns three major phases—the first, culminating in *Sartor Resartus*, is the period of "self-discovery and self-consolidation"; the second, embracing the major works from *The French Revolution* through *Frederick the Great*, is the period of "varieties of social prophecy"; and the third, including *John Sterling* and the *Reminiscences*, he denominates the "return to selfhood." The first is the most literary of the sections, and LaValley is as concerned here to show the way in which Carlyle's developing literary devices of the early period helped to set his manner as he is to use them for personal and social analysis. By the second period, however, the psycho-social emphasis has taken the upper hand and Carlyle's works of the middle years of the nineteenth century are seen less as works in their own right and more as evidences of Carlyle's varied and increasingly despairing responses to the age. It is in this section, treating the major works after *Sartor*, that LaValley makes his most interesting and most debatable points.

In *The French Revolution* LaValley sees neither an unqualified acceptance nor yet anything like a rejection of the events of those chaotic times, but rather a full recognition of the multiplicities of the situation. This is a valuable insight, for *The French Revolution* appears both to affirm the inevitability and rightness of the uprising and to bewail and condemn many of the events that an iron necessity had brought about. Carlyle stands at some distance from Burke, but at a considerable remove too from those apologists for any and all aspects of the Revolution whom Burke sought to silence (curiously, LaValley nowhere mentions Burke's history). More than one critic has failed to grasp the largeness of Carlyle's vision in that book, but LaValley gives it full recognition. Carlyle's *French Revolution* is indeed "problematic," and LaValley has demonstrated his critical acuity in not seeking to oversimplify what he tellingly calls Carlyle's "epic for the modern age."

But valuable insights can become crochets when pursued too unremittingly,

and LaValley's enthusiasm for the "problematic" suffers precisely in this way by being raised to a kind of first principle. It begins to appear that Carlyle can be accepted insofar as he remains ambivalent, but once he takes a stand he has sinned against light. Such is the attitude toward the comminatory portions of *The French Revolution*. In the case of *Past and Present*, which receives sustained and sometimes brilliant analysis, it becomes necessary to show that Carlyle doesn't always mean what he says, or doesn't really know what he means. Thus Carlyle's religious imagery is "cast about" for rhetorical effect and labor is ultimately his god and the means by which man deifies himself. On the one hand a Carlyle position is undermined and negated; on the other, a new and acceptably "modern" position is cozened out of recalcitrant materials. One's respect for Carlyle's integrity decreases as one's respect for LaValley's ingenuity mounts.

No doubt LaValley reaches these positions largely because of the unattractiveness of some of the stands Carlyle actually takes, especially as Carlyle hardens his hero-worship and seems to praise mere force (hence LaValley's distaste for *Heroes and Cromwell* and *Frederick*). This has always been a stone of great stumbling for the Carlyle critic; the choice appears to lie either with an expression of distaste for Carlyle as the author of, say, such an embarrassment as the *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, or with support for repression and even fascism (for that charge refuses to be still in Carlyle criticism). Few critics wish to take the second course; so at a certain point the admiration for Carlyle is tempered, halted, and finally turned to disapproval. Carlyle's brilliant imagery is suddenly termed sick and repressive, his ingenious metaphors strained and far-fetched. The pattern is familiar and the most interesting aspect of all is its similarity to the nineteenth-century evaluation of Carlyle, which held essentially that he was very moving and effective in his early writings but that he became rigid and shrill in the later ones and finally wearisome and fanatic. Or as William Morris put it in attributing some of his own ideas to Carlyle, "but somebody should have been beside Carlyle and punched his head every five minutes"; and as Matthew Arnold more sedately phrased it, Carlyle had become a "moral desperado." LaValley's intoxication with the modern, the problematic, can thus at times become a new stick to beat the old Carlyle with; it can, in short, become very Victorian.

Where LaValley breaks new ground is in his assertion of a return to selfhood, a throwing off again by Carlyle of the reactionary and harsh social ideas he had embraced in his middle writings. This return is marked by the *Reminiscences* and *The Life of John Sterling* (and LaValley's interpretation of that book, and especially the Coleridge chapter, is certainly the most penetrating one around). Again, apart from the ever-present danger of LaValley's lapsing into armchair analysis, he does an arresting and sensitive job with these late works. The trouble is that they are not quite late enough, and LaValley has had to ignore dating to force them into a pattern of return by Carlyle to earlier openness and flexibility. As LaValley well knows but avoids stressing, the Carlyle of *Latter-Day Pamphlets* and *The Life of John Sterling* is the Carlyle of 1850-51, for the two were written in the above order within a year of each other and both came before Carlyle had even started work on *Frederick the Great* and more than fifteen years before the caustic *Shooting Niagara*. How then can these works of the same period fall into different periods or be followed by works of an earlier period? The fact is that Carlyle may be even more problematic than LaValley realizes.

If the definitive Carlyle eludes LaValley, even as he has eluded other critics, much of the essential Carlyle remains. LaValley's comparisons of Carlyle works with comparable ones by Blake, Marx, and Nietzsche are frequently very illuminating, and he does a first-rate job of distinguishing between comparison and identity; nor does he hold each author responsible for more than he says himself. His best comparisons are with Nietzsche, whom he is even bold enough to criticize from time to time (that Nietzsche should become a hero to "modern" theologians and Carlyle still be condemned as a "fascist" is one of the great inexplicables of modern thought, especially if openness is taken seriously as a criterion of the modern).

But perhaps the greatest strength of LaValley's book is in the doing of it at all. LaValley's own openness to some virtues at least in so problematic an author as Carlyle is a welcome sign of a new awareness of the variety and range of a figure once castigated for his narrowness. That one could write a book about Carlyle's awareness of multiplicity, of alienation, and the like suggests that some pioneering moderns are at last beginning to catch up with a pioneering Victorian. Maybe that is the idea of the modern.

G. B. TENNYSON

University of California, Los Angeles

Joyce Cary: The Developing Style by Jack Wolkenfeld. New York: New York University Press, 1968. Pp. xiii + 200. \$6.95.

The title of this study of Joyce Cary's novels is misleading in that the scope is much larger than considerations of style, encompassing also Cary's narrative methods, character patterns and basic themes and ideas. The book is organized around a series of dual patterns of narrative art within which there is development or at least shift of emphasis between Cary's early and later novels. For example, the first duality considered is that between "confrontation and juxtaposition": the early, African novels are viewed as a series of direct confrontations between opposing forces of society whereas in the later novels, particularly the trilogies, these conflicting ideas of life are juxtaposed rather than directly opposed. Cary's developing concept of repetitive patterns of human character and actions that underlie the revolutionary changes inherent in direct conflicts of ideas and generations lends itself well to this kind of comparative analysis, for there is a fundamental shift in emphasis from the earlier novels with their narrative focus on division to the later novels with their thematic focus on the unity that underlies partial views of reality.

However, while always cogent in his analyses of individual novels, Mr. Wolkenfeld places a disproportionate emphasis on the early African novels (*Aissa Saved*, *An American Visitor* and *The African Witch*), the first two of which are apprenticeship works and lesser novels in the Joyce Cary canon. But because they form one pole of the various dualities of narrative art, they are more thoroughly examined in detail than even the two trilogies, Cary's major works. The absence of any commentary on *A House of Children* (1941) is an unexplained gap in Mr. Wolkenfeld's treatment of Cary's development. Whether from the perspective of a traditional chronology or different modes of narrative art,

A House of Children represents a significant stage in Cary's developing style. It was Cary's first successful use of the first person point of view; closely followed as it was by the first trilogy with its use of the same narrative method, it deserves close attention as a development in Cary's use of point of view, one of the categories of Cary's narrative art Mr. Wolkenfeld investigates. Furthermore through a series of juxtapositions and ironies (irony being another mode of Cary's art examined in this study), Cary succeeded in mastering his Anglo-Irish experience in *A House of Children* whereas he failed in *Castle Corner* (1938) when he used the method of direct confrontations; and he succeeded in rendering the sensibility of the inner experience of childhood through style which he largely failed to do in *Charley Is My Darling* (1940).

In considering point of view, Mr. Wolkenfeld rightly places his focus on Cary's exploration of multiple views of reality, but his suggestion that there is no real difference between Cary's use of the first person in the trilogies and the use of the third person in the earlier novels fails to account for the difference in intention and form between the African novels and the trilogies. The African novels, particularly the first three, are novels of ideas in the tradition of E. M. Forster and Aldous Huxley in which conflicting views are given more or less equal weight in the world of values although not always equal spokesmen. In order to present these ideas or attitudes dramatically rather than didactically Cary, as Wolkenfeld has shown, establishes "a multisided view of reality" in which each version of reality is accepted "from within its own context, but never finally" because "there is always another view opposed or juxtaposed which undercuts it" (pp. 89-90). However, this multiple view of reality is not achieved by an abdication of the omniscient narrator's authority, as Wolkenfeld suggests, but rather by an interaction between the controlling omniscient point of view and the individual versions of reality. The omniscient narrator, a detached but thoroughly British voice, remains in narrative control so that there is a consistent tone of skepticism throughout the novel, an outside perspective that is uncommitted to any of the warring viewpoints.

On the other hand, the form of the trilogy, as envisioned by Cary, demanded a different kind of interaction than that between outside and inside perspectives. The interaction in the two trilogies is between the separate volumes with each separate voice entirely in control of its perception of reality however partial so that what occurs is a multiple view of the same reality on three levels rather than a multisided view on one level as in the African novels. It is the *style* of each voice that makes the difference; each voice is distinctly and inseparably a part of the character so that there are three different levels of reality rendered. Cary's approach in the trilogies is the opposite of his approach in the African novels not just because the trilogies are told in the first person rather than the third person but because there are three possible objective realities that can be constructed out of the subjective voices of the trilogy. There is no fourth "unheard voice" that functions as an omniscient narrator in the trilogies, proclaiming "a general objective reality," as Mr. Wolkenfeld asserts; there are only the internal structural, thematic and character interrelationships that give unity and form to the trilogy as it turns in on itself. The reader must ultimately choose, for example, between Jim Latter's and Chester Nimmo's conflicting versions of history; there is no omniscient narrator to do it.

Cary's view of history is inseparable from his concept of the comic irony of

human freedom. Several years ago E. H. Carr the Cambridge historian said to me, "Cary was terribly naive about history, wasn't he?" My answer, not exactly a memorable riposte, contained an element of truth: "Well, yes, but he's a damned good novelist." Cary *was* naive about history, as he was about philosophy, which is an unpardonable sin for a historian if not for a philosopher, but Cary was a novelist not a historian or philosopher. It was not the complexity of history that engaged Cary's imagination but rather the comic ironies of individual human acts creating history. As Mr. Wolkenfeld suggests, in the context of revolutionary change and progress, Cary believed that justice is only accidental and never final and time is not a continuous flow but a medium within which the individual acts according to partial views of reality and fragmented units of time. In this context, historical surfaces are changed rapidly by human actions but human nature remains an unchanging pattern. Therein lies the ironic comedy of freedom.

CHARLES G. HOFFMANN

University of Rhode Island