VOLUME 13
1988
NUMBER 1

THE ALIGARH JOURNAL OF ENGLISH STUDIES

Focus on T. S. Eliot

Editor :
Munir Ahmad

The Aligarh Journal of English Studies is edited by Munir Ahmad and published by him on behalf of the Department of English, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. The *Journal* aims at bringing out, twice a year (April and October), critical and research articles dealing with subjects in all the main areas of English studies (with special attention to Shakespeare) together with detailed and careful reviews. Contributions should be addresed to the Editor. They should be neatly typed double-spaced, and with notes and references at the end. Stylistic and other conventions as recommended in *MHRA Style Book* should be strictly adhered to.

Annual Subscription :
Rs. 30 00
£ 3.50
$ 6.00

Single Copy :
Rs. 20.00

Volume 13 1988 Number 1

THE ALIGARH JOURNAL OF ENGLISH STUDIES

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEW

K S MISRA

John Drayton by Naqi Husain Jafri 122

M C Bradbrook

THE DOVE DESCENDING

The strongest impression of the centenary celebrations of T.S. Eliot's birth was for me that his poetry, as he once said of Shakespeare's, is a unity, an integrated circuit. In a letter on Christmas Eve 1921, Pound wrote that *The Waste Land* 'runs from April to Shantih without a break'; the recovery of the original MS shows a constellation; the recovery there of earlier material, the excision of recent additions, implies that Eliot's form was achieved by toil—an adjective he in 1962 applied to that 'major poet' Geooge Herbert, also adding 'magical' to the lines

> Church bells beyond the stars heard, the soul's blood,
> The land of spices, something understood.

as compared with his 'wit'. These alternatives are in Eliot also.

Pound's jesting little rhyme maintained that the Muse was the father of Eliot's poem, and the poet its mother, he himself the midwife. Later, John Hayward helped the birth of Four Quartets—and for *Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats* Eliot was joined by some children, one of whom, his godson Tom Faber now assists more scientific births of knowledge as Lecturer in the Physics Laboratory of the University of Cambridge.

All his life Eliot suffered from abulia, the blocking of will power, which led to violent sudden breaks in relationships when will exploded—the break with his family and country in 1915, compounded with his disastrous marriage; the break, when he revisited America, ended that disastrous marriage. The break of his second marriage severed two companions,

John Hayward and Mary Hutchinson, and Emily Hale, his first love after a long correspondence (his letters remain locked up at Princeton, hers were destroyed). The sudden marriage in 1957 with Valerie Fletcher, after a period of uncertainty, cleared the air in the manner of the protagonist facing his ghosts in *The Family Reunion* and again in *The Elder Statesman*. Eliot told Valerie, he could imagine the man Vivian should have married or the one Emily Hale should have married. Playing with the plays, Vivian should have married B. Keghan and Emily, in her youth, Charles Hemington.

I am not suggesting that the plays should be read as translations of the life, for it is clear from the first volume of *Letters*, which have now come out, that in Eliot the separation is strong between 'the man who suffered' and 'the mind which creates'. Unlike the letters of Keats or Byron, Lowry or Lawrence, the letters of Eliot supply what Edwin Muir termed the 'story' but not the 'fable'. In the 'fable' I see three stages; the first with the appearance of *The Hollow Men* (1925)—a break I noted long ago in a littile booklet on Eliot. I would now set a second break in 1935, when Eliot began *The Four Quartets* and also turned to drama—there is one significant passage that links the two.

The inner journey of the poet is his own, and dramatic figures who appear should not be identified with those in the 'story' of his life, even if it is significant that he visited Burnt Norton with Emily Hale, or that in the course of writing *The Elder Statesmen*, he married Valerie Fletcher. Poet's dreams are mused on by Yeats when in *Under Satrun* (1919) he explained to his young wife that he wrote of the past

> Because I have no other youth . . .
> For how can I forget the wisdom that you brought,
> The comfort that you made ?

In his sixty-ninth year, Eliot was not writing more than fragments; his wife recorded that 'he had paid too high a price for poetry': and long before that, poetry had seemed to him

once not only to be found through suffering but in suffering. This was the mood of *The Waste Land.*

In *The Waste Land's* emptiness, Valerie Eliot saw the religion of *Four Quartets*—'I never thought of Tom in fragments, you know. I saw the whole totality of Tom I ; (*The Times*, 17 September 1988).

Yet the early poetry was a mosaic of fragments, built into a unity; the first of *Four Quartets* appeared as a single lyric in *Collected Poems 1936*. For this reason, I think form is most easlly seen by looking at that first period, the one in which Eliot most decisively changed the course of English poetry; this period is now most clearly revealed—, thanks to discoveries, and its relation to the later writing becomes more lucid.

> My thoughts tonight have tails but no wings
> They hang like clusters on the chandelier
> Or drop one by one upon the floor
>
> (Transcript of *The Waste Land*, 105)

The image may be applied to any of Eliot verse of the period 1917–22, specially to the dense yet disjunctive poem 'A Cooking Egg', published in May 1919, when he had been at Lloyd's Bank as a confidential clerk for two years, on foreign correspondence—

> My feet are at Moorgate and my heart
> Under my feet, (*The Waste Land*, 296)

His work in the City, his marital troubles, the weariness of the war are behind the title, a cross between a sneer and a humiliation—like some other titles of this time—that reveals a stale yet not yet unedible rarity in the late war years, but suitable only for mixtures. Yet an off-grade egg once held the germ of bird-life. Eliot's interest in wild birds suggets that Pipit was named for the wagtail or pipit, a twittering and fluttering little creature. This Pipit was once a girl, but now perched formally distant from her companion, equipped with

knitting, she was defined by 'Views of the Oxford Colleges' and danguerrotypes of her forbears.

Vivian Eliot, whom he had met at an Oxford College, claimed to belong to the Irish landed gentry—a claim that *Burke's Landed Gentry* does not endorse—and had been pretty and sparkling, but Bertrand Russell did not put her in the 'stud book' at all, she who perhaps had lured Eliot, 'supine on the floor of a narrow canoe', to help escape from New England and to ditch Emily Hale; found the marriage as stale as he did.

> En l'an trentiesme de mon aage
> Que toutes mes hontes j'ay beues...

The opening varies a repeated situation of a man encountering a woman but with no power to connect.

The four stanzas of the second section reject Pipit's world for a grand vista :

> I shall not want honour in Heaven
> For I shall meet with Sir Philip Sidney
> And have talk with Coriolanus
> And other heroes of that kidney

Insult, flung by that double rhyme on 'kidney', leads to one of the attacks on a Jew, an attitude which later was to draw obloquy on Eliot's name and which surfaced at the time of the bicentenary, in correspondence in *The Times* and elsewhere.

> I shall not want Capital in Heaven
> For I shall lie with Sir Alfred Mond,
> We two shall lie together lapt
> In a five per cent Exchequer Bond

Mond, of German origin and the founder of I. C. I., presents for Eliot feeling that arose from his work on war finances, as he learnt them at Lloyd's Bank. Other attacks by the use of Jewish names (Bleistein, Rachel nee Rabimovitch) sets the Jew in apposition to his heroic 'Sidney', Jean Verdenal, as Bleistein is set against the drowned Phoenician sailor—Ver-

denal, died at the Dardanelles. (Eliot did not remember that good poet, Isaac Rosenberg from Whitechapel who died in Flanders after writing some superb war poetry).He did not persist in this unjust imagery - in later years Sir Claud Mulhammer of *The Confidential Clerk* is of German extraction, married into the peerage, and in *The Elder Statesman*, Michael the protagonist's son is placed in the care of 'Sir Alfred' but goes off with an Englishman from the Midlands who has turned Central American and gained wealth as Frederico Gomez.

In 'A Cooking Egg' Pipit is replacad in Society by Lucrezia Borgia :

> Her anecdotes will be more amusing
> Than Pipit's experience can provide

and the induction into Heaven is by way of mysticism and Dante, Madame Blavatsky and Piccada de Donati. . .

Here this section of the poem ends, the last few broken verses, with no rhymes at all, awake nostalgia for the childish happiness of the 'penny world' of baker's treats shared with Pipit as, *Dans le Restaurant* looks back in the memory of the ragged waiter; and here the drowned Phoenician sailor appears also. A fortunately suppressed parody of him, and of the dirge in *The Tempest*, is presented in a dirge for Bleistein in the fragments of the MS for *The Waste Land*, whose venomous corpse imagery compares with that other necrology, *The Death of St Narcissus.*

'A Cooking Egg' closes with a squalid London, recalling Blake's darker visions. A cheap meal in a cheap London tea shop is placed where

> The red eyed scavengers are creeping
> From Kentish Town and Golders' Green
> Where are the eagles and the trumpets?
> Buried beneath some snow-deep Alps.
> Over buttered scones and crumpets
> Weeping, weeping multitudes
> Droop in a hundred A. B. C 's

The verses themselves droop and collapse. I don't thinke that at the end of the first World War even a cooking egg would have gone into 'scones and crumpets'. The egg seems to haunt Eliot, in the eggs ruined in *The Cocktail Party*, in the name Eggerson (in early drafts he was named Harold) and of course, very powerfully, in *Sweeney Agonistes'* songs, on which Doris comments

> I don t like eggs; I never liked eggs :
> And I don't like life on your crocodile isle

The 'cluster' of this poem, under the pressure of Eliot's 'personal grouse' was to remain, and partly to reappear in later verses. The 'clusters' swim and swirl in different formations, as Eliot moved towards his breakdown, and the release that afterwards came with *The Waste Land*. The orchestration of that poem is based on the last section which Eliot praised as the best, indeed the only good part. In the same way *Four Quartets* was to be based on 'Little Gidding'. These are the controlling achievements of the two visions

Christopher Ricks's *Eliot Lectures* (due to be published in November 1988) points out the dead centre that follows in *The Hollow Men*, the importance of the word 'between'. The suspension is given in half-spoken phrases, and prayer that cannot be completed; the 'dream songs' are short, incomplete, but they are moving forward, into specific scenes. In *Ash Wednesday* (1930), Dante was the 'chandelier'; although the titles of earlier sections were not retained in the full sequence. In this poem, Eliot had reached the other side of a little death. The world is becoming unified. In a later beautiful image based upon Mallarme, the wheel of time or fortune is bedded in hedgerow's mud, where the garlic from beside its pools reflect the sapphires of the heavens :

> Garlic and sapphires in the mud
> Clot the bedded axletree ..
> the boarhound and the boar
> Pursue their pattern as before
> But reconciled among the stars. ('Burnt Norton' II)

But in *Ash Wednesday*, where the image is that of Mary, not of 'eyes that once I saw in tears', Eliot at first dedicated the volume 'to my wife'; and then took the dedication out. It was a break.

In 1930-1, he began the Ariel Poems where the bird song, the sea, the mountain heights of the *Minor Poems* unite in the difficult inner and outer journey of the *Journey of the Magi*, in the temple scenes at Christ's birth but he inverts the movement with *'Triumphal March'* which may serve as counterchallenge to 'A Cooking Egg'. Eliot had been writing a fair amount of political commentary in *The Criterion*, of which he was editor, whilst in the Church which he had joined in 1927, he became interested in social concerns; whilst his life followed an ascetic code. This poem did not receive the title *Coriolan* until it appeared, with its weaker sequel, in *Collected Poems 1936*. Coriolanus of Shakespeare had given the epigraph to the very early and grisly mockery of *The Death of St Narcissus*; religion and fleshly necrology combining under a banner plucked from Shakespeare

> To you particularly and all tha Volscians
> Great hate and mischief.

The 'broken Coriolanus' of *The Waste Land* (416) was a long forgotten hero. In an essay on *Hamlet* Eliot selected this Shakespearean play as a 'most assured artistic success'.

The post-first-war period had ended in 1929, and the pre-war period begun. Mussolini, threats in Germany, then the 'Manchurian incident' in the Far East gave a tremendous sense of *deja vu*. A voice from the waiting crowds opens with the splendid sonority of

> Stone, bronze, stone, steel, stone, oakleaves, horse's heels.

The formal Roman splendour of London or Paris (the Parthenon) introduces death (Nelson and Wellington are in the crypt of St Paul's). The catalogue of armaments are General Luderdorf's list of those surrendered at the end of the first

war, at the end of a book entitled *The Coming War.* Before this, Eliot quoted 'The natural waking life of our Ego is a perceiving'; but the hero when he appears is a carapace over a hidden life, statuesque, behind the eyes 'watchful, waiting, perceiving, indifferent. What is 'behind' is the memory of Virgilia—as she is to appear to Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* later when she—and not the rhetoric of his mother—breaks his carapace

> What is that curtsey worth or those dove's eyes
> Which can make gods foresworn ? I melt, and am not
> Of stronger earth than others ?
> *Coriolanus*, 5. 3. 27-29

Here then is the arrival of the human.

> O hidden under dove's wing, hidden in the turtle's breast...

but there is more than that, there is the suggestion of a triumphant entry into Jerusalem

> Under the palm tree at noon, under the running water
> At the still point of the turning world. O hidden.

It is indeed hidden. For here, the sacrifice at the temple is approached by virgins bearing urns with

> Dust
> Dust
> Dust of dust.

The victory parade includes the war sacrifice. Still more ominously, the voice from the crowd speaks again with the derisive double rhyme caught up from twelve years from 'A Cooking Egg'—and we are back in the London of today.

> But how many eagles and how many trumpets!
> (And Easter Day, we didn't get to the country,
> So we took young Cyril to church. And they rang a bell
> And he said right out loud, crumpets!)

The child in the temple, who thinks the sanctus bell is a muffin man's signal, immediately proceeds the unconscious echo and appeal of the common man's darkness :

Please will you
Give us a light
Light
Light

Shakespeare is the 'chandelier' that attracts the images here; but the next and the final line

Et les soldats faisent la Haie ? ILS LA FAISAIENT

is from Charles Maurras, who had not as yet revealed his Fascist sympathy; but the 'hedge' of the ranked men is a halt, a pause in the flow of life itself, that removes still rather that gleam of 'the dove's wing.' Yet tor 'the still point of the turning world' is a Christian vision and the dove is therefore the Dove of the Spirit. The second half of this 'unfinished poem', 'Difficulties of a Statesman' is merely an ironic comment on a politician with his committees, with only the despairing 'What shall I cry ?' and the appeal 'Mother, mother', the recall of 'the dove's foot' from the first half, to suggest a natural, human, breathing world with children, small animals; it ends with a reminiscence of the *Coriolan* overture of Beethoven, and of the knocking at the end of *Sweeney Agonistes* :

RESIGN RESIGN RESIGN

Eliot added the Shakespearean titles to *Coriolan* (with Beethoven also there) as he removed the titles from the components of *Ash Wednesday;* attempts to relate parts of his poetry by using other poets surfaced as itself a theme, in 'Little Gidding', his culminating achievement. 'Difficulties of a Statesman' belongs to the moment when he was turning to the drama to bind his work together, but there was still the culminating lyric for the Ariel Poems, *Marina,* which was the Paradiso, as *Ash Wednesday* had been the Purgatorio of the inner journey; and again evoking Shakespeare. Here 'the wood-thrush singing through the Fog' of the New England coast of Eliot's childhood, heralds 'the hope, the new ships'. Marina is living in Time 'a world of time beyond me.' The world is

still present, but, as Ricks says, its various forms of death are dissolved; not annihilated but dissolved in the context of space-time. Marina is close to Mary, but she is not Mary. The natural world returns, is itself part of the beatific moment. The split in Eliot's mind is healed and he can move to the conception of *Four Quartets* where too death is present in various forms. The antithesis of love and death is the groundbase of the last poems of the four elements – air, earth, water, fire, of the four seasons and, I think, of the four gospels. 'East Coker' is approaching—the verse remains on the outskirts of the village—the home of Eliot's west country ancestors, where he was finally buried himself. 'The Dry Salvages' returns, like 'Marina' to the New England coast, the fishermen of his boyhood, but also speaks to the Battle of the Atlantic, during which it was written, was the culmination of the second war for the people of England. To those who lived through these times, the verses have a dimension that others cannot share. (An American once mistook 'the blowing of the horn' in 'Litlte Gidding' at the end of section II, the street scene as a motor horn.) In those very streets when I was fire-watching, I heard the relief of the All Clear sounded at the end of a raid as dawn broke. My fire-service was done in a cellar, led by an extremely efficient bus conductor, who as one 'crump' sounded, exclaimed in agony, 'OH! there goes the Albert Memorial till, picking up the phone, he proclaimed in relief 'No! Its only the Geographical Society:' I used to walk past St Stephen's, Gloucester Road every day to catch the bus to the Board of Trade's offices. The two worlds, the world of the senses, and that of illumination from above and within, united :

> Who then devised the torment ? Love.
> Love is the unfamiliar Name
> Behind the hands that wove
> The intollerable shirt of flame
> Which human kind cannot remove.
> We only live, only suspire
> Consumed by either fire or fire. (Section IV)

The 'dark dove' with the 'flickering tongue' of the German bombers is set against the Dove that descends at Penticost. Penitence and love replace those animosities 'ill done and done to others' harm' (perhaps the attacks on Jews) 'that once you took for exercise of virtue'. For Eliot was in touch with Bishop George Bell in Sweden when Bell met the members of the German resistance in the person of the martyr Bonhoeffer. The catalogue of sins recalled by the ghost in 'Little Gidding' is dissolved in 'the refining fire' where

> the impossible union
> Of spheres of existence is actual. (East Coker, V)

The birds appear as messengers in the first and in the last of the Quartets– in between there is only the warnings of an 'early owl' and the petrel, stormy rider of the waves The 'intolerable shirt of flame' recalls the death of Herakles, his stellification after being wrapped in the shirt of Nessus. Eliot never escaped the torments, which he holds along with the vision. He cannot really regain the childhood vision which he thinks of in 'The Cultivation of Christmas Trees' through religious imagery, only in the jests of *Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats'*, set in the very streets of 'Little Gidding III (that sequence was at first called *The Kensington Quartets)*. The practical cats to my mind reflect upon Kensigton memories of earlier ways—The Rum Tum Tugger is a reincarnation of Ezra Pound and perhaps Eliot himself is the Magical Mister Mistoffelees. For the 'magic' of his poetry remains beyond the 'toil' which can be traced in his verses and of which now there is much evidence.

In his plays very often the main action is some kind of kidnapping—Celia by Reilly,—she is at Eliot's *Waste Land* stage of her journey; Harry by his 'angels', Colby by Eggerson, and in the last play, Claverton by the gods, but his son by demon. The young and the old are here separated as sheep and goats. This piece, more like an oratorio than play, was given, together with all Eliot's drama, on Radio as part of the birthday

centenary celebration—with some judicious cuts, including the whole part of Mrs Piggott. A version of *Sweeny Agonistes* was unfortunately set with modern jazz music-totally unsuitable to the rhythms of the 1920s; but a concert in Magdalene College Cambridge, where Eliot was an Honoary Fellow, opened with Stravinsky's *Introit*, which was composed in memory of Eliot, who was Stravinsky's friend. Here perhaps is the best musical tribute to that power of the poetry which still evades yet always invites the reader.

Cambridge
U. K.

Z. A. Usmani

THE HOLLOW MEN—A SIGNIFICANT CAESURA IN ELIOT

Eliot's central concern, which makes for the underlying unity of his poetry, is the regeneration of personality through the purification of love, which also means the purification of the will. The key symbols related to the theme of love have been borrowed from the last cantos of Dante's *Purgatorio*. those dealing with the Earthly Paradise situation.[4] (This was first pointed out by I. A. Richards, his misconception of love as sex notwithstanding). The symbols are conventionally. rather mythically, associated with the three inter-related aspects of love : Eros, Agape and Charis—which are pronounced by The *Waste Land* as *Datta* (Give), *Dayadhvam* (Sympathise), *Damyata* (Control). In the purified condition of love Eros is symbolized by garden; Agape, which reaches idealization in the Eucharistic Pageant of the *Purgatorio*, by some ritual of togetherness and communion, usually, food ritual; and Charis, the aspect of love in which Divine Grace directly touches the heart, by light, music and water. But with the debasement of love there would be for Eros a waste land; for Agape a vapid food ritual of tea and cakes and ices or a situation lacking in sympathy and understanding and marked by selfishness, lust or violence; and for Charis a 'twittering world' of smoke and fog and noise and dirty water or no water.

With the recurrent use of these key symbols and certain personal symbols Eliot's poetry delves deeper and deeper into the meaning of reality under the motivation of a final cause.

The meaning ranges between the indeterminate and the Infinite, which are the two poles between which Cassirer traces the symbolic activity of the human spirit itself. It is indeterminate in so far as the unregenerate consciousness of the *Prufrock* volume shows a sense of undifferentiated uneasiness in the face of an 'overwhelming question.' But it becomes Infinite in *Four Quartets* where all the symbols of human experience, with their interpenetrating perspectives of myth, religion, language, history, art and science, reveal God or Love as their meaning and the 'overwhelming question' is at last identified as 'the drawing of this Love, and the Voice of this Calling.'

The Hollow Men. which sees the meaning of all the kingdoms of human experience in the 'Shadow' that claims them for the Kingdom of God marks a point of departure towards the realization of the Infinite. The poem looks back to the 'lost Kingdoms' of the romanticised, egoistic, 'Personality' figuring in the poetry up to *The Waste Land*,—Pufrock, Burbank, Sweeney, the young man carbuncular etc.—and forward to 'death's other kingdom', the Kingdom of purification and Illumination that constitutes the consciousness of the responsible 'Person' of the later poetry. Indeed, *The Hollow Men* marks a significant caesura in the poetic development of T. S. Eliot. For understanding his poetry one must always return to it.

With its epigraphs the poem announces the death of the egoistic 'Personality', the 'Old Guy' (Fawkes)-Kurtz personality, and looks forward, as 'the world ends' with a 'whimper', to the birth of the responsible 'Person' who will become the 'new man' of St Paul's conception. The potentially 'new men' call themselves the 'Hollow Men'; for they have evacuated themselves of the 'world of fancy' and 'of sense', have reduced themselves to the bare essentials of a person and have divested their souls of 'the love of created beings' in the hope of its being 'possessed of the divine

union'—which is to remind ourselves of the observations of St John of the Cross.[2] The divesting of the soul of the love of created beings implies, among other things, the 'expanding/Of love beyond desire'; it implies loving them as a Shadow (or, as Dante puts it, as 'shadowy prefaces'[3]) of the Absolute Reality they signify (*For Thine is the Kingdom*). Notwithstanding the ambivalence of the term, the Hollow Men's 'hollowness' has positive implications. These men have prepared themselves for the undertaking of a Dantean, purifying and regenerative journey through the kingdoms of death and Shadow in the hope of meeting the Eucharistic-Beatrician 'eyes' from which the light of Divine Grace will break forth, to reveal the Incarnational reality of the Shadow itself. They are confronted with a vision of the 'Heart of Darkness', as their spiritual journey lies through it; but it is only in an ironical sense that they remind us of Kurtz and Guy Fawkes and all the 'lost/Violent souls'. They themselves are not to be remembered as 'lost/Violent souls', who went after illusions, and they are the 'empty men' who do hope for 'the Light of lights' which is, as the Gita observes, 'in the heart of dark shining eternally.'

The mythical theme of the poem is the need—felt after an awareness of the illusions of the egoistic way of life—for the purgation or the purification that can bring regenerative grace. Having died to the egoistic way of life, of which they are now aware as 'our lost kingdoms', the Hollow Men have prepared themselves for a purifying and regenerative spiritual journey that lies, as it did for Dante, through 'death's dream kingdom', analogous to the vision of Hell, and 'death's other kingdom', analogous to the vision of Purgatory. All these kingdoms—which are kingdoms of death and Shadow—are as in Dante, meaningful extensions and intensifications of the *saeculum* which the Hollow Men call 'death's twilight kingdom'. It is *here* that they are on a point of departure for going through a vision of Hell and a vision of Purgatory.

In the poem they do not actually make the mythical descent-ascent journey—which remains a 'gesture without motion'. It is rather that they visualize it in snatches from a here-now point in the *saeculum* or 'twilight kingdom'. From this point, which is 'Under the twinkle of a fading star', they visualize the darkening vision of Hell as they will proceed through 'this valley of dying stars' hoping to emerge into 'death's other kingdom'—the yet unfamiliar kingdom of Purgation and Illumination which is explored in subsequent poetry. Towards the end of the poem the Hollow Men visualize a purgatorial cycling (which Dante began 'At five o'clock in the morning') in terms of a half-juvenile May game reminiscent of a death-rebirth ritual. They recognize the Shadow that falls between the idea and the reality etc. to claim every Kingdom for God, and with this they recognize that 'the world ends/Not with a bang', as Guy Fawkes and other 'lost/Violent souls' would have it, 'but a whimper'—which shadows forth the birth of 'death's other Kingdom' the Kingdom of God among men, and of the men themselves, the 'new men', the respansible persons who will inhabit it.

In keeping with the awareness of the (idolatrous) illusions of false love (which misled not only Kurtz and Guy Fawkes but also Dante) the key symbols associated with the theme of love are marked with a 'desiccation of the world of sense', their ambivalence pointing to the hoped-for blossoming of transcendental beatitude. Thus, for Eros there is 'cactus land' which is different from the 'waste land' in being potentially regenerate. It anticipates 'the desert in the garden, the garden in the desert of drouth' of Ash Wednesday, and symbolizes the wilful desiccation which, it is hoped, will bloom into the 'Multifoliate rose' of true Eros. It looks back to false Eros as 'lost kingdoms', and the protagonist would be' no nearer' to their illusion in 'death's dream kingdom,' where he visualizes the illusion of Semiramis in the Circle of the Lustful (*Inferno* V)—her 'broken column' etc. The 'cactus

land' looks forward to the 'Multifoliate rose' (Cf. Dante's Mystic Rose') because it is what the visionary makes of his situation in the *saeculum* in order to cultivate true Eros. For Agape, there is a ' leaning together' and a 'whispering together' and, as the spiritual journey is visualized, there is a 'groping together' 'In this last of meeting places'. But Agape. it is hoped, will come to its own in 'death's other kingdom' where the 'final meeting' with the Eucharistic beloved is hoped for after the purgatorial process has been gone through, the pugatorial process itelf being visualized in terms of a half-juvenile, May game-like cirling together round the Eucharisic 'prickly pear', which reminds us of Adam-Christ's tree on top of Mount Purgatory. As for Charis, we have the 'wind', the symbol of the spirit (as the Bible testifies), in dry grass' and the 'twinkle of a fading star', under which most of the poem is enacted, in the 'twilight kingdom', and the hoped-for light of Grace breaking forth from the Beatrician 'eyes.' As the spiritual journey is visualized the light and wind and music of Charis reveal the illusion of false love-which reminds us not only of Semiramis in the *Inferno* but also of Dante's own 'false phantoms' and the idols of Kurtz and the images in *Ezekiel*. For seeing' the Beatrician eyes the soul must purify its love through the purgatorial discipline which is as yet visualized in half-juvenile, May-game fashion. But one thing is finally recognized in respect of Charis. It is the Shadow that falls between the idea and the reality etc. to claim every kingdom as the Kingdom of God—*For Thine is the Kingdom*—and also to indicate that *Life is very long* stretching into eternal damnation or eternal beatitude. The Shadow falls and 'the world ends' with a 'whImper', which is also the whimper of the new-born. But the Kingdom of God among men is shadowed forth, and for those who may be born into it through the purified love that affirms the Incarnational reality of the Shadow itself 'the darkness shall be the light'. This is what the poem suggests towards its end.

The context of the poem evokes the word 'Kingdom' in its most comprehensive sense, one which reverberates along perspectives of myth (the kingdoms of death and the need of a journey through them), history (the British Kingdom which Guy Fawkes wanted to change by violence; the African jungle kingdom of Kurtz; and the kingdom of Semiramis and all the 'lost kingdoms' whose 'broken columms' are what is left of them), art ('death's dream kingdom' with its 'broken column' and' 'stone images'; the three kingdoms of Dante's vision; and the kingdom of poetic art itself), science (the macrocosm and the microcosm and the animal, the plant and the mineral kingdoms that form the background of the poem), language ('this broken jaw of our lost Kingdoms') and above all religion *(For Thine is the Kingdom)*.

The Hollow Men's 'hollowness' marks a new phase in the developmnnt of the language perspective. The Hollow Men speak, or 'whisper together', in 'dried voices', voices denuded of all rhetorical flourish and poeticism, in gasping. exhausted, almost monotonous rhythms, and in a language which, as it comes out of the recognition of 'this broken jaw of our lost kingdoros,' is empty of all sensuous and fanciful emotions but rings, no doubt with a peculiar note of humility. Here poetic language itself is undergoing a 'death in love' and is looking forward, with the 'whimper' sounded at the end of the poem, to the birth of a new poetic language which includes and transforms the old, a purified 'dialact of the tribe' urging 'the mind to aftersight and foresight'. This 'regenerate' Poetic language comcs to its own in *Four Quartets*, which explores, 'With the drawing of this Love and the voice of this Calling', the end and the beginning of all the symbolic forms of human experience in the stillness of the Word It becomes so transparent that 'the poetry does not matter, while it offers, in its attempt to formulate a regenerate consciousness, its own 'form', its own 'pattern', as an analogy of regeneration through love. But it is with *The*

Hollow Men that the mind starts recognizing the symbolic, Shadow kingdom of language and poetry too as the Kingdom of God, who is Love, the True Meaning of this and every other 'kingdom',

The Hollow Men are also, paradoxically, the 'stuffed men,' having their head-pieces 'filled with straw'—like the 5th Nov- effigies of Guy Fawkes, of which chidren make bonfires (*A Penny for the old Guy*). This is to reinforce the point that the Hollow Men recognize that in. themselves and without the Grace of God they are insignificant ('hollow'), as inisgnificant as straw before the wind (Bible). We are reminded of the scare crow image in Yeats, which is reiterated later on-'Leaning together' may be appropriately said of the effigies; but the phrase slso suggests a posture of prayer. 'Alas!' neutralizes the self-mockery of the description, as attention is drawn to 'whisper' of their 'dried voices' Since they have seen the illusons of the flesh for what they are thier 'dried voices/Are quiet and meaningless As/wind in dry grass' ('All flesh is grass')' Or rats feet over broken glass/In our dry cellar,[5]--which are images of ultimate decay and meaninglessness of mere worldly life. Kurtz ended up with confronting a vision of 'grayness without form' in the twilight kingdom of an African jungle, after he had fattened his ego to the extreme. So did Guy Fawkes in different circumstances. Both were 'hollow men, in another sense, and we know in what way the Hollow Men. who ironically identify themselves with them, out of self-tormenting humility, are different from them, Ironically they lead themselves, like the 5th November effigies of Guy Fawkes, to becoming sacrificial victims in a ritual of purgation similar in intentions to the original ritual in primitive Nature Cults, which is now represented by the juvenile celebrations of Guy Fawke's day on the 5th of November.

'Those who have crossed/With direct eyes, to death's other Kingdom' are the penitent and purified souls who have

joined the Kingdom of god among men. They have already met the reproachful Beatrician eyes in the Garden of Earthly Paradise. They remember the Hollaw Men—If at all—'not as lost/Violent souls' damned in Hell, but only 'As the Hollow Men/The stuffed men.'

The image of the 'eyes' insists on the chief import of the poem. It is a personal symbol that develops along perspectives of myth, religion, history, language, art and science through recurrence in various contexts.[6] 'The natural wakeful life of our Ego is a perceiving', and the 'eye' can very well represent the 'I' (which sometimes occasions a cryptic pun in Eliot). In the early poetry it is the 'personality' and not the 'responsible person' the *I* of *I-It* and not the *I* of *I-Thou*, that is associated with the 'eye' symbol. We recall, for example, the *fin de siecle* eyes 'that fix you in a formulated phrase,' the eye of the Gorgon woman, the 'lustreless protrusive eye' of Bleistein, and the 'Russian eye' of Grishkin, 'underlined for emphasis'. These eyes, associated with despair and pain begin to provoke in the Gerontion volume a horrified questioning of values in a corrupt and degenerate world. *The Waste Land* surverys these eyes from the case of the infernal crowd flowing over London Bridge, in which 'each man fixed his eyes before his feet,' (reminiscent of the situation in the First Circle of Dante's Hell) to the case of 'the young man carbuncular' (Cf. the eyes of Milton's Satan) who arrives with one bold stare.' But *The Waste Land* itself throws hints of a purgatorial sea-change of the 'personality' in the case of Phlebas-'those are pearls that were his eyes'—and also in the case of Tiresias himself who, though 'blind', can 'see' the whole situation with the vision of responsible person', his responsiblilities being summed up in terms of the three aspects of love—*Datta, Dayadhvam. Damyata.* With this the old personality—'eyes' die. The 'eyes' that will reappear in later poetry will be associated with the light of Divine Grace.

The 'responsible person' must purify his love of egoistic

desires through a Dantean, spiritual journey in order to meet the light of Divine Grace, which is symbolized in Dante by the eyes of Beatrice. To begin with, these 'eyes' are so intensely reproachful as to draw a flood of tears in Dante's eyes (Cf. 'Eyes that last I saw in tears'. Although the eyes have already wept for his sake,[7] it must be remembered that, like Dante, the protagonist himself is in tears—and not the 'eyes he sees;[8] also Cf. 'The wind sprang up at four O'clock,' where 'the face that sweats with tears' is the protagonist's own face likened to 'the surface of the blackened river', Styx. in the infernal vision. Both these minor poems, we are told, have a genetic association with *The Hollow Men*[9]. What has bearing on the 'eyes' in *The Hollow Men* is the 'multifoliate' symbolic significance of the Beatrician Vision. The Beatrice figure is a *Thou*-figure becoming a glimpse-through to the *Eternal Thou*, and her 'eyes', in the 'final meeting' that takes place in the Earthly Paradise on top of Mount Purgatory, are a symbolic concrescence of human love united with divine love, of the temporal united with the eternal, of the mystery of Incsrnation, 'the impossible union/Of spheres of Existence'—as the Twyform nature of the Gryphon is reflected in them—of the regenerative light of Divine Grace, of Virgin Mary, of the Eucharist, of the Church Triumphant, of divine Revelation, and of the promise of ecstatic Beatitude through the transcendence of the Love that is also Free Will. The Hollow Men are not aware of all these signifcances which unfold themselves in subsequent poetry, particularly in association with the symbolism of the 'rose'.

For the visionary in the 'twilight kingdom' of the *saeculum* the descent into Hell becomes a purgatorial ascent. So the visions of 'death's dream kingdom' and 'death's other kingdom' interpenetrate. The Hollow Men see now one vision, now the other, as the Shadow falls again and again in the 'twilight kingdom' of which the other kingdoms are extensions. As the spiritual journey is visualized from a here-now point in

the 'twilight kingdom' the protsgonist realizes that it lies through 'death's dream kingdom'. He is obsessed with the desire of meeting the Beatrician 'eyes' which will bring the light of the Divine Grace he so much needs. But he is afraid that these 'eyes' that he dares not meet in dreams owing to his yet unpurified soul—'These do not appear' there in 'death's dream kingdom'. The *there* indicates the extension of the vision of the *saeculum* into that of hell. There Divine Grace reveals only the unreal, and Love itself devises torment for the soul fixed in its temptation in its desire for what is unreal or illusory. 'There the eyes are Sunlight on a broken column'—associated with Semiramis. There the 'eyes' are the old eyes of temptation which reveal to the visionary the illusion of Semiramis who is in the Circle of the Lustful in Dante's Hell. The 'broken column' and the 'swinging' tree are all that is left of her grand monuments and hanging gardens and sinful romances—

> There is a tree swinging
> And voices are
> In the wind's singing

for there, the Divine Spirit, often associated with the wind, manifests itself as the tormenting Black Wind of Hell (*Inferno* V). in which the Lustful and their voices and everything is hurled about. 'More distant and more solemn/Than a fading star' refers not only to the voices, the tree and the column but also to the 'eyes' of temptation whose illusion has been revealed for what it is. It is more distant and more solemn than the 'fading star' situation of the visionary in the 'twilight kingdom'. While he means to pass by it, through' 'death's dream kingdom', he would be 'no nearer' to it. In order to protect himself from falling into it he 'would slso wear/such deliberate disguises/Rat's coat, crowskin, crossed staves'—which make him like Yeats's scarecrow—the 'crossed staves' particularly suggesting the Crucifix in this image of humility

he would assume, In a field/Behaving as the wind behaves'[10]—in a condition of compete Resignation-'No-nearer

> Not that final meeting
> In the twilight kingdom

He would be 'no nearer', in 'death's dream kingdom', to a meeting with the 'eyes' of temptation which are actually 'sunlight on a broken column'. Such a meeting would not be 'that final meeting/In the twilight kingdom' when, after his own purification the 'eyes' reappear in the Earthly Paradise, as Beatrician eyes: as the bearers of Divine Grace and promise of Beatitude. 'As the perpetual star/Multifoliate rose Of death's twilight kingdom.'

A few words about the 'wind', the symbol of the spirit, another personal symbol of our poet.[11] In the earlier poetry it is an uncomprehended wind that blows through the infernal world of 'Preludes' and 'Rhapsody' and sways the readers of 'The Boston Evening Transcript'. Gerontion, 'A dull head among windy spaces,' sums up and reconsiders its uncomprehended character; he observes that in the depraved world around him 'Vacant shuteles/Weave the wind; and he finally visualizes himself as a 'Gull against the wind'—'White feathers in the snow.' In the Gerontion volume the 'insurgent gales' of 'Sweeney Erect' and the gusts of the wind are God-directed agents, but they are associated with horror, disgust and anger (characteristic of this volume), which challenges the mind to comprehend their meaning. *The Waste Land* makes this attempt, though it also sums up the incomprehensibility – 'What is the wind doing?'. The poem arouses hopeful erotic and artistic associations with the *Frisch Weht der Wind* of *Tristad und Isolde* and observes that 'the wind crosses the brown land unheard', which takes on a stern note in the 'cold blast'—of *Inferno*. But the wind also becomes, towards the climax of the poem, the 'warm' Southwest wind of *St Luke* (12 : 55) that drives the bark of Elizabeth and

Leicester–of the State and the Church. The poem asks those who 'look to windward' to 'consider Phlebas' who died through a purgatorial cycling, 'Entering the Whirlpool'; and finally with the 'damp gust/bringing rain' it considers the possibility of regeneration through the three interrelated aspects of love, indicated as *Datta*, *Dayadhvam* and *Damyata*, which would turn life into Purgatory. It is with *The Hollow Men* that the 'wind' is fully recognized as the Spirit.

The protagonist. or portagonists—because the 'I' is disappearing to merge back through a subtle transition, from a half-impersoual 'we' in the tenth line of this Section to the communal 'we' of the next Section the protagonists from the point of their stance in the 'twilight kingdom' see their world as 'cactus land', which should not be confused with the 'waste land', as has been pointed out above. Here the illusory objects of desire and devotion (Dante's 'false phantoms of the good') that man has himself created through an exclusively *I–It* attitude–his idols, so to say—appear as 'stone images' (cf. Eze., 6), as dumb, blind and heartless 'images' that receive the supplication of a dead man's hand/under the twinkle of a fading star' (We are reminded of Kurtz who forgot his true love and took to idols.' So was it with Dante—with the difference that he made a purifying, regnerative journey through the 'heart of darkness'). The protagonists wonder if it is 'like this' in 'death's other kingdom.'

Is it like this
In death's other kingdom
Waking alone
At the hour when we are
Trembling with tenderness

– of course it reminds us of Dante in the presence of his beloved[12]—

Lips that would kiss
Form Prayers to broken stone

That happens here in 'cactus land'. (The lines do not end with

a question mark; they end with a period. Except this, punctuation is absent throughout, which creates, because of the possibility of multiple syntactical connections, an effect of ambiguity, which goes well with the uncertainty of the speakers' mind). But: Is it like this in 'death's other kingdom' too? Is it like this that lips that would kiss form prayers to broken stone there too? Is it like this that there too we are

> Seeking for
> False phantoms of the good, which promise make
> Of joy, but never fully pay the score. (*Purg.*, XXX)

As they visualize their spiritual journey that lies through Hell, the panick-striken Hollow Men realize that in their infernal 'death's dream kingdom' there are no Beatrician eyes to bring the light of Divine Grace. No eyes here in this hell which is, as in Dante, a valley of dying stars—

> In this valley of dying stars
> In this hollow valley
> This broken jaw of our lost kingdoms

This reminds us of the mouth of Hell shown as the open mouth of a huge monster in medieval iconography and in some Mystery Plays. But the 'hollowness' of the situation resounds with the ideality of the language perspective with reference to 'our lost kingdoms', which we have already taken note of. In point of language these lost kingdoms are a 'broken jaw' from which are heard broken rhythms and exhausted cadences (Cf. 'Voices singing out of empty cisterns and exhausted wells' in *The Waste Land*) in respect of the things 'one no longer has to say, or the way in which/One is no longer disposed to say it.' This 'dying' language, with its 'whimper', foreshadows the birth of the 'new language' and the 'new men'.

The Hollow Men visualize themselves gathered for their journey through Hell on the beach of Acheron, 'the tumid river'. Here all speech has lost its relevance and point. 'In this last of meeting places' they grope together/And avoid speech'. They are 'sightless' unless the Beatrician 'eyes', the mediators

of the light of Divine Grace, 'reappear'

As the perpetual star
Multifoliate rose
Of death's twilight kingdom

—of 'death's twilight kingdom' or *saeculum* into which the visions of Hell, Purgatory and Paradise merge back the 'multifoliate rose' or the Mystic Rose of Paradise being, as in Dante, an extension and intensification of the Beatrician vision in the Garden of Earthly Paradise on top of Mt Purgatory ('The single Rose is now the Garden'). The 'eyes' can 'reappear' only when the Hollow Men recover innocence and transform their 'twilight kingdom' into an Earthly Paradise through the purgation of love. Reminding us of the rose gardenof the *Vita Nouva* and the Mystic Rose of *Paradiso* the 'rose' too is Eliot's personal symbol[13]. It is associated with the first (childhood) intuition of the Eternal Beloved through Eros, of the *Eternal Thou* through the particular *Thou*, leading to the ecstatic vision of ultimate Beatitude. In the earlier poetry it appears in a debased form in a debased, unregenerete world, for example, as a faded yellow colour in the skies of *Prurfock* and *Portrait* or as a 'paper rose'twisted the hands of the infernal Moon-Woman of *Rhapsody Dans Le Restaurant*, as Genesius Jones observes, makes a forward step for the rose-garden but 'the cynical evangelist of this poem sees the garden through the eyes of a 'vieux lubrique', not a pilgrim in Paradise'. Now, in *The Hollow Men* the 'eyes-perpetual star-multifoliate rose' vision is mentioned as a possibility,

The hope only
Of empty men

The hope only of empty men who are empty of everything the world values; the only hope, and the hope only, of empty men who do not hope for anything else—Cf. St Paul on Hope in *Colossians*, 1 : 5-3 : 10, Knox trans. :

Hope from . . . the message of the Gospel . . . Christ among you,

your hope of glory . . . Risen, then, with Christ . . .you must be heavenly -minded. You have undergone death, and your life is hidden away now with Christ in God . . . you must deaden, then, those passions in you which belong to the earth . . . quit the old self . . . be clothed in the new self that is being refitted all the time for closer knowledge, so that the image of the God who created it is its pattern.

In the last section of the poem the Hollow Men visualize a purgatorial cycling. They see themselves going round and round 'the prickly pear' which, above all, reminds us of Adam-Christ's tree on top of Mount Purgatory, the symbol of death-in-love and regeneration (*Purg.*, XXXII). That it is purgatorial cycling is explicitly indicated by the time five o'clock in the morning—the morning of Easter Sunday, to be exact—which is the time when in Dante's spiritual journey the vision of the Inferno ends ahd the vision of the Purgatorio begins, paralleling as it does Christ's own emergence from Hell on the morning of Easter Sunday (Cf. Northrop Frye's remarks on the death-burial-resurrection rhythm implied in *The Waste Land*)[14]. In keeping with the poem's half-juvenile irony the purgatorial cycling echoes the music of an exhausted nursery rhyme and the jingle of recovered innocence—in Dante's Purgatory, too, man passes (Phlebas-like) 'the stages of his age and youth' to recover innocence in the Earthly Paradise[15] 'The prickly pear' is also a phallic image, as Grover Smith observes, substituted for the 'Mulberry Bush' of the nursery rhyme, which is a fertility symbol connoting love—as in the legend of Pyramus and Thisbe to which, interestingly enough, Dante also refers in *Purgatorio* XXVII and XXXII. In addition to the Mulberry Bush nursery rhyme the first four lines also echo the chant of the erotico-religious May games—'Here we go gathering nuts in May'—in which 'the country copulatives' pick up their paramours. Genesius Jones adds to the cross-references by reminding us that the suppressed Mulberry Bush makes a point of contact with Semiramis, too, who built Ninny's tomb. But he points to something more basic. The Mulberry Bush has been changed to a cactus, 'the prickly

pear', in as much as this is 'cactus land'. 'In the Resurrection which took place at five O'clock in the morning the glorified body of the Lord, which suffered once and once only, and which now, as resurrected in the Eucharist, takes its place in the new life which the awe-struck soul looks forward to. And in that Kingdom which is shadowed forth even here, it embodies a promise of the noon's repose on top of Mount Purgatory, which is to follow the 'troubled midnight' of all the preceding poetry'. Further, the prickly pear like the Mulberry Bush is edible. and at the conclusion of the game which accompanies the singing of the rhyme, the one who stands in the centre (at the still point) is fallen upon and metaphorically eaten of by the participants.[16] With all its multiple allusions the 'prickly pear' stands for love resurrected as tne Eucharist of redeemed Agape. In connexion with Agape it would not be irrelevant to remember 'Give us this day our daily bread' which is hinted later on, as Genesius Jones suspects, in the repeated doxology from the 'Pater noster'.

As in Dante, the end of Purgation is vision, which gets more and more purified by the help of Divine Grace, for the perception of the Eternal in the temporal, of the mystery of Incarnation itself—through the love of a *Thou* figure which is the personal sign of this mystery—which also involves the perception in oneself of the union of Divine Love and human love or Divine Will and human will. Without such a vision one would remain 'sightless'. And in spite of the recovery of innocence and the perfection of the natural man in oneself (symbolized by Dante's Earthly Paradise) the gulf would remain between will and power, intention and execution, idea and reality—as St Paul too well knew ('For to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do'). Or, if one may draw on neoplatonic terminology for the sake of a wider, more general and more

philosophical view of things, between 'the idea and the reality', 'the motion and the act', 'the conception and the creation', 'the emotion and the respense', 'the desire and the spasm', 'the potency and the existence', 'the essence and the descent.' These pairs of concepts also refer to the obstruction caused by the gulf in the free operation of Eros, Agape and Charis. To the 'sightless' Hollow Men the gulf appears as 'the Shadow'; but the Shadow itself is the Incarnation that spans the gulf (cf. the theological *raison d'etre* of Incarnation in *Paradiso* VII). The vision that sees in the light of the final cause all manifestation of the 'shadow and poison of the flesh' (*Paradiso* XIX) as 'shadowy prefaces' of Absolute Reality (*Paradiso* XXX) is yet to be attained.

In an *I-it* situation the Shadow is the obscured reality of the not-self as well as the spectre of the unredeemed self that obscures it by projecting it self ontoit – a Jungian Shadow at that—and in both the image of God is yet to be realized through a purgatorial death in love which is the end of the Eucharistic 'prickly pear' game. The Shadow is the Darkness in whose heart the Light is hidden; but it is also the Darkness that falls on the 'twilight kingdom' and all the other kingdoms to make them kingdoms of death and also to claim them for God (*For Thine is the Kingdom*). The Shadow with its ambivalent significance for the promise of damnation or beatitude does involve death in any case, and is the ultimate judgment on life in time and on all forms of human knowledge—'the bitter tastelessness of shadow fruit' (*Little Gidding*) from 'the wrath-bearing tree-Prickly pear'. The mythico-religious perspective controls the meaning of 'the Shadow', but we can very well think of other senses subservient to this meaning. The Shadow is also the reality of History, 'the lengthened shadow of a man' *(Sweeney Erect,)* stretching in time and out of it into the timeless, which must be realized as theophany. The Shadow that fell on all the kingdoms of History (including the kingdom of Semiramis) or the Shadow that fell on personal lives of individuals like Kurtz, even the

Shadow that fell on the life of Guy Fawkes because of the sudden scruple of his co-conspirators, is a sign of God. So is life in time meaning death. The Shadow is the reality of language and art and science, too, as it falls on all these kingdoms and claims them for God. We think particularly of language, a 'shadow fruit' of Knowledge (*Little Gidding*) meaning death, as in the Bible, but implicitly testifying to the Word under the very shadow of death—

For Thine is
Life is
For Thine is the

To sum up, the Shadow is the mediated reality of human experience in all its symbolic forms which are, in fact, signs of God. It is what Kierkegaard calls the 'Shadowgraph'. In and through it must be seen the image of God who claims all the symbolic, Shadow kingdoms as His Own, to reveal His Power and Glory. The visionary must learn to love the Shadow itself in order to see in and through it the Light.

As they go round the Prickly Pear-Adam-Christ's tree the Shadow falls for the Hollow Men as it falls not only for Kurtz and (like the axe on the scaffold) for Guy Fawkes but also for Adam and all his children who taste death—the Shadow fruit—through it. It falls with the realization that

For Thine is the Kingdom

and with the realization that

Life is very long

The former phrase occurs twice, that is, once before and once after the latter. Both the phrases implicate the Shadow in its ambivalent significance for hape or despair—that is,

The hope only
Of empty men.

The former phrase which Marlowe, in the *Heart of Darkness*, calls 'a phrase of careless contempt' may imply despair or

hope with reference to the falling Shadow – for *Life is very long* and stretches into eternity, an eternity of damnation or of beatitude. In the same way *For Thine is the Kingdom* refers to the Shadow that in falling on all the kingdoms of knowledge and experience to claim them for God and join time with eternity may imply the despair of eternal deprivation or the hope of eternal beatitude through the affirmation of its own Incarnational reality. In any case the Shadow demands resignation to the ending of the world.

As the doxological phrases are repeated they are interrupted by the falling Shadow (like prayer on the scaffold interrupted by the falling axe) and become the broken utterance of a dying person—coming from the 'broken jaw of our lost kingdoms', as it were :

For Thine is
Life is
For Thine is the

With the recognition of the Shadow the visualized purgatorial cycling ends in a death-time whirling of the mind that realizes the ending of the world.

This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but a whimper

'Not with a bang', as Guy Fawkes and other 'lost/Violent souls' would have it, 'but a whimper' – which, with its ambivalence, implies a death which is a birth, through the affirmation of the Incarnational reality of the Shadow, into the 'twilight kingdom' become the Kingdom of God among men and a renewal of vision by the help of Divine Grace (symbolized by the 'eves') for seeing the meaning of all the kingdoms as Love (as in the vision of St. Julian of Norwitch alluded to in *Four Quartets*. The meaning of the Shadow itsf elis Love.

Department of English
Aligarh Muslim University,
Aligarh

Notes & References

1. See Genesius Jones, *Approach to the Purpose* (London, 1964), pp. 87-90. I am too indebted to him to acknowledge it every time.
2. *The Ascent of Mt Carmel,* Bk I. Chap. IV.
3. *Paradiso,* XXX.
4. Cf. *Heart of Darkness:* 'and the Whisper . . . echoed loudly within him because he was hollow at the core.'
5. Cf. the dry cellar beneath the House of Lords where Guy Fawkes was discovered by his captors.
6. See Genesius Jones, *Op. cit.* pp. 211-86.
7. *Purgatorio,* XXVII.
8. However, an effect of Lafourgian doubling cannot be ruled out.
9. See Hugh Kenner, *The Invisible Poet : T. S. Eliot* (London, 1960), p. 205.
10. 'The wind which bloweth where it listeth' (Jn: 3:8)
11. See Genesius Jones, *Op. cit.*, pp. 207-12.
12. See *Purgatorio,* XXX; but it also reminds us, ironically, of death-time prayers—particulary of those, who, 'waking alone', like Guy Fawkes find themselves at the scaffold white their broken 'Idols' remain unmoved.
13. See Genesius Jones, *Op. cit.*, 237-39.
14. Northrop Frye, *T. S. Eliot* (Edinburgh and London, 1963), p. 64ff.
15. See, for example, Farncis Furgusson, *Dante's Drama of the Mind.* (Oxford, 1953).
16. Cenesius Jones, *Op. cit.*, p. 111.

K. S. Misra

A NOTE ON ELIOT'S DELIBERATELY ACHIEVED FAILURE AS A DRAMATIST

Eliot's intentions and efforts in the revival and re-establishment of poetic drama in our age of prose are creditable. But, looked at in retrospect, his achievement seems almost certain to be of historical importance. We wish that his sound critical manifesto were geared to produce plays of lasting appeal. It would have been, perhaps, less disappointing to Eliot readers had he practised what he said at a later stage in his career: 'I am no longer very much interested in my own theories, especially those put forward before 1934. I have thought less about theories since I have given more time to write for the theatre.'[1] But his plays amply testify to his efforts to follow, as far as possible, his critical beliefs which somehow did not go well with his extraliterary convictions. For example, combined with this adherence to his critical convictions are his religious and spiritual concerns, obsession with which pronounced a doom on his success as a dramatist.

As we all know, Eliot's primary concern was to bridge the gulf between the poetic and the commercial theatres by fashioning a verse which may have the appearance of having been carved out of living speech, so that it is capable of working on its hearers' minds unobtrusively. He says, 'What we have to do is to bring poetry into the world in which the audience lives and to which it returns when it leaves the theatre; not transport the audience into some imaginary world totally unlike its own, an unreal world in which poetry is tolerated.'[2] This poetry, rooted in the living speech of the

people, has to strive towards the state of music, that is towards that intensity of expressiveness which can articulate those vague, indefinite feelings 'which we can only detect, so to speak, out of the corner of the eye and can never completely focus; feelings of whish we are aware in a kind of temporary detachment from action. . . .'[3] But the 'verse ought to be a medium to look Through and not a pretty decoration to Look at.'[4] Unlike Yeats, Eliot was aware of the importance of action and character in drama.[5] He draws on Aristotle's *Poetics* to say that the audience's expectation of action must be fulfilled if a play has to succeed.[6] Eliot's most precise statement about the nature of poetic drama occurs in his Introduction to S. L. Bethell's *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (1944) :

> A verse play is not a play done into verse, but a differnt kind of play: in a way more realistic than 'naturalist drama,' because, instead of clothing nature in poetry it should remove the surface of things, expose the underneath, or the inside, of the natural surface appearance. It may allow the characters to behave inconsisently, but only with respect to a deeper consistency. It may use any device to show the real feelings and volitions, instead of just what, in actual life, they would normally profess or be conscious of; it must reveal, underneath the vacillating or infirm character, the indomitable unconsicous will; and underneath the resolute purpose of the planning animal, the victim of circumstance and the doomed or sanctified being. So the poet with ambitions of the theatre, must discover the law, both of another kind of verse and another kind of drama.

Inspite of all his talent, artistic equipment and well-meaning critical intentions Eliot has on the whole failed to produce a drama which could stand the test of time. His experiment with verse from his fragmentary *Sweeney Agonistes* to *The Elder Statesman* was attended with 'fatal' success. In the process of making his verse transparent and close to living speech by putting it on a 'thin diet' Eliot managed to gradually vanish poetry altogether from his plays. *'The Elder Statesman* is the logical end of that development. . . . There is nothing

here that could not be (one might say *is not*) done in prose. Even those moments of heightened emotion when, according to Eliot's theory, poetry should become apparent and natural—the exchange between Monica and Charles at the end of the play, for instance—are of a piece with the bulk of the play's dialogue'[8]. In fact, the validity and wisdom of Eliot's resolve to put his verse on a 'thin diet' are questionable. Eliot praises Yeats' 'purging out of poetical ornament' in his later plays and goes on to say that 'the course of improvement is toward greater and greater starkness.' If we go deep into the whole issue, Conor A. Farrington's statement in this context sounds pertinent : 'Why ? Have souls all grown starker since Shakespeare's day that we need greater starkness to comprehend them ? This is the realist heresy all over again. . . . Man has not changed in essence since the plays of Shakespeare were written. . . . I suggest that the protagonists of Drama need to study again the basis of their art, which is the living word. And it is no use proclaiming "we are not Shakespeare" till we have tried and failed.'[9] Inspite of his strenuous and almost continuous experimentation with the medium, Eliot failed to provide, what Tyrone Guthrie has called, the 'basic plasma of the theatre,' that is, a living poetry which could be dramatic and yet moving. Guthrie, in his *A Life in the Theatre*,[10] regards drama primarily as a ritual, and likens it to Holy Communion. Language is the wine by which we are consecrated and nourished The ritual of drama may appear completed in Eliot's plays to the undiscerning eye, but we cannot help feeling that what we pass about is the empty, dry cup where communion is missing.

After the tremendous success of his first major play, *Murder in the Cathedral*, Eliot's resolve to write secular plays was, in fact, the right direction to ensure the fufilment of his professed aim of reaching out to a larger audience. But to do so he decided to adopt the already overworked dramatic conventions of social comedies. Besides making his verse 'starker,'

this was another self-imposed constriction by Eliot on his dramaturgy. His friend and collaborator, E. Martin Browne, has regretted this decision and its execution by Eliot :

> I feel that, by adopting this pattern of ironic social comedy, Eliot placed upon his genius a regrettable limitation. He tied himself to social, and still more theatrical conventions which were already outworn when the plays were written . . . The result was that, while he was working successfully to free his dtamatic verse from the exhausted post-Shakespeararean forms he was submitting his dramatic form to the same kind of constriction. And to do so, he put his poetry as he says, on 'a thin diet.' We have seen the progressive diminution of poetry in these plays quite deliberately achieved . . . Then too much of his energy is devoted to the correct expression of unimportant social niceties. The comedy is often delightful, but one pays too great a price for its prolixity.

Eliot's choice of material proved intractable for his dramatic framework and conventions, because his social comedies were primarily concerned with working out religious and spiritual issues. This led him to his preoccupation with saintly persons and their transcendental problems. Men of lesser mettle and their worldly concerns were almost ignored. Paradoxically, this preoccupation was behind the immediate success of his first major play.[12] But there the dramatic and theatrical experience resulted primarily from the flexibility and intensity of poetry.

In fact, in Eliot's obsession with religion and spirituality lie both his stregth and weakness as a dramatist. 'It has been his strength in that it has led him to write passages of spiritual exploration and communion such as we have hardly known in English drama ouside a few moments in Shakespeare. It has been his weakness in that such passages tend to be static and do not in themselves fulfil our expectations of a play. The spiritual life does not lend itself to drama, which requires a certain amount of physical action, and the groping *towards* spiritual understanding, which is what mostly we have in the plays in the contemporary settings as in the life

they repesent, is hardly dramatic. In fact, the tension of drama seems to arise more naturally if one starts from a religious basis. Damnation or the threat of damnation is more dramatic, for instance, than salvation or the hope of salvation, perhaps since it is more likely to involve physical action, being essentially a turning away from the Creator to the creature."[13] Sweeney, Becket, and Harry are strivers towards spiritual understanding and whatever action is provided as a surce of their understanding is not adequately dramatised.

Eliot's spiritual and religious obsession has brought in structural looseness in most of his social comedies. For example, in *The Family Reunion* we do not fully understand the nature of Harry's mission. As soon as he has understood the source of his sin and realised that his supreme duty is to atone for it and thus purge his family, Eliot's purpose is served and any further particulars of Harry's mission would not concern him. In *The Cocktail Party* Celia's martyrdom becomes melodramatic when it is deliberately made to appear shocking enough to the social set which it is intended to fertilize. In *The Confidential Clerk*, the central figures in the spiritual drama, the old and the 'young' clerks, remain lifeless figures, because the dramatist is more interested in the ideas than in them as individuals. Similarly, in *The Elder Statesman* the future of Michael is left ambiguous because it is not pertinent to Eliot's purpose which is simply to record the reflections its implications have produced in the mind of the father who has never cared to understand his son.

Eliot has clearly stated that the proper material for drama is human life, and emphasis on feelings and emotions in a play serves to lend vitality to it. He himself believed that poetry expresses not thought, but emotional equivalents of thought - a concept which Wordsworth expressed aptly in his 'truth carried alive into the heart by passion.' But his plays remain concerned with ideas—expressed directly or in

disguise—and not with emotions and passions. He ignored one important principle of art, that an idea becomes vital and vivid when it is steeped in feeling. Moreover, ideas become integral to a play only when they are dramatised, that is, if the human exponents of those ideas are able to show that they are the outcome of their experience, gained through action and suffering We can cite here Shakespeare's example. His ideas are seldom original or uncommon. But the 'film of familiarity' is removed from them by the pressure of the experience of life undergone by a Hamlet, an Othello, or a Lear. A. D. Moody's observations in this context support our argument :

> What one begins te make out in Eliot's idea of poetic drama is something very like 'Our peace in His Will.'. . . It was one thing to say that in the poetry in his own voice and in the forms of prayer of the Catholic Church; but to try to say it in the public theatre wes like trying to marry the art of Dante with that of Marie Lloyd. Yet that was more or less what Eliot was after. 'Every poet would like, I fancy, to be able to think he had some direct social utlity,' he said in 1933, 'a part to play in society as worthy as that of the music-hall comedian.' The worthiness of that role, in the case of Marie Lloyd, was that she not only amused her audience, but succeeded in 'giving expression to the life of that audience, in raising it to a kind of art.' Eliot, too, wanted to express the consciousness of his audience, of as large an audieece as he could commnd. But I am not sure that he was trying to do quite the same taing as Marie Lloyd. He was rather trying to transform the common consciousness. and to bring his audience to a new and radically different perception of their lives.

Eliot's purpose was evidently not materially different from that of George Bernard Shaw who also aimed at persuading his audience to appreciate his unorthodox but salutary points of view by exposing the hollowness of their cherished old conventions and notions, which seemed, to use Dr. Johnson's famous distinction, right because they were customary, not customary because they were right. However, Shaw is different from Eliot in one essential respect. His plays are discussion plays, where ideas are debated by characters,

and the clash between two seemingly equally valid points of view gives life and animation to the idea and so to the characters themselves. The wheels catch fire through motion and friction; and this is supplemented by action and situation, which Shaw could manage, if he so desired, with superb skill. But even Shaw could not escape the dangers which are inherent in a drama of ideas. The idea which a play is intended to project may fasten upon it like a leech and suck its very life-blood if plot and and character are subordinated to it and cease to be ends in themselves. Unfortunately, Eliot acted under the belief that the theatre of ideas was distinct from the theatre of character. In an interview in 1949 he said : 'It seems to me that we should turn away from the theatre of Ideas to the theatre of character.'[15] The case would have been different if he had practised what he said in the same interview about making 'the essential poetic play' with human beings rather than ideas : 'It is not for the dramatist to produce an analysed character, but for the audience to analyse the character.'[16]

Primacy of ideas over everything else in Eliot's plays reduces the characters to mere abstractions or mskes them just the mouthpieces of their author. They are sometimes abruptly endowed with their author's insight, understanding and wisdom required for the analysis and elaboration of the idea. Edward and Lavinia in *The Cocktail Party*, Sir Claude and Colby in *The Confidential Clerk*, and Lord Claverton in *The Elder Statesman* are the signal examples of this. This also explains the sudden changes Eliot's characters undergo regardless of motivation and consistency. We find ourselves at a loss to explain the reason for the burden of guilt weighing so heavily on Harry' conscience and tend to apply to it Eliot's own criticism of *Hamlet* as an artistic failure for lack of 'objective correlative.' Similarly, we find it difficult to account for the sudden conversion of a sophisticated lady of the world, like Celia, into a mystic eager to embrace a life of suffering

and sacrifice. We also fail to comprehend why Lord Claverton, after leading a loveless and unscrupulous life all through his active years, should in retirement become such an ardent believer in the power of love to fertilize hearts and wash away the stains of guilt and sin.

Eliot's decision to treat of secular themes and his critical statements in favour of drama, concentrating on action and character, do lead him to include in his later plays situations and relationships which are rich in emotional potential for dramatic exploitation. But his usual restraint and obsession with ideas do not allow him to effectively work them out dramatically. Amy's emotional distress, Agatha's amorous frustration and sacrifice, a possible tension in Mary and Harry's relationship, B. Kaghan and Lucasta affair, and Celia's worldly love attractions, could have been rich sources to draw on if Eliot were interested into probing the human psyche.

There is nothing wrong with presenting ideas in drama. But the ideas themselves should have a universal relevance. In his *Poetics*[17] Aristotle makes a distinction between poetry and history by saying that the former is more serious and philosophical than the latter, because history deals with the particulars while poetry is concerned with the universal. Commentators on Aristotle have distinguished the 'universal' in poetry from the universal in philosophy, noting that the latter is concerned with the abstract universal while the former is concerned with the concrete universal, that is, the permanent and generic traits of human nature embodied in individual characters, vivid and life-like, so that before we are able to detect the type they represent we must be impressed by their strong individuality. But Eliot's characters, embodying 'the abstract universal,' are mere types; at most they 'represent human dilemmas rather than the actual people the playwright enjoyed observing.'[18] Moreover, whatever concrete universals Eliot's characters project are narrow and topical. In fact, Eliot's anxious interest in re-establishing poetic drama

and restoring it to its pristine glory sometimes seems enwrapped in his ulterior intention of propagat ng Christianity. He himself has confessed his intention when he said that a 'literature should unconsciously rather than deliberately be Christian.'[19] In his *The Idea of a Christian Society* his anxiety to organise a community of Christians and endeavour for their spiritual edification, and work for the restructuring of the crumbling edifice of modern Christian civilization is too well-known to need much elaboration.[20]

Eliot's Christian bias converted the human milieu around him into a world of 'a heep of broken images' and 'withered stumps; and ordinary human life into just a repetition of 'birth, copulation, and death'. This is instanced by his picture of the London crowds in *The Waste Land, Four Quartets,* and *The Hollow Men.* Though in his social comedies Eliot seems to have come out of the waste land, the spiritual problems he raised there continue obstructing his grappling with the issues of ordinary human life.

In his last play, written after his second marriage, Eliot holds out a fresh and strong hope of his eventually deciding to deal with emotions as the spring of his dramatic action. In his dedication of the play to his new wife, who gave him a taste of real love and of the blessing that love is in the life of a man who has been doomed to a sterile married life through his most strenuous years, he promiss his warm interest in emotions :

> To you I dedicate this book, to return as best I can
> With words, a little part of what you have given me,
> The words mean what they say, but some have a further meaning
> For you and me only.

Youthful love enters as a major thematic concern in his work for the first time. In his earlier poems and plays this theme is taken up for treatment, no doubt. But Eliot's ironic and restrained expression of it does not produce any effective emotional response in the reader. Love in his early poetry is presented,

on the physical plane, as sterile and perverted. Sweeney's encounter with Mrs. Porter, the mechanical matching of the young man corbuncular with the female typist, and the lustful passion which deflowers the poor Thames daughters, in *The Wast Land*, are some of the striking examples. Even romantic love in the garden, in the first movement of *The Waste Land*, has an element of guilt and adulterates its joy. A version of the same love, inspiring the duet between Mary and Harry in *The Family Reunion*, is only the ghost of a momentary experience of childhood, too weak to be of any help to the guilt-haunted lover. Even the unadulterated love between B. Kaghan and Lucasta in *The Confidential Clerk* is devoid of emotional intensity and is motivated by the practical worldly considerations of marriage, i.e., the lovers' need for the company of each other and a sense of understanding reached between them *The Elder Statesman* disappoints us most, because here a positive hope was held out by the dramatist himself in his dedication of the play averred to above. The hope is belied when we come to discover in the play that the 'leaping delight' Eliot speaks of in the dedication does not find expression in the dramatic action. The play is too restrained and 'subtilised' to have enough warmth and fervour in it. Like the usual Eliot, the lovers remain reserved and restrained even in their intimate exchanges. Idea intrudes again to relegate the emotionl aspect of the play into the background. Eliot deliberately desists from exploring the hearts of the lovers to sound their emotionl resonance, and directs his attention to the workig out of the spiritual and psychological effect of love on the lovers as well as on Lord Claverton. *The Elder Statesman*, however, remains Eliot's most secular play. Finally, saints and martyrs have been done away with. We have no more Beckets, Harrys, and Celias. This is perhaps 'beacuase there is no special case to throw ordinary life into the shadow. More likely Eliot is now willing to say that there is a possible relationship which, in itself,

gives meaning to life.'[21] But the fact remains that even in this play Eliot lacked interest in common action of real characters, with their conscious motives and springs of action, which he rightly regarded as the body, the outer drama, or the external frame of a poetic play. It is an accepted principle of Western and Indian poetics that this frame or body, basd on common life, with concete characters and lively incidents, requires the dramatist's involvement with ordinary life, with its inextricable mixture of good and evil, its sordid surface hiding elements of beauty and glory. He should in other words be a master of what Keats calls 'negative capability,' of which Shakespeare was the greatest exemplar, because he could conceive an Iago with as much ease as an Imogen.

Department of English
Aligarh Muslim University
Aligarh

Notes

1. See *Paris Review*, no. 1 (1959), pp. 47-70.
2. *On Poetry and Poets*, London, 1965, p. 82.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
4. Eliot, 'Five Points on Dramatic Poetry, '*Townsman*, July (1938), p 10.
5. *Selected Essays*, London, 1951, pp 157-58.
6. T. S. Eliot, 'The Beating of a Drum, '*The Nation and Athanaeum* 6 October, 1923.
7. Quoted in F. O. Matthiessen, *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*, London, 1958, p. 155.
8. Gerald Weales, 'The Latest Eliot : The Elder Statesman,' *The Kenyon Review*, 21, 1 (1959), p. 476.
9. Conor A. Farrington, 'The Language of Drama,' *The Tulane Drame Review*, 5, 2(1960), pp. 71-72.
10. Quoted, *Ibid.*, p.69.
11. *The Making of T. S. Eliot's Plays*, Cambridge, 1969, pp. 342-43.

12. C. L. Barber bases his esteem of Eliot's achievement as a dramatist precisely on Eliot's deliberate choice of religiosity in his social comedies, where religious solutions have been suggested for moral and human relational issues. But Barber is here evaluating Eliot's Christian beliefe rather than his merits as a dramatic artist, because he overlooks in these plays the inadequacy of the indispensable interplay of action and character which Eliot himself was eager to achieve. ('The Power of Development in a Different World,' an additional chapter by C. L. Barber to Matthiessen's *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*, pp. 198-242).
13. D. E. Jones, *The Plays of T. S. Eliot*, London, 1963, pp. 197-98.
14. *Thomas Stearns Eliot : Poet*, Cambridge, 1979, pp. 327-28.
15. *The World Review*, November (1949), p. 22.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Poetics*, Ch. IX.
18. Leslie Paul, 'The Elder Statesman", *Bulletin of John Rylands Lidrary*, 36(1954), p. 53.
19. *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, London, 1964, p. 103.
20. *The Idea of a Christian Society*, London, 1954, pp. 28, 42.
21. Gerald Weales, 'The Latest Eliot : The Elder Satesman,' *The Kenyon Review*, 21, 1(1959) p. 477.

A. Stuart Daley

THE TRIUMPH OF PATIENCE IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

It is hardly surprising that patience plays an essential part in the triumph of virtue that crowns *As You Like It*. After all, the play's source, Thomas Lodge's pastoral romance, *Rosalynde*, repeatedly credits patience for the persistence of its characters Patience arms the hapless lovers against their disappointments because it offers the surest remedy for the ills of fortune. Lodge bases his story on the premise that, in the words of Aliena, 'amidst the depth of these extreamities, Loue would be Lord, and shew his power to bee more predominant than Fortune.'[1] Adam Spencer postulates the ancillary thesis of the romance as follows : 'But why *Adam* doost thou exclaime against fortune ? she laughs at the distressed; and there is nothing more pleasing vnto her than to heare fooles boast in her fading allurements, or sorrowful men to discouer fhe sower of their passions. Glut her not *Adam* then with content, but thwart her with brooking all mishappes with patience. For there is no greater checke to the pride of fortune, than with a resolute courage to passe ouer her crosses without care,' (417/194-95).

Several of the more than two dozen references invoke patience as the tried and true antidote to melancholy, including the grief of exile (421/199) or unrequited love. As Montanus admits, 'Of all passions Love is most impatient' (460/243), a fact made evident too in the play. Aphoristically and metaphorically speaking, then, patience is 'the sweetest

salve for miserie' (402/179).

A second reason for Shakespeare's introducing this virtue of steadfastness into *As You Like It* could be the great interest felt in it at the time in England and on the Continent. Its pervasive popularity as a controlling idea in the literary and visual arts and in political and moral treatises has been demonstrated by Gerald J. Schiffhorst, who finds that, 'Along with its closely related virtues—especially constancy, hope, and fortitude – it is a homiletic theme and iconographic attribute, used so widely by artists, poets, and theologians as to be 'commonplace' in England between 1480 and 1680. 'Moreover, it came to mean something other than Stoic fortitude or passive endurance; it was seen as an active virtue and a positive response to God's will in time of suffering.'[2]

Patience answers to tribulation, and tribulation, before the Era of Progress, was taken to be a universal experience in human life. Thus, in his *A Soveraigne Salve for a Sicke Soule*, David Chrytraeus assures his readers of the necessity of patience : 'The whole life of man is subject to many and sundry miseries and calamities, to continual cares, vexations and other wretchednesse : so that as Euripides truly sayd : Life is not life indeed, but continuall miserie. Therfore euen the very heathen men saw that patience was a most necessarie thing, both to keep the mind in quiet and in health, and to keep the common weale in safetie.'[3] Degrees of calamity might vary, but the necessity of coping with it remained. Duke Senior, a prince of quiet mind, touches upon this in the play :

> Thou seest we are not all alone unhappy;
> This wide and uniuersal theater
> Presents more woeful pageants than the scene
> Wherein we play in. (2. 7. 136-39)

Influential among 'the very heathen men' were, of course, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and others of the Stoic persuasion

who deeply affected Renaissance thinking. Horace disti'ls the essence of the Stoic position at the conclusion of Ode 24, Book 1, 'What it is out of our power to amend becomes more supportable by patience.' When, in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (2. 2. 1-2), Proteus urges, 'Have patience, gentle Julia,' she returns the Horation reply, 'I must, whsre is no remedy.' Hamlet's Horatio could have concurred. Julia's word 'remedy,' by the way, has an operative meanig that must be discussed in due course.

In contrast to the Stoic concept of *faturn* or *fortuna*, the great monotheistic religions had given tribulation a theological interpretation of quite different significance. Thus, In Islamic and Christian teaching the virtue in making a virtue of necessity lies in the submission of the faithful to the will of God, inscrutable as it may be. Fiat voluntas tua. Under the rubric, 'Patience enjoined under affliction,' Maulana Muhammed 'Ali observes that, 'It may also be added in this connection that Islam forbids indulgence in intemperate grief for the dead. It requires that all afflictions be borne patiently, as the Qur'an says: 'And We shall certainly try you with something of fear and hunger and loss of property and lives and fruits; and give good news to the patient, who, when a misfortune befalls them, say, Surely we are Allah's and to Him we shall return'.'[5]

The orthodox Chrytraeus adheres to a similar theological doctrine: 'Christian Patience is a vertue that reuerently submitteth itselfe to the will of God, in bearing mildly and gently all griefs and miseries whatsoeuer: and it doth not seeke helpe by unlawfull meanes, but in faith setteth downe this for a sure rule vnto a man whereon he reposeth him selfe, that God is mercifull vnto him, and therefore he craueth and looketh for aide at his hands, assuredly trusting that he will mitigate and release him: and wifh this faith and hope easeth his sorowe and griefe, and feeleth peace and mirth in his heart' (sig. Aiiij verso). As we shall see, this 'sure rule'

(eloquently embraced by old Adam) underlies the argument of *As You Like It*. It Is proven there in Act 5 when God intervenes through the appropriate agent, an old religious man, to return their states and fortunes to the banished prince and his contented followers in exile.

In *As You Like It* every character who appears In more than two scenes suffers trials and tribulations of various kinds. Among the exiles some have voluntariry shared the misfortunes of the protagonists for one reason or another, but mainly as faithful to bonds of love and duty. They witness the strength of moral suasion. The protagonists in this play, if taken to be the old duke, Orlando, Celia, and Rosallnd, are emphatically characterized as persons ot eminent virtue. So are two of the minor characters : Adam and Corin personify ideal members of the third estate. The underlying scheme of the play requires that the protagonists. the party of virtue, have been stripped of all but spiritual power with the dramatic consequence that with two possible exceptions their conflict with active evil must be worked out on a moral and intellectual level and the strength of their inner resources. To a distinctive degree then apart from the symbolic wrestling bout, the plotted physical action has to be subordinated to debate, reportage. spectacle, and stage imagery expressive of issues and conflicts. This accounts for the oftnoted thinness of plot, a point on which, for example, Agnes Latham quotes Anne Barton, '*As You Like It* derives much of its classical stability and poise from the fact that its plot barely exists.'[6] The reasons for this appear when we abstract from the play its basic scheme of controlling circumstances.

The time is the present time of the closing years of the sixteenth century, when 'The poor world is almost six thousand years old' (4. 1. 94 95), and so, in the common opinion, in its dotage. The place is a nameless sovereign dukedom somewhere in 'France,' a discreet subterfuge because the topical allusions and social abuses relate to Tudor England.

The dukedom has been taken over by a 'rough and envious' (1. 2. 241) tyrant of the worst kind, a tyrant both by usurpation and oppression. By force, fraud, and evil example, his diseased regime infects both the state and its microcosm, the family, with disorder, thereby exposing them to the vicissitudes of Fortune.[7]

Given these controlling circumstances, can a saving remnant deprived of the goods of fortune but armed with excellences of character and mind restore a better world (cf. 1. 2. 284)? That is to say, restore the good society of the old duke and his now dead mentor, Sir Rowland de Boys.

The doctrine of the three estates provides the philosophical frame of reference for the ensuing conflicts. This social theory gives coherence to an agenda that includes such familiar topics as the function of the aristocracy, the difference between the philosophical prince and the tyrant, the importance of vocation, and, above all, the harmonizing power of love in its intertwining private and public relationships of marriage, friendship, and social justice.[8]

Accordingly, the first speech of the play exposes a well-known injustice, an unnatural breach of love, made possible by the common law rule (primogeniture) by which the eldest son inherits the whole real estate of a decadent landowner of the greater or lesser nobility of England.[9] If the father had failed to provide for the younger children, they were left without a means of livelihood, which gives the point to Rosalind's quip about Orlando's scanty beard—'simply your having in beard is a younger brother's revenue' (3. 2. 277-78). In the opening speech Orlando describes to Adam the 'servitude' imposed on him by his eldest brother in defiance of their fathir 's legacy for educating Orlando in his porper calling. To fit his purpose, Shakespeare scrapped the gavelkind sort of inheritance set out in *Rosalynde*, a system used in Kent whereby the estate was equally divided among the sons.

For an audience of landowners, Inns of Court men, educators, and persons of such quality, Orlando's indictment would have had two effects. First, it presented them with a serious social prablem, one noticed, for example, in 'The State of England, 1600,' where Thomas Wilson defines 'The state of great [patrician] yonge brethren.' Wilson writes, in part :

> I cannot speak of the (number) of yonger brthers, albeit I be one of the number myselfe. but for their estate there is no man hath better cause to praise it; their state is of all stations for gentlemen most miserable, my elder brother forsooth must he master. He must have all, and all the rest that which the catt left on the malt heape, perhaps some smale annuytye during his life or what piease our elder brother's worship to bestowe upon us if wee please him, and my mistress his wife.

The second effect for playgoers would be the recognition of the suspenseful dilemma the youngster finds himself in : 'I will no longer endure it, though yet I know no wise remedy how to avoid [get free from] it' (1. 1. 24–24). At this point Orlando introduces two seminal words, 'endure' and 'remedy,' which will hereafter be repeated or enacted as a leitmotif of the play. They in turn attract the closely associated terms patience, content, and constancy, with examples. In this context, we recognize 'remedy' as a technical term of long standing, because it derives from the identification of vice, or sin, with sickness since, at least, Plato's *Republic*, where Socrates says that, 'Virtue is the health and beauty and well-being of the soul and vice the disease and weakness and deformity of the same.' (Book IV. 355).

The analogy naturally inspired the medieval moralists' idea that each sin found its *remedia* in a particular virtue or moral value. Thus Chaucer's Parson, who was himself 'in adversitee ful pacient,' gives standard *remedia* for each of the deadly sins, and his Tale had become available in a number of Tudor printings by 1598, when the Speght edition came out. But the idea enjoyed wide currency in sixteenth-century England, and may be found, for two examples, in Spenser's *Faerie*

Queene and Donne's sermons.[11] In keeping with the thematic purposes of *As You Like It*, Orlando's 'endure' and 'remedy' start off a run of imagery based on sickness and wounds, physical hardships and perils, and remedy-cure metaphors of an amplitude surpassed only by a few of the later plays. The imagery focuses primarily on sin-sickness and love-sickness, wherefore the busiest physician and wise counsellor is Rosalind-Ganymed. The principal patients, whether in court or forest, include Duke Frederick, Eldest Brother, Jaques, and, though less serious cases, the two love-sick shepherds.

When the entry of the eldest de Boys brother, pat to the purpose, sets off the first of the displays of wrath in Act 1, Adam intervenes, true to his character and calling, with the appeal, 'Sweet masters, be patient, for your father's remembrance, be at accord' (1. 1. 63-64). Traditionally and proverbially parience remedies wrath, and Adam is the natural spokesman.[12] After the anger subsides into verbal exchanges, the de Boys contemptuously dismisses the old retainer with the abuse, 'Get you with him, you old dog' (81). He means dog in the *in malo* sense common in Scriptural usage, such as Kings 8.13, 'Then Hazael said, What?' is thy seruant a dog, that I shulde do this great [evil] thing? where dog means 'without all humanitie and pities.'[13] Heraldically, however, 'A dog borne in arms represents a loyal man who will not desert his lord and master in life or death, but will willingiy die for his master'.[14] The dog 'Fido,' emblem of unquestioned fidelity, is seen in portraits (as of Queen Elizabeth, or of John Arnolfini and his wife) and sepulchral effigies. Obviously, the merits of fidelity and vigilance in his master's service and memory can be credited to Adam, and the insult rebounds upon the insulter.

The core of 2.3 is the exemplum that Adam enacts there of the religious man who opposes life's miseries with patience, which wise remedy is the outgrowth of his commitment to

the religious man's distinguishing triad of the spiritual virtues, faith, hope, and charity. In Romans 5.3-4, St. Paul declares that hope (the remedy for despair) first springs from patience tested by tribulation and, in 1 Corinthians 13.4,7 that love 'suffreth long' and 'hopeth all things,' and in 2 Thessalonians 1.4 he praises 'your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye suffre.'

Old Adam now unexpectedly faces a choice that exposes him to a misery that he thought he had prudently insured himself against. When he proffers his life savings, the moment of troth becomes a stage of unselfish love :

> I have five hundred crowns,
> The thrifty hire I sav'd under your father,
> Which I did store to be my foster-nurs,
> When service should in my old limbs lie lame,
> And unregarded age in corners thrown (2.3.38-42)

To be cast aside in one's old age counted one of the hazards of a long life. Thus, in a speech at an Accession Day Tilt, the Hermit of 'Woodstock,' clownishly clad,' explains to Queen Elizabeth that he was formerly a knight, but is now old and 'cast into a corner.' The Order for the Visitation of the Sick stresses the need for patient submission in adversity and requires the reading of Psalm 71, *In te, Domine, speravi,* wherein these verses occur : 'Cast me not away in the time of age; forsake me not when my strength faileth me,' and 'Forsake me not (O God) in my old age, when I am gray-headed : until I have showed thy strength unto this generation, and thy power to all them that are yet for to come.'[15] In what follows, Adam places his trust in God's providence.

Adam owes his unexpected hard choice to his loyal vigilance. He has detected a plot to kill Orlando in his sleep. His last service to the memory of his old master would be to save the young son whom Sir Rowland's spirit animates. But Orlando is destitute. At fourscore years, 'too

late a week,' Adam patiently accepts the gamble, and turns over his life's savings with a prayer, 'He that doth the raven feed,/Yea, providently [providentially] caters for the sparrow,/ Be comfort to my age!' (43-45), Adam's supplication unmistakably declares his faith in God's providence by means of his citation of the raven and the sparrow. First, he alludes to the raven in the Book of Job, a classic study of patience in adversity.

The Geneva Bible gives us the best insights into the meaning of Adam's prayer. There, the headnote for Job, chapter 39 (ch. 38 in AV) justifies Adam's trust in God by explaining that, 'The bountie and prouidence of God, which extendeth euen to the yong rauens, giveth man ful occasion to put his confidence in God.' The first marginal gloss on chapter 39 restates the lesson thus: 'After he had declared God's workes in the heauens, he sheweth his maruelous providence in earth, euen toward the brute beast.' The specific verse that Adam would convey to us is Job 39.3 AV 38.41): 'Who prepareth for the rauen his meat, when hts byrdes [AV, young ones] crye vnto God, wandering for lacke of meate?' The marginal note directs the reader to Psalm 147, where verse 9 picks up the idea again. In reference to 'our God,' it continues, 'Which giueth to beastes their fode, and to the yong rauens that crye.'

The sparrow alludes to Matthew 10.29 and 31: 'Are not two sparrowes solde for a farthing, and one of them shal not fall on the ground without your Father?' and 'Feare yet not therefore, ye are of more value then manie sparrowes.'

The symbolism of Adam's synonyms, feed and caters for, must be deeply relevant because seeking food is a conspicuous (though overlooked) pursuit in *As You Like It*, one that I have given some attention to elsewhere.[16] The Geneva gloss on Psalm 147.9 probably best expresses Adam's meaning here, i.e. the Elizabethan. The gloss finds a lesson in the cry

of the ravens, 'For their crying is as it were a confession of their nede, which cannot be reliued, but by God onely : then if God shew himself mindeful of most contemptible foules, can he suffer them to dye with famine, whome he hathe assured of life euerlasting?' The question is rhetorical merely; the answer is the same (cf. Adam's 'Yea') as that given by the example of the sparrows in Matthew 10.31. Accordingly, 'in thts desert inaccessible' (2 7.110, and cf. 2.6.6 and 18) and 'Oppress'd with two weak evils, age and hunger,' Adam is providentially succored by Duke Senior. In imagery that recalls the Psalmist's 'giueth to beastes their fode,' Orlando rejoices, 'like a doe, I go to find my fawn,/And give it food. There is an old poor man . . .' (2.7.128-129).

Encouraged by Adam, Orlando had proposed a wise remedy; 'we'll go along together,/And ere we have thy youthful wages spent,/We'll light upon some settled low content' (2 3.66-68). In the sequel, Orlando and Adam do not light upon some settled low content. Whether by implausible plotting, as many critics maintain, or by the providential intent that 'your true faith doth merit' (5.4,188) and 'A land itself at large, a potent dukedom' along with a new mentor. Meanwhile, Adam's roles as Orlando's teacher and surrogate father and as the socially beneficial man of religion, a new Adam defined by the virtues of faith, hope, and charity, both these roles have served their dramatic purpose. After the tableau of pity and charity in 2.7, we hear no more from or about the patient old man who brought the youngster safely from the manor house of butchery to the outlaws' camp in the Arden desert. Artistically, there is nothing left for Adam to do, and Orlando continues his education under other mentors, with other examples.

It is Celia and Rosalind who, in the next scene, find settled low content in the uncouth' forest of Arden, like Alinda and Rosalynde in Lodge's romance. While the circumstances fit, the hackeyed praise of the country life in Lodge's dialogue

runs counter to the tone and substance of actuality of the drama. Therefore the playwright recast the artificial pastoral shepherd as Corin, a contemporary type, the landless hired hand who stood at the lower end of the wage and social scales. Like Adam, Corin represents the third estate and, like Adam, he is a 'true', i.e. ideal, representative of this estate and his calling therein. Historically also, Corin comes straight out of the social theory that the Elizabethans had inherited, the same theory that gives the play its philosophical grounding. Then, by importing the familiar debate on the pros and cons of an occupation, Shakespeare occasions Corin's recital of the creed of 'a true labourer' (3.2.73-77). The speech must not be mistaken for a praise of country life even though the accepted criticism would have it that.

It would need a substantial note to explicate this compendium of Elizabethan (and medieval) precepts for the model working man, represented here by the good shepherd instead of the good ploughman. But here, since our topic is patience, we need to concern ourselves only with the rule, '[I am] content with my harm' (75-76), content being a by-product of patient endurance, It is useful to recall the Elizabeth senses of the word as used already in *As You Like It* lest the phrase seem contradictory. It can be asked how can one be content with harm? Indeed, one authority would amend it, substituting own for harm: 'I propose this emendation in the received text: 'content with my harm' is nonsense; the proper apposition to 'glad of other men's good,' is 'content with my own.' An Elizaberhan cnmpositor has slipped up and it seems to have escaped all textual critics hitherto.'[17]

In furthering the themes of the play, however, Shakespeare uses the word principally in one or the other of two current meanings. One is to make the best of and persevere through a serious personal misfortune. Touchstone illustrates this sense in his observation that, 'When I was at home, I was in

a better place, but travellers must be content' (2.4.17-18). The suffering on the road to Arden of Touchstone and his companions is consequent on the serious misfortune of Rosalind's banishment following the encompassing misfortune of the banishment of her father, who represents legitimacy, order, and justice. We are purposefully informed, out of the mouth of her enemy, that Rosalind has endured the deprivations consequent from her father's fall with such stoical composure that, 'Her very silence [uncomplaining]. and her patience/Speak to the people, and they pity her' (1.3.78-79). In a similar spirit of resolve to make the best of things, Celia urges her, 'Now go we in content/To liberty, and not to banishment' (137-138), and, further, it is in this sense that the followers of the exiled Duke are described as contended (5.2.15). In none of these instances does content mean that the subjects are satisfied or glad in their predicaments. To think so is to speculate irrelevantly on why then they leave the 'wild wood' in order to share with the Duke 'the good of our returned fortune' (5.4.159 and 174).

With one or two exceptions, the other meaning of content in the play, the sense in which Orlando (2.3.68) and Corin (3.2.25 and 75) use it, is to accept one's allotted condition and occupation in life and try to make the best of it. One comes to terms with the limitations, suffers the related harms and spurns, and accepts the duties for the common good. Perhaps the old phrase, 'peasant fatalism,' expressed some of this. The topic appears elsewhere in the canon, notably as in the maturation of Prince Hal.

In this instance, Corin accepts his calling in life together with its disadvantages and advantages. He is therefore commendably constant in his calling, like Adam, because. for one reasan, he has overcome what a popular authority on the matter, William Perkins, in a popular book, terms an 'impediment.' Perkins explains, 'The third impediment of

constancie is impatience, which is a disquietnes of mind, arising from the continuall troubles of. harm] that are incident to all callings, specially when menne are not able to bear them, nor to brooke the iniuries [i.e., harm] that are commonlie done vnto them in word or deed. This very sinne maketh many a man to leave his place.'[18] In effect, then, Corin avows his patience and constancy in exactly Perkin's meaning with the four words, 'content with my harm,' and, although it may now seem strange, the remark made unimpeachable sense to Shakespeare's auditors.

As we turn now to consider Orlando, we must acknowledge an unmistakable caveat to critics in Adam's lament, 'O, what a world is this, when what is comely/Envenoms him that bears it!' (2 3.14-15). Adam's choice of the verb envenoms identifies the agent as Envy, or more specifically her infamous daughter Detraction or Calumny. They had long been represented as viperous and held to represent those possessed by hatred of others' virtue. On the unrighteous, a homily quotes Romans 3:13, 'the poyson of serpentes is under their lippes.' So envious Elder Brother has, with malice aforethought, already envenomed Orlando, and slandered Adam with the term dog as an alternative to viper.[19] At the time 'viperous Creticke' had come under vigorous attack in the literary circles. Dissuaded by Adam, I shall not presume to calumniate the comely hero of *As You Like It*.

Shakespeare takes exceptionai care to establish th surpassing moral stature of Orlando, more so than he does for any other male character in his comedies Since the nature and function of this character srill lacks adequate interpretation, a comment on the point may be useful. For one thing, Orlando is the true son, the "memory" (2.3,3) of his father, the play's paragon of aristocrats and gentleman-like qualities, and he has reached the point of mutiny where, as he says, "the spirit of my father grows strong in me" (1.1.70-71). It

is precisely because Orlando incarnates his father's "memory" and determined to follow his calling, that the tyrant duke dismisses the gallant youth without the guerdon he had won.

He so much represents the possession and potential of strength in virtue that the people love him but the wicked hate him, as in their nature they are bound to do. Even, therefore, while Orlando's proud, envious, and avaricious brother plots to murder him, convention requires him to concede, "Yet he's gentle, never school'd and yet learned, full of noble device, of all sorts enchantingly lov'd' (1,1.166-68). Further on in 1.2, Orlando's humilitiy and gentle and valiant spirit wins the outspoken admiration of the princesses and the courtier, Le Beau. Then, in 2.3, he is eulogized for his virtue by his father's devoted retainer, old Adam, an unimpeachable witness to his character.

In the play then, Orlando's enemies embody pride envy, avarice, and wrath, the sins of the devil and the world, and he is pitted against those evils as victim and combatant. He triumps signally in two emblematic deadly combats, the wrestling match with the vainglorious, contumacious plug-ugly, Charles the duke's prizer. and in his challenge of the famous pair from the zoology of the mortal sins, the snake and the lioness with whelps. Orlando is really vulnerable to only one major sin, and that is a generic failing of noble youth. Such "a gallant youth" (1.2.229), a gentle, strong, and valiant" (2.0.6) one born to govern, constitutionaliy liable to anger and impatience. Thus, in his account of an aristocrat's seven eges, Jaques types the youth as "sighing like a furnace," and the soldier as "sudden and quick in quarrel" (2.7.148, 151). That was the conventional view. Gentle though he be—a quality four times credited to him—high-spirited Orlando displays impatience ("I will no longer endure it", i,e. 1.1.24 and 71) and anger, e.g, with his brother and later with outlaws In the forest when threatening (ironically) to enforce charity with sword.

Especially important is Orlando's impatience, if that is in fact the word, with the lifeless pretenses of Ganymed's wooing game. He reveals his hard won maturity when he gives notice that, "I can live no longer by thinking." Rosalind's prompt concurrence validates his decision. 'I will weary you no longer with idle talking," she agrees (5.2.48-52). At that point young Orlando has "chewed the food of sweet and bitter fancy," and with his magnanimous rescue of his brother he has become a man. It is time for him now to put away feigning. The questions of when a young man should become indignant enough with injustice to refuse to endure it, or even impatient with idle talk and make-believe and so end it, were vexed and long debated ethical problems. Despite the official insistence on submission, the virtue of righteous anger had its defenders.[20] One notes that in the course of his education in Arden's school of affliction, Orlando learns to trust the strong enforcement of gentleness, but the substitution of the gentle duke for the rough and envious one surely begs the question. At the end, in his valedictions, the virtue that Jaques commends in Orlando is true faith in love.' Though its object is a different love, this 'true faith' relates to the 'truth and loyalty' and 'constant service" exemplified by Adam. As already noted, true faith partakes of patience and constancy; like Amiens, it refuses to change, and like the duke's contented followers, it learns to endure.

We first see Duke Senior in the winter of his misfortunes hiding with a few devoted followers in a woods in the Forest of Arden, an exile, an outlaw. Charles the wrestler likens them to Robin Hood and his merry men, but they do not, to use Orlando's words, "with a base and boistr'rous sword/ Enforce a thievish living on the common road" (2.3.'32-33). They are living off the country, seeking the food they eat by hunting and gathering as outlaws used to do,[21] This is the

plot level of meaning. On thematic level of the play, they represent victims of injustice and fortune in the forest of the world. In the Stoic, Patristic, and Boethian senses, they are thrashed by the winds of adversity, a well-nigh universal experience.

For the purpose of the play, the old duke, the gentle duke, contrasts decisively with his rough and envious brother, the usurper tyrant. In short, Duke Senior represents the kingly virtues and happy mind of the philosopher king. Among the virtues to be assumed of him by us, a constancy or stability under pressure and a strength or fortitude for patient endurance would be both prominent and indispensable. Then, given the scheme of *As You Like It* that is outlined above, it is important that Duke Senior should give to his co-mates and brothers in exile a discourse or consolation on the sweet uses of adversity. In speaking of himself, he remarks that he smiles even when he shrinks with cold in the icy wind (2.1.6-9). The idea has seemed irrational to some readers, but I imagine that the sixteenth-century audience would have recogaized it. Shakespeare's patterns of patience typically smile at grief and hardship—sometimes through their tears. Thus the tears and smiles of Richard II are 'The badges of his grief and patience' (5.2.32-33, and cf. 3 2.9, 10), both Cordelia and Imogen, as figures of grief and patience, are seen to smile, and in dire dangers Miranda did 'smile,/Infused with a fortitude from Heaven' (*The Tempest*, 1.2.153-54). And there is Viola-Cesario's memorable cameo, 'She sate like Patience on a monument,/Smiling at grief' (*Twelfth Night*, 2.4.14-15) to compare with Pericles' praise of Marina's demeanor, 'Yet thou dost look/Like Patience gazing on kings' graves, and smiling Extremity out of act' (*Pericles*, 5.1.137-39).

Duke Senior's smile consciously identifies him with patience in being. Familiar attributes of patience and per-

serverance seem to be attached to others as well—Adam and the dog, Corin and the sheep, Orlando and the palm tree, and perhaps ironically, the clown with the ox and its yoke or, punningly, the cross that he should bear, and, of course, the loving lords who not only endure shrewd days and nights but also are inferentially equated with the ass for doing so. In contrast, Shakespeare evidently thought of the old and gentle Duke as the thing itself. Like Bunyan's Valiant, 'One here will constant be Come wind, come weather.'

At the end of the play, being then a wiser man, Jaques singles out the Duke's patience for special mention :

> You to your former honour I bequeath,
> Your patience and your virtue well deserve it (5.4.186-87)

These words remind the audience that together with his patience Duke Senior has exhibited by action and example princely virtues such as, for example, fortitude and wisdom in 2.1, temperance and charity in 2.7, and justice in 5.4. Moreover, his key speech on adversity demonstrates not only his wisdom but also his faith in the 'good in everything,' the principle that, Omnis natura, inquam natura est, bonum est. Jaques, the dissenter, now endorses the judgment made by Amiens, the admirer, at that time : 'I would not change it. Happy is your Grace,/That can translate the stubborness of fortune/Into so quiet and so sweet a style' (2.1.18-20). Finally, the Duke justly rewards his contented followers, giving according to the prescription of that virtue every one his due :

> And after, every of this happy number,
> That have endur'd shrewd days and nights with us,
> Shall share the good of our returned fortune,
> According to the measure of their states. (5.4.172-75)

It should be noted that they were motivated by love, they are 'loving lords' (1.1.100-102), and St. Paul teaches that love 'suffreth all things . . . endureth all things' (1 Corinthians 13).

Some conclusions may be drawn, I think, from the play's concern with patience. For one, Shakespeare borrowed from *Rosalynde*, along with the overall plotting structure, its operative doctrine about the power of love and patient sufferance to transcend or overcome the vicissitudes of life. Moreover, as I have pointed out, these ideas did not originate with Thomas Lodge's romance. For centuries they had been recommended as the remedies for individual and social moral ills. They were so much the subjects of an extensive literature and a manifold iconograpohy as to have become commonplaces. Indeed, the very first of the homilies read to every congregation informed them that God's Word 'teacheth patience in all adversitie,' and the Third Part of the Sermon of Faithe reminded them, 'And also it hath been declared unto yow by examples that faith maketh men constant, quiet and patient in all afflictions. Now as concernyng the same matter yow shall heare what foloweth.' It seems likely that when Rosalind wryly compares Orlando's effusive verses on her charms to the parson's 'tedious homily of love' for which he should crave the patience of his wearied parishioners (3.2.155-57), she could be, like a saucy teenager, thinking of the fatigues of An Homilie of Christian Love and Charity, which links love with patience.

On the virtue of patient sufferance, of bearing and forbearing one's harm, the emblematist Geffrey Whitney makes an admirable statement in the second stanza of his epigram on the esteemed motto, Vincit qui patitur. It provides a handy argument for the theme as we find it in *As You Like It* :

> When Enuie, Hate, Contempte, and Slaunder, rage :
> Wh'che are the stormes, and tempestes, of this life ;
> With patience then, wee must the combat wage,
> And not with force resist their deadlie strife
> But suffer still, and then wee shall in fine,
> Our foes subdue, when they with shame shall pine.[23]

Shakespeare will, of course, take up the question of patience in future plays. Finally, it begins to appear that Shakespeare contrived in *As You Like It* a master plan the dramaturgical elements of wihich, with varying emphases and from different perspectives, he would rework from time to time until he concluded it with *The Tempest.*

Notes

1. *Rosalynde. Euphues Golden Legacie* (1590) is reprinted in *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare : As You Like It,* ed. Richard Knowles (New York, 1977), pp. 382-475, and in Geoffrey Bullough. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare,* vol. 2 : *The Comedies, 1597-1603* (London : 1958), pp. 158-256). Page references to both are given in this order for the reader's eonvenience *Rosalynde* was reissued in 1598 (Q4), and so would have enjoyed renewed acquaintance. The topic of patience gets no recognition in *A New Variorium* (1977).
2. "Some Prolegomena for the Study of Patience, 1480-1680," *The Triumph of Patience,* ed. Gerald J. Schiffhorst (Orlando, FL, 1978), p. 2.
3. *A Soveraigne Salve for a Sick Sovle ; A Treatise teaching the right vse of patients bearing the crosse,* Englished by W. F, (London, 1590), sig, A iili verso, STC 5265; see Schiffhorst, p. 41. Touchstoe gives the proverbial exptession, to bear one's cross, a new twist by identifying "cross" with the coin so-called (3.2.12-14).
4. My quotations of Shakespeare are from *The Riverside Shakespeare,* ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. (Boston, 1974).
5. *The Religion of Islam* (Lahore, Pakistan : The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam, 1983), p. 435. Also, man is created to face difficulties, pp. 321 and 369, and adversities, pp. 318 and 322.
6. *The New Arden Edition,* ed. Agnes Latham (London, 1975), p. lxxx.
7. On this, see my paper, "The Tyrant Duke of *As You Like It* : Envious Malice Confronts Honor, Pity, Friendship," *Cahiers Elisavethains,* forthcoming.
8. Ruth Mohl, *The Three Estates in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (1933; rpt New York, 1962),
9. Sir Thomas Smith, *The Common-welth of England* (London, 1594), p. 135, 'Of landes, es ye haue vnderstoode before, there is difference

(from the disposition of goods moveable) : for when the owner dieth, his land descendeth onely to his eldest sonne, all the rest both sonnes and daughters haue nothing by the common lawe, but must serue their eldest brother if they will, or make what other shift they can to liue." There are a few exceptions, as in many places in Kent (p. 136), and Ireland.

10. (Sir) Thomas Wilson, *The State of England, Anno Dom. 1600*, ed, F. J, Fisher. Camden Miscellany, vol. 16; Camden Third Series, vol. 52 (London : The (Camden) Society, 1936), p. 24.

11. Thus a Leach named Patience was fetched to cure the soule-diseased Red Cross (*The Faerie Queene*, 1.10.23, 24), and, of course, the knight undergoes further therapy rn "en Holy Hospitall." For John Donne's use of sin-and-sickness imagery, see Winfreid Schleiner, *The Imagery of John Donne's Sermons* (Providence, RI, 1970), pp. 68 ff. Schiffhorst, 15 : "Patience is a remedy for every grief, an English proverb reminds us." And most moralists and preachers as well ! *In As You Like It*, the new duke is humorous, Jaques is sick, but claims to have medicine for "the 'infected world" , the lovers are "wounded," the stag lenguishes, Rosalind would cure Orlando, Corin treats sick sheep, Adam has a recipe for longevity, and so on. Duke Senior is sound.

12. "The most familiar virtue answering to Wrath is Patiene," reports Rosemond Tuve, *Allegorical Imagery* (1966; rpt Princeton, NJ : Princefon University Press, 1977), p. 95. See Schiffhcrst, ep. 3, and 15: "The most common antithesis th *Patientia*, however is *Ira*, the wrathful anger by which a desperate man distrusts the will of God, on whom he should depend." A morality play, The Castle of Perseverance (ca, 1425) allegorically dramatizes the contest of Patience with Wrath, or Ira. For this tradition see Georgia Ronan Crempton. *The Condition of Creatures* (New Haven and London : Yale University Press, 1974), p. 146-49. The rwelfte homily, in *Certain Sermons or Homilies* (1547). ed, Ronald B. Bond (Toronto, 1987), "An Homilies agaynst Contencion and Braulynge," urges the efficiency of patience, pp. 195-197, 19, 201.

13. Biblical quotations, unless indicated otherwise, are from *The Geneva Bible, A Facsimile of the 1660 Edition*, intro. Lloyed E. Berry (Madison, WI, 1969)

14. Rodney Dennys, *The Heraldic Imagination* (New York, 1976), p. 69. Also, Samuel C. Chew, *The Pilgrimage of Life* (1962; rpt Port Washington, NY, and London , 1973), pp. xxiii, 293, 401, n. 19,

and Beryl Rowland, *Animals with Human Faces* (Knoxville, TN, 1973), s.v. Dog.

15. *The Book of Common Prayer 1559 : The Elizabethan Prayer Book*, ed. John E. Booty (Charlottesville, VA, 1976), p. 305.
16. "The idea of Hunting in *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Studies*, forthcomming.
17. A. L. Rowse, *William Shakespeare : A Biography* (New York, 1963), p. 475, n. 42.
18. *A Tretise of tha Vocations, or Callings of men*, in *The Works of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ . . . M. W. Perkins* (Cambridge, 1605), p. 932. A modern edition is, Ian Breward, ed., *The Work of William Perkins* (Abingdon [1976]). According to Louis B. Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (1935; rpt Ifheca, NY, 1958). p. 170, "The influence of this treatise, the forerunner of many later works which discussed the same social ideas, is incalculable, for not only was the author's personal influence great, but his writings were among the most popular of contemporary works of divinity."
19. The play both states and enacts the evil of envy and detraction or calumny, a popular motif with a long history. It is aesthetically fitfing that Orlando should encounter, at the climax of the play, the green and gilded snake' (4.3.108). On the motif see Rosemond Tuve, pp. 128, 182-83 on Detraction. The vogue in the 1590s of the topos of envy and detraction and its Greek and Latin origins are treated by R. B. Gill, "The Renaissance Conventions of Envy," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, ed. Paul M, Clogan (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 215-30. For example, "To Det-action" opens John Marston's *Scourge of Villanie* (1598). Both Spenser and Shakespeare made considerable use of the conventions, as Gill points out, pp. 219-21.I quote Romans 3 ; 13 from An Homelie of the Misery of Al Mankinde, *Certain Sermons*, p. 71.
20. In discussing Spenser's trearment of the deadly sin of Wrath in *The Faerie Queene*, Books 1 and 2, Crampton reviews contemporary ideas of anger as sin, suffering, and heroic action, pp. 142-55. Eugene M. Waith, *The Herculean Hero* (London, 1962). pp. 44-45, explains the moral difficulties raised by the prominence of anger in the make-up of the hero. Yet the righteous anger of God and his prophets could hardly be ignored.
21. I analyze the evidence for this important fact of the play in "The Idea of Hunting in *As You Like It*."

22. The homilies are quoted from *Certain Sermons*, pp. 63 and 97 respectively. I quote the epigram from Peter M. Daly, ed., *The English Emblem Tradition* (Toronto, 1988), p. 325, where it is reproduced from Geffrey Whitney, *A Choice of Emblemes* (Leyden, 1586), p. 220.

Kenneth Muir

HAMLET AMONG THE IDEOLOGUES

Everyone will agree, since we are academics as well as ideologues, of the dangers involved in interpreting Shakespeare's plays in the light of our prepossessions, since our interpretations will be predictable and therefore suspect. Neither Freud, nor Jones his biographer, could avoid treating Hamlet as a case-study of Oedipus Complex; and C. S. Lewis, during his theological period, inevitably came to the conclusion that Ham'et was Everyman, burdened with original sin and worried about the Last Judgement. Academic people will not imagine that they are immune to such dangers, although awareness of them may serve as some protection.

I was amused when up-dating my edition of *Richard II* to be asked to include a feminist article on the play. As far as ! could discover, it is a play that has been left alone by feminist critics, so I toyed with the idea of writing an article on the disadvantages of being married to a bi-sexual monarch, but I desisted.

I propose, therefore, to consider seven interpretations of *Hamlet*, in order to show that all of them were predictable, given the nature and nurture of the critics concerned. All the critics were known to me personally, but for obvious reasons I have altered their names.

MARK FINNEY, the first of the seven, was a lecturer in Educational Psychology, who had, of course, made a study of Freud, Jung and Adler. Inevitably he concentrated on the psychology of the Prince; but in his two articles on the play, separated by some years, he first accepted Wertham's

theory that Hamlet suffered from an Orestes Complex, and afterwards decided that Adler was right when he argued that Shakespeare was demonstrating that killing was justified only in self-defence.

The second of these critics, E. G. NEWBERRY, has been a life-long member of the Fabian Society, a devotee of Bernard Shaw rather than of the Webbs. You will recall that the society took its name from the conqueror of Hannibal, who deliberately delayed for a long time, till he could strike the decisive blow. This, Newberry argued, is precisely what Hamlet did. He proved Claudius's guilt in Act 3, but he delayed until he could assassinate him when that guilt was apparent to all, and when Gertrude could no longer be hurt by the death of the man she loved.

HENRY STEPHENS, the third critic, is an avowed Christian. To him the play was an embodiment of an ethical problem. At one period he was influenced by the views of Middleton Murry and Roy Walker, who applauded Hamlet's reluctance to take revenge; but later he was tempted by Eleanor Prosser who claimed, you will remember, that the Ghost was the Devil in disguise, tempting Hamlet to commit the mortal sin of murder.

LOUIS CARTEL, the fourth critic, younger and more up-to-date, is an admirer of French existentialists, the author of a study of the plays of Jean-Paul Sartre. He has no difficulty in diagnosing Hamlet as a typical existentialist hero, compelled to make an agonising decision, agonising because he knows that on his decision depends the fate of his kin and country. He therefore decides reluctantly, with the anguish of which Sartre speaks.

No 5, KYLE SIMPSON, is an actor and director, and when he produced *Hamlet* he tried to bring out the significance of role-playing, the centrality of the inserted playlets (the Dido speeches and *The Mousetrap*) and he argued that the play is essentially about acting.

The sixth critic, CEDRIC PYM, is better known as a politician, with considerable experience as a borough councillor, and as the author of scores of political articles. To him *Hamlet* is essentially a political play, a struggle between two mighty opposites. The hero has been cheated of the throne by a conspiracy between Claudius and Polonius. Shakespeare, as Sam Schoenbaum recently demonstrated, was a political realist; and *Hamlet* is a great political play in which the main opponents are fighting for their lives. The hero is threatened by Machivellian intrigue, by espionage. framing and poison. The action (as Aristotle demanded) is more important than the character of the hero.

For the seventh critic, I have immodestly chosen myself. You may recall that about the time Mahood was writing her brilliant book on Shakespeore's Word-Play, I was writing on the subject of the Uncomic Pun. We exchanged proofs of our articles. And in a lecture I delivered both in Moscow and Germany, with my head full of Empsonian ambiguities, I suggested that the key to the understanding of *Hamlet* was to be found in a brace of quibbles : that on conscience and *conscience* in the soliloquy in Act 3, and the pervasive quibble on *act*. Why can Hamlet act, but not act ? Play a part, but not kill the king.

You will by now have seen through my strategy. The first six names are all pseudonyms I have used as a journalist, and all of them represent a selection of the positions I have taken up with regard to the play. I don't repudiate my dead selves. They still haunt me : why should I repudiate them? I'm still a paid-up member of the Fabian Society, still (in a sense) an existentialist; still a disciple of Rheinhold Niebuhr and Karl Polanyi, still a Christian, subscribing to as many heresies as Milton and Blake.

My own interpretations of Hamlet during a period of fifty years (1935-85) varied in emphasis from time to time, but

not in essentials. The seven personae I have tried to isolate all contributed to my understanding of the play, such as it is, and because of their divergent emphases I am prevented from adopting a simplistic view of the play. They make me suspicious of skeleton keys which usually reveal skeletons in intellectual cupboards.

I am suggesting four things about ideological interpretations. First, they will do more harm than good unless their practitioners realise that the light they shed is partial only. Second, an ideological interpretation invariably invokes its opposite, however true. A Christian Shakespeare is immediately followed by an agnostic Shakespeare, as we can see from the criticism of *King Lear* or *Measure for Measure* during the present century. A reactionary Shakespeare is followed by a progressive one, 'somewhat to the left of advanced bourgeois opinion', as a Soviet critic put it. Marxist interpretations are red rags to reactionary bulls. This was brought home to me when I demonstrated (I think for the first time) that Marx's conversion to communism was immediately preceded by his brillant analysis of Timon's speeches on the corrupting effect of gold. A well-known critic jumped to the conclusion that I was trying to prove that Shakespeare was a communist, whereas I was only showing that Marx was a notable Shakespearian critic.

Thirdly, it is surely deplorable, if not immoral, to use Shakespeare as a means to an end. We may feel passionately about the evils of monetarism, or anti-semitism, or about the enslavement of women but we should not attempt to enrol Shakespeare under our banners.

Fourthly, I am arguing that we sacrifice our own complexities, as well as Shakespeare's when we plug a particular ideological line. I have outlined a few of my own experiences which may have influenced my views on *Hamlet*. I could have added others. One of the first Hamlets I witnessed was Gielgud's, and that was a memorable experience. I occupied

the chair formerly held by Bradley and Raleigh, and this may have led either to misplaced loyalty or jealousy of their achievements. My concentration during the last ten years on Spanish drama of the golden age has made me consider it a disadvantage for a dramatist to hold dogamatic views of any kind. It is, perhaps, an equal disadvantage for a critic. Yeats was not referring to critics when he said that the best lack all conviction, and that the worst are full of passionate intensity; but at least we should remain in uncertainties, doubts and fears, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason. Keats, as you see, was another of my mentors.

Robert Kimbrough

ILIUM REVISITED : MIXED GENRE IN *TROILUS AND CRESSIDA*

On April 23rd, 1964, I celebrated Shakespeare's 400th birthday by writing the Preface to a soon to be published study, *Troilus and Cressida and Its Setting*, in which I had tried to show *why* Shakespeare wrote the play and *how* he had gone about his business. *Why* Shakespeare wrote *Troilus and Cressida* rests in the fact that, as we know from *Hamlet*, about 1600 private, chorister companies of London were hurting the box-office of the public companies such as Shakespeare's. The plays offered by the private houses, as Alfred Harbage argues, were almost different in kind and attitude from those we normally associate with Shakespeare ahd his theatre, the public theatre. My thesis was that a great deal of the internal, artistic tension of *Troilus and Cressida* stems from the fact that Shakespeare was trying to follow the lead of the private theatres with their more racy, spicy plays at the same time that he wanted to continue to please public audiences with traditional fare. *How* he went about this dual effort was to turn to the rich and varied 'matter of Troy' filled with the familiar : the noble Hector, the evil Achilles, and the young lovers Troilus and Cressida. By displaying Cressida he could have it two ways : she is the only unmarried woman in Elizabethan drama who sleeps with two men in the same play,—but then no one is really disturbed, for everyone knew she would. My conclusion was that the trying to embrace two strains, one old and one new, single play ended in an apparent artistic failure : the play was

too large, diverse, and strange to please in its own day. Shakespeare may have known what he was about, but the Elizabethans were confused.

I knew in 1964 that there was still one more chapter I wanted to write : a theoretical discussion of *what* it was that Shakespeare had actually wrought. Even though the book was finished (and so was I !) I did not feel it had been completed. Now, a quarter of a century later, I should like to return to Troy. Here now is my final chapter, my 'Ilium Revisited.'

Simply put, my thesis is that far from being an artistic failure, *Troilus and Cressida* is a carefully wrought play which we are now old enough to appreciate : it is one of the world's most sustaind, tough, and wistful presentations of the human comedy. Indeed, only in the twentieth century has the play gradually caught our attention, for we feel there is much of our 'modern world' in the ancient world of the play. And Shakespeare achieved this success by consciously mixing the three genres of his day : comedy, tragedy, and history.

Polonius's recital of the dramatic genre of the Elizabethan popular theatre is so overtly satirical that even he must have laughed. A university man, he had been exposed to the dictum that, strictly speaking, there were only two genre : comedy and tragedy. Certainly, Virgil Whitaker and others have proved to us that Shakespeare was well schooled in the belief that these two were the only proper forms of drama. This is the assumption that Sidney makes in the *Defence of Poesie* when he talks of 'right tragedies' and 'right comedies.' By the time the *Defence* was published several times in the 1590's, Shakespeare, however, might well have felt, with the smile of a Hal commenting on Fluellen, that Sidney' strictures on the impropriety of 'mingling kings and clowns' was 'a little out of fashion,' for by this time Shakespeare was well into the creation of a third kind of drama, one theequirrt ed the mixing of high and low : the history play, a kind not

formally added to the critical canon until Shakespeare's friends arranged his works in 1623 under three categories : comedies, histories, and tragedies. They could have added, on the English authority of Sidney and Fletcher, 'tragicomedy' as a fourth heading for the group of plays we now call the romances, but comedy is comedy, and they stuck at three.

As they neared the end of their work on the First Folio, Heminge and Condell got last-minute permission to print *Troilus and Cressida* but could no longer place it within any of the three groupings by kind, so they placed it in between the histories and tragedies. But their location of *Troilus* was not the result of indecision regarding genre; rather, they were forced to use the most appropriate space left after nearly all of the printing of the Folio had been completed, when last-minute rights to print *Troilus* had been administered. As originally set up, *Troilus* was to have appeared in the Folio between *Romeo and Juliet* and *Julius Caesar*. It would be nice to know if the editors deliberated over this placing of *Troilus* and, if so, what the nature of those deliberations were; nevertheless, the evidence is clear : their conclusion was that *Troilus* was a tragedy.

Fourteen years earlier, Bonian and Walley had come to the opposite conclusion : *Troilus* was a comedy, as their preface to the 1609 Quarto makes abundantly and wittily clear. Even though the Stationers' license for them to print, and both versions of their title page, call the play a history, this usuage does not mean a 'history' as Shakespeare had, through practice, defined a new genre. History here means story, as in 'the history of Romeo and Juliet,' 'the history of Cymbeline', and 'the history of Julius Caesar.'. But this 'matter of Rome' *was* history, British history, just as was the 'matter of Troy,' for the road to Britain ran back through Rome to the ashes of Ilium. Right after World War II, Harry Levin, in remarking on this long thread in British history, emphasized his point by stating that the name of Ilium was

'as much a byword for catastrophe to the Elizabethans as the name Hiroshima seems to us.' I would like to think that in 1989, the light of Hiroshima still haunts us as the light of Troy (to borrow Thomas Greene's phrase) did the Elizabethans.

Hyder Rollins, and a great many others with and since him, demonstrated how ubiquitous, unceasingly popular, and wide-spread was the use of the 'matter of Troy' in Elizabethan literary culture, popular as well as esoteric. Yet, *this* play on the 'matter of Troy' seems not to have been popular with the Elizabethans.

I believe that *Troilus and Cressida* must have had a brief theatrical life at the Globe during the 1601-02 season, but was not played so often that anyone would cry out against the claim in 1609 that Troilus was 'a new play, never staled with the Stage, never clapper-clawed with the palms of the vulgar.' Inspite of evidence to the contrary, some scholars have taken Bonian and Walley's claim to mean that the play was never intended for the public theatre, nor even the private, but was commissioned for a unique performance before one of the Inns of Court where, they feel, tastes and judgments were mature and sophisticated enough to appreciate the special humour and wit of *Troilus*. Even though many others have pointed out the lack of practical, economic, theatrical logic in such a thesis, the idea of special origins of *Troilus* will remain prominent because it allows a scholar or critic to 'explain' this puzzling, difficult play.

No play of Shakespeare's, not even *Timon* which took the place originally meant for *Troilus* among the tragedies in the First Folio, is harder to cope with as it stands. Dryden rewrote it : others tried. And not until 1898 is there a confirmed record of the play's performance.

Indeed, because in Shakespeare's day the play was called variously a history, a comedy, and a tragedy, the critical cliche has arisen that not even his contemporaries knew what to make of it. Well they might not have, but *not* because of

a confusion over what label to apply. Elizabethans, writers and audiences, were willing to accept the mixing of genre with the same wonder-invoking ease with which they accepted the wide-ranging, fast-changing contradictions of their world – that period which allowed the medieval world to become the modern. But the range and contradictions in *this* play were too great even for that wonderfully flexible age.

The reason is that Shakespeare within the confines of *Troilus and Cressida* presented a comedy, a tragedy, and a history, mixing these three genres in such a way that he made a comedy that left his audience totally bewildered. Shaw, sensed as much in 1898 when he remarked that Shakespeare was 'ready and willing to start at the twentieth century if the seventeenth would only let him.'

Troilus and Cressida, then has three main plots, each with its own primary setting and thematic concern : the comedy of Troilus and Cressida with its emphasis on love, the tragedy of Hector and the Trojans with its focus on honour, the history of Achilles and the Greeks with its evocation of the problems of social order.

Taken in isolation, the love story involving Troilus and Cressida and Pandarus is sustained comedy, as sterotypically comic as is a Punch and Judy show, for we know the outcome from the beginning and never lose our sense of detachment, even as each of the three characters goes through the apparent agonies of self-delusion without self-discovery. Even though Troilus doesn't recognize the irony of his own outburst at the end, from the very beginning the whole affair has been, 'Words, words, mere words, no matter from the heart.'

On the other hand, the story of Hector is tragic, as Shakespeare was coming to his own comprehension of that word, for Hector's story is one of a man whose reason knows the 'moral laws/Of nature and of nations,' yet allows his appetite for chivalric honour to control his will, as we see in his

emblematic pursuit of the emblematic armour : 'Most putrified core, so fair without.' Hector's story is tragic because it is centred on wrong choice and moral blindness which characteristics form the essence of the great tragedies to follow this play.

This tragic essence is entirely missing in the Greek camp where we have the range run from King Agamemnon to Clown Thersites. Here we have the essence of the history play as Shakespeare had defined that genre through the writing of all of his history plays. Except for *Richard III*, Shakespeare's histories are filled with bickering plots gone awry, petty intrigues, accidental successes, and blind chance, Shakespeare, as had the Florentine historians, understood the realities of historical movement of events through time that 'great sized monster of ingratitudes' who has 'a wallet at his back/Wherin he puts alms for oblivion.' From the history play more clearly than from the comedy or the tragedy we learn that 'One touch of nature makes the whole world kin.'

Each of these plots of various kind, however, is not treated in isolation, but is brought into contact with the others; for example, Aeneas runs through the play as a kind of charge d' affaire, Troilus is both warrior and lover (as are Hector, Achilles, and Paris, but in contrasting ways), and the play is resolved in a final, fragmented battle which brings all three plots together. As a result two general themes are suggested : true worthiness is an ethical attribute more than a moral achievement, and Time is a force in our fallen world which works to defeat our successive expectations. Because these themes are revealed, not preached, one must sit neutrally attentive to the torrents of words and the sweeps of action.

This desirable state of attentiveness is difficult to attain and even more difficult to maintain, for the dominant fact of the play is that words and deeds seldom go hand in hand : Cressida pledges her faith. only to prove untrue at the first temptation, Hector tells Troilus to listen to Cassandra, but does not do so himself, and Ulysses diagnoses the sickness

of the Greek host, but cannot cure it with his derision medicinal.

What Shaw recognized in the artistry of the play is what has become dominant in modern drama--disengagement. Alienation is a broader, more popular word, but disengagement better reminds us of the sine qua non of comedy—detachment. And what makes *Trolius and Cressida* such a special kind of comedy is that Shakespeare here carried comic detachment to the brink of total disengagement. The play seems to fly out from its centre, to rip open at its seams, to fall apart for lack of structure. But structure there is, for every where Shakespeare is in total control, setting up expectations and pulling the rug out from under the unsuspecting, jolting the audience right along with the characters.

The play may end with the death of Hector, but love remains unrequited, and the Greeks will bumble along to achieve what the world calls a victory in the fall of Troy. Shakespeare consciously mixed three genres and did not allow any single one to dominate at the end. Just as in mixing of colours we end up with brown so also in the full mixing of genre we end up in—brown. Brown comedy. Our life is so. Santayana said that 'Everything in nature is lyrical in its ideal essence, tragic in its fate, and comic in its existence.' Dorothy Sayers has said that 'The whole tragedy of futility is that it never succeeds in achieving tragedy. In its blackest moment it is inevitably doomed to the comic gesture.' And Heine observed that the muse of Tragedy 'is perceptible everywhere in this play, except that here, for once, she would be gay and act the clown.'

Department of English
University of Warwick
Warwick

G. E. Bentley

THE ST JAMES PARISH CHARITIES TO CHILDREN AND THE BLAKE FAMILY

William Blake was born in one of the richest and most enlightened parishes in England, and the St James Parish Workhouse, Infirmary, School, and Burying Ground were very near to where he grew up. He must have known many children who went to the Parish School of Industry, and he wrote about such schools and their children, particularly in 'The School Boy' and the two poems called 'Holy Thursday' in *Songs of Innocence* (1789) and *Songs of Experience* (1794). His family did business with the Workhouse and School, and Blake must have known their workings intimately. An indication of Blake's involvement with the parish is the sorrow he expressed in his letter of 7 June 1825 for the recent death of Gerrard Andrewes, who had been Rector of St James Parish many years earlier and as such must have been extensively involved with the School and Workhouse.

It is the purpose of this essay to set out some of the chief facts about St James Workhouse and its School in Blake's time and the evidence for the Blake family connection with it. The discovery of the Blake documents derives from the researches of my friend Dr Stanley Gardner, who so far as I know is the first to pursue the history of the School with Blake in mind and to whom I am deeply indebted for telling me of his discovery long before it was published. He pointed to the significance of the Parish School and the Wimbledon nurses in his edition of Blake's *Selected Poems* (1962) and

in his *Blake* (1968), pp. 74-75, and the Blake references in the Parish records are set out in his recently published book on *Blake's INNOCENCE and EXPERIENCE Retraced* and in *Blake Records Supplement* (1988). Dr Gardner's purpose is largely critical, mine largely historical.

The Workhouse and the School

'The eighteenth century .. was, *par excellence*, the age of benevolence' in England,[1] and the most visible and important manifestation of this charity was in the support of the poor and particularly of the children of the poor. Though most of the parish's money was spent on the Workhouses, it was difficult to regard them with equanimity—certainly their inmates often found it difficult to do so—but the Charity Workhouse and Schools were remarkably successful. Their success could be measured in gratifyingly persuasive ways; not only did the children receive an education, not only were they successfuly placed out as apprentices, but manifestly many childen survived to adulthood who would otherwise have died. In the cities, and particularly in London and Westminster, houses were erected to accommodate the poor en masse, and schools were created to educate some of their children. And among the most generous and foresighted parishes in England was that of St James, Westminster, where William Blake was born in 1757 at No. 28, Broad Street, Golden Square, and christened on 11 December at the parish church of St James, Westminster, on Piccadilly.

At first, charity schools were chiefly dependent upon private charitable foundations such as that of Archbishop Tenison in St James, Westminster, Such schools were intensely admired by contemporaries, and in *The Spectator* No. 294 for 6 February 1712 Richard Steele wrote :

> The Charity Schools which have been erected of late Years, are the greatest Instance of public Spirit the Age has produced . . . .[2]

A number of schools were founded in the Parish of St James, Westminster, within a century of the enclosing in 1661 of the alley for playing palle-maille (-ball-mellet, a game like croquet) and which became the fashionable Pall Mall, and of Golding Close, which became Golden Square. About 1670 there was a school in Jermyn Street,[3] and in 1688 Dr Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, put up a little school between King Street and Swallow Street which flourished through the 18th Century.[4] In it sixteen poor 'Boys *[were]* to be taught to Read, Write, Cast Accounts, and such other Parts of Mathematics as may the better qualify the said Boys to be put out Apprentices. . .'[5] There was a shortlived school, in St James Street by 1706.[6] Another, the Boys' Charity or Offertory School, was so called because it was supported by church offerings; in 1686 it had fourteen boys, in 1704 a school-room for it was built over the watch-house, and by 1708 it had fifty day boys. Sixty years later it moved to Little Vine Street.[7] A charity boarding school for forty poor girls was established in 1699 in Burlington Gardens to teach them 'all parts of Housewifery, that may qualify them to be good Servants, such as Washing, Scouring, Sewing plain Work and spinning Flax, besides Reading and Writing.'[8]

The most important of the early school for our purposes was that of the entrepreneur Lewis Maidwell, who was a school master in King Street in 1687.[9] His was a very fashionable school for the nobility and gentry, and in 1700 Maidwell proposed that it should be supported by a tax on all books, pamphlets, and papers—a proposal which was stoutly resisted by the book trade and by Parliament.[9] The school was sold in 1706 to Henry Foubert, under whom it gradually declined to a mere riding-academy and stable, until it closed in 1778.[9] It was this elegant establishment which was acquired by the vestry of St James for its own school a few years later.

All these institutions had been founded by private charity,

even though the charity was sometimes given through the Church, as in the Offertory School.

Public charity was manifested in a poor house for the indigent sick and impotent which lasted from 1688 to 1748[10] and was presumably later merged with the Infirmary of the Poland Street Workhouse. In December 1724 an Act of Parliament regularized recent practice by allowing parishes to purchase houses to lodge the poor 'and there to keep maintain and employ all such poor persons and take the benefit of *[their]* work'.[11] The St James Workhouse was built in 1725-27 between Poland Street and Marshall Street, very close to the corner of Broad and Marshall Streets where Blake was born, and it survived until 1913.[10] From the start there were large numbers of poor living in the Workhouse : In 1762 there were 1,100 poor in the parish receiving £ 6,000-7,000 per year :[12] On 27 November 1782 the 'N of Poor *[in the Workhouse was]* 625';[13] In 1801 there were 839 poor in the Workhouse (588 Females, 251 Males), 290 of them in Trade, i.e., capable of working :[14] In 1804 the annual cost of maintaining the poor in the Workhouse was £ 15.118.15.9;[15] and among the population of the metropolis at large (864, 845), 8% were relieved by the Poor Rate;[15] and in 1810 it was calculated that the earnings of the poor in Britain corresponded to only 'about one-sixtieth of the money raised for them'.[16]

At first the work done by the poor in the Workhouse was fairly miscellaneous; in 1732

> all that are able work at spinning Jersey, Mopp Yarn, and Flax; the Jersey and Flax is *[sic]* wove in the House by Weavers beloning to the Family.
>
> The Women and Girls knit all the Stockings for the Poor in the House. The Men that are able Card Wool, or assist the Cook in tending the Fires, and Coppers.

The work was from 6:00 A.M. until 6:00 P.M. Monday to Friday and a half day on Saturday, with half an hour far

breakfast and an hour and a half off for dinner,[18] and they were paid not only in room, board, and clothing but in cash—for example, they received *3d* if their labours had earned *2s*.[19] Considering that almost all the poor were there because they could not support themselves—many were infants, mothers with small children but no husband, cripples, or senile—the arrangements were remarkably rational and even generous.

This certainly was the view of the rate-paying public :

> *the* Poor *can have no Occasion to complain, because every one has therein* Food *and* Raiment *suitable to their Circumstances; their Dwelling is warm, sweet and cleanly, and all proper Care is taken of them in Age and Sickness. Their reasonable Wants of every kind are supplied; and therefore they ought to be* content *and* thankful, *and so their Duty, that is, all that they can do, in that* State *of Life wherein it has pleased God to place them. It is indeed a Sin for them to murmur and complain, or to refuse the work; when no Work is put on them beyond their Strength and skill; nor are they kept closer or longer than other poor People without Doors are ebliged to, if they are as industrious and diligent as they ought to be, in getting a Livelihood for themselves and Families. IDLENESS and Sloth are Immoralities as well as publick Nuisances. . .*[20]

But despite this stern injunction of 1732, the poor in the Workeouse often persisted in disorderliness and ungratefulness. The Minute Books of the Governors and Directors of the Poor in St James Parish in the 1770s and 1780s are repeatedly troubled by petty theft, women selling clothes just given them by the parish, old men leaving the Workhouse to beg, reluctance to work, and punishments therefor.

As the poor multiplied and the Poor Rates went up, the parish vestry cast about for ways of reducing their expences.

> and in the Year 1790, the Governors and Directors of the Poor contracted with Messrs. Gorton and Thompson Tenants to Lord Bathurst at Cuckney in Nottinghamshire, and very considerable Manufacturers, that the Governors should build a Workshop capable to hold 90 Looms at the least, and keep the same in Repair, and that Gorton and Thompson should at their sole Expence build and set up that Number of Patent

Looms, and all other Machinery. Wheals, &c. and keep them in Repair; and find all other Utensils necessary, useful, and proper for carrying on the Business of Spinning, Winding, and weaving. and all other Works incident thereto: and also all Candles and other Necessasies, and bear all other Expences whatever, except the building the Workshop and keeping it in Repair, and to allow Two Shillings and Sixpence per week for each poor Person's Labour, who shall do as much Work as is usually allotted to a Child of fourteen Years of Age, and whatever more Work they do, to be paid for at the usual Prices; and all the Poor that are capable are employed therein, whilst other are employed in Needlswork, Tayloring, Shoe-making, and mending, Opening Horse Hair, Picking Cotton and Oakham, and in the necessary Business of the House[21]

The children of the workhouse were also taught a little. According to *An Account of Several Work-Houses* (1732), iii, workhouses

may be made, porperly speaking, Nurseries of Religion, Virtue, and Industry, by having daily Prayers and the Scripture constantly read, and the poor Children Christianly instructed.

And according to the *Rule . . . of the Parish of St James* (1768), 12.

the Children in the Workhouse *[are to]* be carefully taught to Read and to Work at such Kinds of Work, as are suitable to their Age, Sex, and Condition.

Clearly not *much* reading was expected of them.

The first great reform for the children of the Parish of St James was for the very small ones. When foundlings and infant orphans were brought to the Workhouse, or when babies were born in it, the likelihood of their survival for more than one or two years was very feeble. As an anonymous reformer wrote in 1762,

Parish officers may amuse themselves till *Dooms-day*, but to attempt to nourish an Infant in a Workhouse . . . I will pronouce from the moet intimate Knowiedge of the Subject, is but a small Remove from Slaughter, *for the Child must dic*. . . . I have heard it declared in *Public Court* of one very important Parish, which in 14 Years did not preserve a single Child, and I hava seen the Accounts of *another* which acknowledged

that out of 63, being the whole Number received in 5 Years, not one was kept alive. . . Is it not Time to alter our Plan ?[22]

The statistics of infant mortality in the Workhouse are horrifying. In 1783, of fifty children nursed by their mothers in the St James Workhouse, barely half (26) survived the year,[23] and in 1756 'the Governors of the Foundling Hospital . . . boasted to have lost only 75 per cent. Per Annum of the Children entrusted to their Care.'[24] Consequently 'In the 1760s'.[25]

> The first Attention was paid to the Children who were mouldering away in the Worhouse, or with profligate and drunken Parents; after Search and great Difficulty, several *Cottagers* on *Wimbledon*, fit and proper to be entrusted with the Care of Children, were induced to take them, and they were placed under them accordingly.
>
> **THE TERMS AS UNDER:**
>
> Three Shillings per Week for nursing each Child; and five or six being placed in one House makes the Nurse a good Income.
>
> A Surgeon and Apothecary upon the Spot superintends their Health and Cleanliness.
>
> If a *sick* or *infirm* Child is sent, or one *under the Age of Twelve Months*, and *recovers* or *lives a Year*, the Nurse has one Guinea given her Care and Success. . . .
>
> If two Children die with any Nurse in a Year, she is discontinued, as it either implies want of skill or attention, or both.
>
> They remain at Wimbledon till six or seven Years of Age, according to their Strength and Ability, and sometimes longer in Cases of Sickness or Infirmity.
>
> Those who can walk are sent to School, and Three-pence per Waek paid their respective Mistresses for instructing them to read and sew.[26]

The improvement in the health of the children was dramatic. In 1783, of 77 children from the parish of St James at nurse at Wimbledon, only two died.[23] This was a triumph of charity.

However, there remained the problem of what to do with the children when they were too old to stay longer in the country.

The Time when these Children were to be brought home was a dreadful Period to the Children, and to the feeling Mind; yet, as the Expences of their Nursing, Cloathing, and Schooling in the Country, so very much exceeded the Expence at the Workhouse, and Objections were made by many of the Inhbitants to the Expence they were put to, little Schools were established at the Workhouse, and every Care taken of them that the Nature of the Case would admit of. But still the Examples of Vice and Profligacy being continually before their Eyes, very little Good could be expected to arise to the Children.

Great Difficulties and Oppositions were made to forming a separate Establishment for them, however. In the Year 1781, the House, Stables, and Riding House, late Mr. Durell's, in King Street, were purchased for Two Thousand Two Hundred Pounds. . . .It is Crown Land, granted by Patent, at the Rent of 13s. 4d. per Annum.

A Plan for establishing a 'Parish School of Industry' on the Premises was then prepared by order of the Board of Governors and Directors of the Poor,a nd confirmed by Vestry and has been found effectual to this Day *[1797]*, with very trifling Alterations.

The unwearied Attention that has been given this School, has brought it to a State exceeding the most sanguine Expectations of its Patrons.

All the Children are taught their Duty as Christians. The Girls make and mend their Gowns, Petticoats, and all their Clothes; knit their own and the Boys' Stockings, and make the Boys' Linen. They also do Neddle-work for Hire. . . .

Besides which, they are taught Housenold. Kitchen, and Laundry Work. There are at this Time many Girls in the School, who, at twelve Years of Age can make a Shirt fit for the most respectable Inhabitant to wear, and make her own Gown and other Cloathes; cash iron, cook, clean and scour the House, make Beds, and do every Thing that qualifies them for good and useful Servants.

The Boys make their own Cloaths, and Cloaths for Hire; they also mend their own and the Girls' Shoes; the rest are employed in Heading of Pins.

The Girls and Boys bathe alternately during the Summer Season.

There are TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY Children in the School at this Time, and there has been (till the late great Number apprenticed) 305.

The *whole* Numter of Children that have *died from October*, 1792 *[to January 1797]*, are only SIX.[27]

Note that the children live in dormitories in the School.

party to separate them from the unfortunate influences of the Workhouse.

The most intense satisfaction with the success of the School was felt by almost all concerned with it from the start. The Governors and Directors inspected the School not long after it had bequn, according to their Minutas of 22 October 178-, 'and found every thing clean and in good order', the children likwise, and the Minutes of 13 December 1785 report that 'The Committee heard 105 Boys say the Catechism and found they were vary perfact." According to the official *Sketch of . . . the Poor, in the Parish of Saint James* (1797); 11, 20-21.

> The Governors and Directors of the Poor have been detained . . . [*in the School* to examine every child] many Times from Ten in Morning till Five in the Afternoon with much Pleasure; for as far as human Frailty can be perfect the Children are in all Things ss, suitxbie to their Age and Situation in Life. . . .
>
> The workhouse and Parish School of Industry have been visited by the Earl of Winchelsea, the late Lord Bathurst . . . Mr. wilberforce . . . and many other Gentlemen well acquainted with the Business of the Poor, who all expressed their highest Approbation at the Industry, cleanliness, and Health of the Poor, particularly of the Children, whose Loss by Death is much less than any Calcvlation upon that Subjedt . . . .

The teaching in the School was, of course, intended to be severely paractical. The 'Rules, Orders, and Regulation' for 'the Parish School of Industry in King Street Golden Square' in 1783[28] specified that

> The Girls are taught Household Kitchan and Laundry work in rotation and two sew knit mark mend and make their own and the Boys Lines and their own Cloathing , . . .

There is "a general visitation and examination of the Children half Yearly on or before the 29th day of Dccember", 'Tbe Boys and Girls bathe alternately in the Morning as long as thc Season will permit", and the four School servants

> Cause their hands and face to be washed every morning their hair

combed their Shoes and buckles cleaned Shoes changed their Stockings and c'oathes manded. . . . all the Children say the Lords Prayer in the Dormitory immediately before they go to bed . . . the children *are* to be taught the Church Ca echism and Rishop Williams's exposition thereof and . . . such as are capable learn the Collect for the Day every Sunday... the Bcys . . . *are* instructed to make and mend their own Shoes and Cloathes . . . *[The children may]* play in the Garden in the Summer and in the School room in winter provided they do not use bad language or otherwise misbehave themselves or throw stones.

Children who continually misbehave will be sent to the Workhouse and 'not readmitted on any pretence whatever'.

Sarah Trimser, one of the great educational reformers and writers of the time, described[29] the purposes and effect of teaching in charity schools in terms which probably reflect accurately the conditions in the King Street School. But, she complains, the children are merely learning by rote and do not understand what they have learned; they 'do little more than store their memories with *words* and *sentences* or at least obtain a few crude indistinct notions of the great truths of Christianity . . . '[30] The chief problem was that the books from which they learned were written by learned prelates for their peers, not for children, and Mrs Trimser therefore wrote a series of popular school texts such as *The Charity School Spelling Book*, price *3d*, and *A Little Spelling Book for Young Children*, *6d*, which she advertised in her own book about education.

The purpose of the St James Parish School was to prepare the children to support themselves *outside* the workhouse, the girls as house-servants and the boys as apprentices.[31]

Note that, for the children of the poor, apprenticeship was an enormous step upward in the commercial and social worlds. To be apprenticed in the cities of London and Westminster, a child ordinarily had to have some education, and an apprentice-fee was common, both of which were ordinarily beyond the reach of the poor. The apprentice of good behaviour was guaranteed seven years of lodging, food,

and clothing, modest accomplishments of which the parents of most Workhouse children had proved themselves incapable, and with the acquisition of training for a trade, of a 'mystery' as it was called, the apprentice who had graduated to be a journeyman could expect far better pay than an unskilled manual worker. For a modest fee, the journeyman could become a member of his trade, employing other journeymen and taking his own apprentices. As a member of his guild, he could even become Lord Mayor of London. All these doors were open to a dutiful Poorhouse apprentice, but most of them were forever closed to his parents, who could not even vote. The effect of such apprenticeship was to open the doors of security, prosperity, and social acceptance, to make it possible for the children of the lowest class, the offspring of beggars and prostitutes and idiots, to enter the expanding middle class of artizans and tradesmen, artists and merchants. Apprenticeship provided a noble opportunity otherwise scarcely accesstble to the inhabitants of the Workhouse.

This was the generous school system instituted in St James Parish when William Blake was twenty-four years old and still living at home in 28, Broad Street.

Naturally the Governors and Directors of the Poor were keen to keep down the expenses of the School, and from the start the children made and repaired most of their own clothes and shoes. Equally naturally, it occurred to them to try to sell the produce of the children's labour, as they did with that of the poor in the Workhouse, and in their Minutes of 24 October 1783 they recorded an advertisement to be placed in newspapers, addressed

TO SHOEMAKERS GLOVERS PIN MAKERS AND OTHERS

In September 1782 the Governors and Directors of the Poor of the Parish of Saint James Wastminister caused all the *Poor Children* belonging to the Parish between the Age of Seven and thirteen years to be reserved from the *Work-house* in Poland St. & placed in a House purchased for their receipt late Mr. Durells in King St. Golden Square . .

There are about a *Hundred Boys* and a *Hundred Girls* orderly in behaviour and clean and healthy in their Persons who have the advantage of good example and daily instruction- - They are admittcd at the Age of Seven & remain in the School until capable of being put Apprentice. Any Manufacturers or Tradesman in an extensive line willing to emp'oy such children. . . is desired to attend at the School house. . .[*with proposal and to see the children.*]

There are several Stout well disposed Girls qualified to be put Apprentices as Household Servants who may be seen within the above-mentioned hours by any Reputable Housekeepers . . . .

And on 27 February 1784 the Governors and Directors agreed to build 'a Workshop for teaching the Boys at King St. to learn to make Shoes'. Thus the King Street School really was a School of Industry. However, at first the children apparently did only piece work on a somewhat casual basis until they were apprenticed.

But this was not enough, and three years later an attempt was made to profit more systematically from the labour of the children. Another advertisement, in the Minutes for 5May 1786, addressed to shoemakers, said that there 'are 110 healthy Boys' aged seven to thirteen or fourteen in the School, 'many of them have been instructed in making Shoes for themselves and others'. The advertisement offers sixty to seventy boys for piece work, their pay therefore to be used for the School. This was something like a factory system; clearly the emphasis in the School of Industry was shifting from School to Industry.

Whatever this may have meant for the children's education, at least it proved a profitable investment, and a report of 1810 claimed that in the King Street School of Industry 'their earnings have been always sufficient to yield a fair profit upon the raw materials by the conductors for their manufacture' [32]

Humble or even mean as these achievements may seem in the 20th Century, it is well to remember how unusual and even admirable they were at the time they were made. The

King Street School of Industry may have offered an education which was brief and industrial, but it educated *all* its poor children, and most children of the poor in England then were not educated at all. As late as 1810, there were 188,794 children aged five to fourteen 'who have been the subject of parish relief', but only 20,330 of them had received any education, 'being not so much as one-ninth of the number receiving parish relief.[33] In the 179 Charity Schools in and near London in 1799, there were 7,108 children,[34] averaging forty children per school, whereas in the Parish of St James in 1809 there were three hundred poor children in the School of Industry, and two hundred more were at nurse at Wimbledon,[35] some of whom also went to school.

Further, powerful opposition to *any* form of education for the poor persisted for many years. When Whitbread presented his Parochial Schools Bill to Parliament in 1807, it was defeated by arguments such as that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer [Spencer Percival], who said that 'The education proposed would disqualify the persons possessing it from the most necessary and useful description of labour',[36] and in the same dabate Davies Gidd argued in the Commons that

> the project of giving education to the labouring cleasses of the poor . . . would, in effect, be found to be prejudicial to their morals and happiness; it would cause them to despise their lot in life . . .; instead of teaching them subordination it would render them factious and refactory, as was evident in the manufacturing counties; it would eneble them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity; it would render them insolent to their superiors . . . .[35]

In the context of majority governing opinions like these, the achievement of the School of Industry in the Parish of St James are especially impressive. Given the poverty of their means and precedents, the measures to educate and protect the children of the poor of the parish seem foresighted and humane, generous and wise, especially at first. There was

good reason to be proud of the achievements of the school for the poor in the Parish of St James, Westminster in the late 18th Century.

THE COMMERCIAL RELATIONSHIP OF BLAKE'S FATHER AND BROTHER WITH THE WORKHOUSE AND SCHOOL

William Blake's father James began to supply haberdashery to the School almost as soon as it was in operation. Previously, in the period 18 July 1777 to 17 December 1779 (and perhaps earlier), before the School was established, Mrs Limm, the Midwife to the Workhouse, was reimbursed for disbursements for Haberdashery. Almost certainly she was merely the purchaser of the goods, not their supplier. The Minutes of the Govarnors and Directors of the Poor for 1780-July 1782 are missing, but then 'Mr. Blake Haberdasher' appears in the very first accounts thereafter and continued steadily, without a break, for almost two years.

Sums Paid to 'Mr. Blake Haberdasher'[37]

Date of Meeting	'For the Workhouse'	'For the Schoolhouse'	*Total* £ s d
9 Aug 1782			1. 6. 3
23 Aug 1782			2. 3. 2
6 Sept 1782			1. 2. 5
20 Sept 1782			1. 8. 6
4 Oct 1782			1. 3. 8
18 Oct 1782			1.14. 3
1 Nov 1782			1.19. 0
15 Nov 1782			1. 9.10
29 Nov 1782	1.16. 2	11. 9	[2. 7.11]
13 Dec 1782	2. 8. 2	10. 0	[2. 1. 2]
27 Dec 1782	1.18. 4	14. 6	[2.12.10]
10 Jan 1783	1. 6.10	3. 1	[1. 9.11]
24 Jan 1783	[1. 8. 6]	12. 1	[2. 0. 7]

7 Feb	1783	1. 4.11	6. 7	[1.11. 6]
21 Feb	1783	1.12.10	16. 9	[2. 9. 7]
7 March	1738[38]	[1. 9. 2]	[7. 9]	1.16.11
21 March	1783[38]	1.11.10	6. 9	[1.18. 7]
4 April	1783[38]	1. 7. 4	16. 1	[2. 3. 5]
18 April	1783[38]	1.18. 5	12. 9	[2.11. 2]
2 May	1783[38]	1. 2. 2	7. 3	[1. 9. 5]
16 May	1783[38]	1. 7. 8	11. 9	[1.19. 5]
30 May	1783[38]	1. 3. 2	9.10	[1.13. 0]
13 June	1783[38]	1. 6. 4	9, 0	[1.15. 4]
27 June	1783	2.11. 3	5.11	[2.17. 2]
11 July	1783	1. 0.10	11.10	[1.12. 8]
25 July	1783	1. 2. 8	13. 4	[1.16. 0]
8 Aug	1783	1. 0. 9	13. 1	[1.13. 4]
22 Aug	1783	1. 2. 7	7.11	[1.10. 6]
5 Sept	1783	1.12. 4	10. 7	[2. 2.11]
19 Sept	1793	12. 9	10. 9	[1. 3. 6]
3 Oct	1783	1. 4. 8	19. 9	[2. 4. 5]
17 Oct	1783	1.11. 1	14.10	[2. 5.11]
31 Oct	1783	1. 0. 3	1. 2. 5	[2. 2. 8]
14 Nov	1783	1. 3. 3	17. 9	[2. 1. 0]
28 Nov	1783	1. 4. 7	14. 3	[1.18.10]
12 Dec	1783	19. 1	1.14. 6	[2.13. 7]
26 Dec	1783	1.19. 3	1. 1. 4	[3. 0. 7]
9 Jan	1784	19. 4	14. 2	[1.13. 6]
23 Jan	1784	1. 1. 7	1. 5. 9	[2. 7. 4]
6 Feb	1784	1. 5. 6	1. 1 2	[2. 6. 8]
20 Feb	1784	1. 7. 2	1. 2.10	]2.10. 0]
5 March	1784	15. 1	1. 7.11	[2. 3. 0]
19 March	1784	1.10. 6	2 16. 5	[4. 6. 1]
2 April	1784	15. 8	———	[15 8]
16 April	1784	1.10.11	———	[1.10.11]
30 April	1784	1. 4. 7	———	[1 4. 7]
14 May	1784			[1. 3. 8]
28 May	1784	1. 4. 1	———	[1. 4. 1]

11 June 1784	1.13 6		[1.13. 6]
49 fortnights or 1 years 10 months, 3 days	1.13. 2 per fortnight	15. 5 per fortnight	[95.9 10]

On 25 June, 23 July, 23 Aqgust, 3, 17, 31 September, 29 October, and 12 November 1784, there is no sum entered for Haberdashery; on 6 August Messrs Jones & Co, Haberdashers, had a bill for 16s for the School, and on 14 October there was another for the huge sum of £ 7.17.7 for the Workhouse, and then no more.

James Blake [Senior], the poet's father, supplied Haberdashary to the School of Industry and the workehouse for almost two years, from August 1782 or earlier until June 1784. By then, however, his health must have been frailing, and he died probably in June and was buried on 4 July 1734.[39] His eldest son, also named James, took over the family business in Broad Street, Golden Square, but evidently he did not know much about his father's dealings with the Governors and Directors of the Poor of St James, Westminster —or at any rate the Blake firm was replaced sporadically in supplying Haberdashery to the Parish by Messrs Jones & Co, Haberdashers, in two accountings in August and October 1784.

By the Spring of 1785, James Blake [Junior] was anxious to recover the lost business with the workhouse and the School of Industry, and he knew that at the April meeting annually the twenty-one Directors and Governors of the Poor were chosen, and they in turn chose their servants, such as Matron of the Workhouse and the Messenger of the Committee, among whose duties was 'apprehending the reported Fathers of Bastard Children'.[40] They also chose their suppliers for the rest of the year[41] such as the butcher, baker, chandler, milkman, and vendors of greens and butter. James Blake

therefore wrote to them, and his letter was recorded in their Minutes for the meeting at 1:00 P.M. on 1 April 1785:

A Letter from Mr. Blake was delivd. to the Board & read [i] Copy th *[ere]* of is as follows

Gentn.

As at this Se*[a]*son of the year you appoint your several Trades persons permit me to offer myself to serve you with Articles of Haberdashery for I flatter myself I am able to supply the Infirmary & School of of Industry with every Article upon as low terms as any house in London & being an Inhabitant of this P*[ari]*sh & my family for many years[42] hope a preference may be given me for which should I succeed shall make it my study to deliver for the use of the same such Articles as will bear the strictest Examination. Shd. any be found not agreable or otherwise not suiting shall be happy to provide such as will every day answer the use intended or exchange the Articles if not approved—I remain Gentn. for Mother & Self

Broad St. Golden Sq*[ua]*re : Your very hble Servt.
Jas. Blake

Resolved that the Consideration thereof be referred to the next Board.

The fact that James Blake was writing 'for Mother & Self' suggests that they were managing the shop together—had he merely wished to evoke sympathy, he surely would have referred explicity to her recently widowed state. She may have helped to manage the shop until her death in 1792. The reference to supplies for 'the Infirmary & School of Industry' suggests that the Haberdashery supplied was chiefly for the Infirmary in the Workhouse and for the School. Some confirmation of this hypothesis may be seen in the fact that previously, in 1777-79, the haberdashery for the Workhouse had been supplied by the Workhouse midwife.

A few other letters received at the same meeting from merchants one referring to 'your Advertizement' for bread,[43] and several, like that of James Hartley, [?Knife] Grinder of 30 Broad Streat, Golden Square, ask as James Blake did for special consideration as a parish resident. James Blake's

letter seems to imply that his competitors Messrs Jones & Co were *not* residents of the parish.

The immediate decision of the Committee about James Blake's letters was the usual one, to refer the matter to the next meeting of the Board. However, there is no mention of Blake at the next meeting, and indeed no Haberdasher is named as appointed to supply the poor at the April meetings 1783–89, though a Hosier (Mr Humphreys) and Linen Draper (Messrs Evans & Willians) in allied trades were so named respectedly. However, James Blake's application was clearly approved in principle, for in subsequent accounts are recorded bills for James Blake & Co (or Mr Blake) Haberdasher as follows :

Date of Meeting	*Sums Paid to* 'Mr Blake Haberdasher' 'For the Schoolhouse'
15 April 1785	£ 11. 3.6
29 April 1785	1.10.6
13, 27, May, 10	
24 June 1785	———
8 July 1785	£ 5. 2.1

These are much larger sums than had previously been recorded for haberdashery in the fornightly School accounts, and presumbly James Blake was building up the supplies depleted since his father's death. The total of £ 17.16.1 for the seven fortightly accounts from 1 April to 8 July averages almost £ 2.10.10 per fortnight, a good deal more than his father had received (10*s* 6*d*) when he was supplying Haberdashery to the School regularly.

However, no further reference to the Blake family Haberdashery Shop in Broad Street, Golden Square, has been found in these records.

The commercial standards of the Governors and Directors of the Poor in the Parish of St James were admirably high, and they scrupulously framed their rules and practice to avoid

the possibility of persistant theft and embezzlement from the School and Workhouse and even of conflict of interest among their own members. The Governors

> are prohibited from having any Benefit in any Contract, or in the Service of Goods, Materiale, Provisions, or Necessaries for the Poor.[44]

Almost certainly, therefore, William Blake was not thinking of his own parish when he wrote in *America* (1793) pl. 13 that

> pity is become a trade, and generosity a science,
> That men get rich by . . . .

Blake's own parish of St James was proof against such charges. His indignation was reserved for the politics not of the parish but of the nation.

Notes

1. M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement : A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action* (1938), 3.
2. *The Spectator*, ed. D. F. Bond (1957), III, 48. Cp. Joseph Addison in *The Guardian* (thus vaguely cited in Jones, p. 59) : 'I have always looked upon the Institution of Charity Schools' which of late has so uniformly prevailed throughout the whole nation, as the glory of the age we live in.'
3. Survey of London Volume XXIX : *The Parish of St James Westminster Part One South of Piccadilly* (1960), 7.
4. Survey of London Volume XXXI : *The Parish of St James Westminster Part Two North of Piccadilly* (1963), 180-185. N. B. Tenion's school in King Street is quite distinct from the later Parish School of Industry in King Street. According to A. Highmore, *Pietas Londinensis :* The History, Design. and Present State of the Various Public Charities in and near London (1810), 765-767, it was founded in 1700.
5. *An Extract of the Deed of Settlement of the School and Chapel In King-Street Made by His Grace the Most Reverend, Dr. Thomes Tenison, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, For the Use of the Parish of St. James, Westminster* (1775), 11.

6. Survey of London Vol. XXIX (1960), 7. There was also an 'Academy or School' in Mason's Yard in 1772 (p. 76).
7. Ibid, p. 54. According to A. Highmore, *Pietas Londinensis* (1810), 831, fifty boys are taught to read, write, and cast accounts according to Dr. Bell's method; they are carefully instructed in the doctrines of Christianity according to the Church of England . . . . *[and]* are educated for trades or handicrafts . . . .
8. *An Account of Several Work-Houses for Employing and Maintaining the Poor;* Setting forth The Rules by which they are Govereed. Their great Usefulness to the Publick, And in Particular to the Parishes where they are Frected As also of several Charity Schools For Promoting Work and Labour. The Second Edition very much Enlarged (1732), 55. There is an account of the school in A. Highmore, *Pietas Londinensis* (1810), 739-740, and A Survey of London Vol. XXXI (1963) 590, cites Marion Arderis Burgess, *A History of Burlington School* (n. d.) and says (p. 543) that the school survived for more than a century.
9. Survey of London Vol. XXXI (1963), 178, 179. Maidwell wrote an *Essay upon the Necessity and Excellency of Education* (1705).
10. Survey of London Vol. XXXI (1963), 210.
11. *Ibid*, 210. [William Combe] *Microcosm of London,* III [1809], 241, says that 'a silk menufactory, situated between Poland-Street and Carnaby Market, was purchased by the parish' and adapted as the Workhouse.
12. Survey of Loneon Vol. XXXX (1973), 212.
13. Minutes of the Governors and Directors of the Poor D1870.

    The Minutes of the Meetings of the Governors and Directors of the Poor of the Parish of St James, Westminster, are in the Archives Department of Westminster City Libraries, Buckingham Palace Road, London; the volume with pressmark D1969 covers 11 July 1777-17 Dec 1779, D1870 begins 2 Aug 1782 (*N. B.* The Minutes for Dec 1779-July 1782 are missing). D1871 begins 19 Nov 1784. and D1872 begins 9 March 1789. The Minutes are written in fair, clerkly hands and are, of course, in chronological order.
14. A printed Act [40 Geo III, Cap. XV] for taking an Account of the Population of Great Britain, 31st December 1800, filled out by hand for the Parish of St James, Westminster, in the Westminster City Archives, Buckingham Palace Road, London.

15. *Abstract of the Answers and Returns Made Pursuant to an Act Passed in the 43d Year of His Majesty King George III. Intituled 'An Act for procuring Returns relative to the Expence and Maintainance of the Poor in England'* (1804). 724.
16. A. Highmore, *Pietas Londinensis* (1810), 578.
17. *An Account of Several Work-Houses* (1732), 54.
13. *Rules, Orders, and Regulations Made by the Governors and Directors of the Poor of the Parish of St James, within the Liberty of Westminster* (1768), 11-12.
19. *ibid*, 22-23.
20. *An Accoun' of Several Work-Houses* (1732), iii.
21. *Sketch of the State of the Children of the Poor in the Year 1756, and of the Present State and Management of all the Poor in the Parish of Saint James. Westminster* (1787), 13. The 202 working poor in 1797 earned £ 35.18.2 in a typical fortnight (p. 14) or about 1*s* 9*d* per person per week. A picture of the interior of the St James Workhouse factory by Rowlandson & Pugin is given in [William Combe] *Microcosm of London,* III *[1809]*, at p. 242, with an account of it on pp. 240-242.
22. *Serious Considerations on The Salutary Design of the Act of Parliament For a regular, uniform Register of the Parish-Poor In all the Parishes within the Bills of Mortality* (1762), 10,11.
23. *Abstract of the Annual Registers of the Parish Poor . . . [for] 1783* (1784).
24. *Sketch of . . . the Poor, in the Parish of Saint James* (1797), 1.
25. Survey of London Vol. XXXI (1963), 180.
26. *Sketce of . . . the Poor, in the Parish of Saint James* (1797), 3-5. In 1797 there were 169 'Children at Nurse at Wimbledon' (p. 17). In the context of 'drunken Parents', note that the School children were given ' a Pint of Beer each' every day but Thursday (p. 7).
17. *Ibid*, 5-6. The deed of sale of Thomas Durrell's buildings on 22 April 1782 is copied in Westminster City Archives D1870, pp. 535-513 (copied from the other end of the book).
28. Westminster City Archives D1870, pp.47-57. Children were admitted only 'from the Workhouse or from the Nurses in the Country', i.e., not children of parents, however poor, who were nor in the St

James Workhouse. The School servants should 'cause all the children to be washed once a week when the Season will not permit them to Bathe'. In the Minutes for 26 Dec 1783 is a record that Mary Blake (otherwise unknown) was sent to the School of Industry.

29. Mrs [Sarah] Trimner, *Reflections upon the Education of Children in Charity Schools* : with the Outline of a Plan of Appropria e Insturction for the Children of the Poor; Submitted to the Consideration of the Patrons of Schools of Every Denomination Supported by Charity (1792), 8, 11, 29-20, 35-36. Mrs Trimmer's particular interest is indicated in *The Economy of Charity*: or, An Address to Ladies Concerning Sunday-Schools . . . (1787). in which she wrote : 'Working for the poor is a species of charity which forms a part of the prerogative of our sex' (p. 48).

30. Mrs Trimner, *Reflections* (1792), 35-36.

31. *Sketch of . . . the Poor, in the Parish of Saint James* (1797), 11-13. In 1656 'only 'SEVEN' Children had been . . . brought up and placed out [as Apprentices] by all the Parishes [*in the metropolis*,] 147 in Number' (p. 1).

32. A. Highmore, *Pietas Londinensis* (1810), 768; Highmore remarks of the School, 'Its method and regularity, and a careful regard to the religious instruction of the Church of England, are its best recommendations' (p. 768).

33. *Ibid*, 578.

34. M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement* (1938), 61.

35. [William Combe] *Microcom* of London, III [1809], 241. Combe remarks (III,. 242) that the children in the St James School of industry do not wear livery, so 'The children walking two & two in red & blue & green . . . into the high dome of Pauls' in Blake's 'Holy Thusday' in *Songs of Innocence* (1789) presumably do not refer to them.

36. *English Historical Documents* [Vol. XI] 1783-1832, ed. A. Aspinall & Anthony Smith (1959), 714,13

37. The Committee met weekly, and at alternate meetings the accounts were itemized under 'Provisions', i.e., food, and 'Other Bills', and they are always referred to the Treasurer for verification and authorized to be paid at the subsebuent meeting. (This was more frequent than was called for in the *Rules, Orders, and Regulations, Made by*

the Governors and Directors of the Poor of the Parish of St Jamse, within the Liberty of Westminster [1768], 9': 'all Bills [*shall*] be paid once a Month').

> Neither is there any Article boguht for the Poor entered into Stock until the same has been duly examined and compared with the Samples. And there are Tables for every Article consumed, which are compared every Fortnight with the Bills, both by the Committee and Board, and also the Abstracts thereof, so that no Waste or Embezzlemant can be made, but it must be known every Fortnight.
>
> [*Sketch of . . . the Poor, in the Parish of Saint James* (1797), 20.]

The bills are for the fortnight ending six days before the meeting at which they are first considered, so there was always at least a fortnight between the presentation of a bill and its payment. A good many clothes are ordered, but there is no indication of from whom.

From March 1789, the bills are no longer itemized, and only a lump sum is given 'For the Schoolhouse' and 'For the Workhouse'.

In some accounts there is no distinction between Workhouse and Schoolhouse, in others there are separate entries for each. In the Blake periods, when there are separate Schoolhouse Committee Minutes, the totals run from £33.16.4to £65.8.10,averaging £42.17.6, of which James Blake's share of 10*s* 6*d* per fortnight is 1.1%. The totals for combined School and Workhouse expenses for a fortnight ranged from £130.8. to £250.14.10 during James Blake's period, averaging £182, of which James Blake's share of £1.19.1was about 11%

Occasionally other documents are interspersed among the Minutes of the weekly meetings of the Governors and Directors of the Poor, such as letters to or from the Committee and, very occasionally, Minutes of the subordinate Committee for the Schoolhouse. There are references to other reports, etc., which one would like to see in connection with James Blake, such as the regular 'Minutes of the Committee of the Parish School of Indusfry' (D1871, p. 96), the 'bocks of Cloathing' (D1871, p. 99), the 'book of Recommendations' D1871, p. 99), and the 'Book of Orders' (D1871, p. 99) which one might expect to find either among the Westminster City Libraries Archives or in the Greater London Record Office, to which records of schools were supposed to be transferred, but they are not known to the indices or officers of either institution.

38. There are separate Schoolhouse Committee Minutes and accounts a few days after the meeting of the Governors and Directors of the Poor, on 10, 25 March, 8, 22 April, 6, 20 May, 3, 17 June 1783, giving the same figures for Mr Blake Haberdasher.

39. *Blake Records* (1969), 28.

40. D1871, p. 48.

41. According to the *Rules . . . of the Poor of the Parish of St James* (1768), 10. 'all Tradesmen who serve the poor, *[shall]* be appointed once in a Year, or oftener, as Occasions shall require'. Occasionally the Governors and Directors became dissatisfied with the quality or price of the goods supplied, and they summoned the merchant to explain himself or even advertised for a new supplier.

42. James Blake was born at 28 Broad Street, Golden Square, on 10 July 1753, his father had lived in the parish at least from 1744 and his mother at least from 1748 (*Blake Records*, 2, 551).

43. D1871, p. 76. Present at the meeting which received James Blake's letter were William Jones, Robert Johnson, Cornelius Neep, Sefferin Nelson, John Butler, Henry Daws, and William Johnson, the last two as Overseers of the Poor.

44. *Sketch of . . . the Poor, in the Parish of Saint James* (1797), 3.

Jibon Krishna Banerjee

COLERIDGE'S ENGLISH RENDERING OF SCHILLER'S PLAYS*

Coleridge's knowledge of the German language had already been considerable before he set out for Germany with Wordsworth in 1798.[1] The young poet saw *Wallenstein* upon the German stage and shared the enthusiasm of the German audience.[2] Immediately after his return from Germany (between December 1799 and April 1800), Coleridge translated *Die Piccolomini and Wallenstein's Tod*—two plays of Schiller's trilogy—within six weeks from copies supplied by the publisher Longmans and attested by the hand of Schiller himself (30 September 1799).[3] On 28 February 1800 he writes to Southey : 'I am translating Manuscript Plays of Schiller,'[4] and on 21 April 1800 he writes to a friend : 'Tomorrow morning I send off the last sheet of my irksome, soul-wearing labour, the translation of Schiller.'[5] Evidently Coleridge's enthusiasm for the German dramatist—the 'Bard Tremendous in Sublimity' of his early youth[6]—had subsided by then. The drudgery of the translation of the 'prolix Plays of Schiller'[7] had a depressing effect on his nerves and he told Josiah Wedgwood (April 21, 1800) that he 'could have written a

*Catalogue of Coleridge collection issued in 1913 by Messrs. J. Pearson & Co., of Pall Mall Place, London, reproduced verbatim in a catalogue by Charles Scribners Sons of New York, a wrong entry, 'Don Carlos : A Tragedy : Translation from German of F. Schiller'. This was not translated by Coleridge, but by Sir John Studdart, assisted by N. H. Noehden, (See T.J. Wise, *A Bibliography : Supplement*, p. 26).

far better play himself in half the time'[8] To him this translation 'is indeed a Bore' and *'never, never, never,* will be so taken in again'.[9] When he was accused of being a partisan of the German theatre by the reviewer of his translation in the *Monthly Review,* Coleridge wrote back to the editor (November 18, 1800) : 'The mere circumstance of translating a manusript play is not even evidence that I admired that one play, much less that I am a General admirer of the plays in that language . . .'[10] Coleridge made many other uncharitable remarks against Schiller and his plays ('the deep unutterable disgust which I had suffered in the translation of the accursed *Wallenstein* [which] seemed to have struck me with barrenness'.[11] 'These cursed plays play the Devil with me'.[12] 'It is a dull heavy play . . .').[13] In after years, his attitude changed and he remarked that *Wallenstein* was 'a specimen of my happiest attempt, during the prime manhood of my intellect . . .'[14] He thanks Sir Walter Scott for quoting from his translation 'with applause'.[15] Translation is often in the nature of hack-work, and Coleridge's disparaging remarks may be traced to his weariness; and yet some of his observations are a valuable commentary on the trilogy.

He tells Southey (28 February 1800) : '. . . they are poems, full of long speeches—in very polish'd Blank Verse—'[16] About the success of his translation he entertained hopes, for, as he writes to Josiah Wedgwood, 'the language for the greater part, [is] natural and good commonsense English'.[17] On *Wallenstein* he remarks to Godwin (8 September 1800) : 'Prolix and crowded and dragging as it is yet it is quite a model for its judicious management of the *Sequences* of scenes—and such it is held on the German Theatres.'[18] The publication of the translation was a complete failure from the publisher's point of view. Coleriege writes to William Sotheby (September 10, 1802) : '. . . I told Longman, it would never answer—when I had finished it, I wrote to him and foretold that it would be waste paper on his Shelves, and the

dullness charitably layed upon my shoulders. It happened, as I said—Longman lost by £ 250 by the work, £ 50 of which had been payed [sic] to me—poor pay, heaven knows; for a thick Octavo volvme of blank Verse—and yet I am sure, that Longman never thinks of me but Wallenstein and the Ghosts of his departed Guineas dance un ugly Waltz round my Idea' . . .[19]

We may pose here a pertinent question : What prompted Coleridge to translate Schiller? Was it the satisfaction of of having a hand in the production of one of Schiller's plays—'the loftiest achievement in the dramatic literature of the German Language'*[20] ? Or was it simply financial compulsion? These considerations may have influenced Coleridge, but what is of special interest is the identity of moral concerns that he found in the German dramatist. Consider the following observation in Coleridge's handwriting (1808) in a presentation copy of *Wallenstein :*

> The great main moral of this play is the danger of dallying with evil thoughts under the influence of superstition, as did Wallenstein; and the grandeur of perfect sincerity in Max Piccolomini, the unhappy effects of insincerity, though for the best purposes, in his father Octavio (Note to Preface, Part I, in edition 1877-80)[21]

At another place he says about Schiller's plays : '. . . they have passion, distinct and diversified character, and abound in passages of great moral and poetic beauty.'[22]

In this context it may be pertinent to note the relevant facts concerning Schiller's play. The theme centred on one of the most complicated periods—Thirty Years' War—in the history of Europe. Set against the seventeenth century

---

*It is recorded that two attempts were made to fit Coleridge's translation of *Wallenstein* to the English stage and Edmund Kean was eager to appear in a role. A copy of the translation, preserved in Forster Library (South Kensington), was marked for acting by Macready. (*PW*, Campbell, p. 649).

German background *Wallenstein* is a play of intrigue and betrayal. The emperor, Ferdinand II, was a weak, vacillating monarch, a bigoted Catholic, guided by priests and monks, and was far from a national ideal, His courtiers, unfit to be called ministers, were self-centred and jealous of Wallenstein, the Duke of Friedland, and the Generalissimo of the Imperial Forces in the Thirty Years' War. As Max Winkler says,[23] Wallenstein was a man of many schemes, and it is difficult to determine his motives in carrying on negotiations with the Swedish King (a champion of Protestantism) and revolting finally against the Imperial authority His ideals were political rather than religious; his conversion to Catholicism was more or less a formal event and he never showed any enthusiasm either for his own religion or for any other religion.[24] Up to 1630 Wallenstein's chief aim was to strengthen the authority of the Emperor against the power of the German princes, both Protestant and Catholic. However, his military renown, his religious tolerance, his towering ambition and his attempt at achieving general peace aroused the hostility of the princes and the Emperor and led finally to his downfall.[25]

In Schiller's trilogy Wallenstein retains the grandeur of a hero—the ambiguity of his intentions both complicates and enriches the portraiture—but in the main he is presented as a realist. Max Piccolomini and Thekla, two entirely fictitious characters,[26] are presented as pure, disinterested idealist,[27] and they serve as a contrast to the central figure. The word 'contrast' should however, be qualified, for there is a deep emotional bond between Wallenstein and Max Piccolomini, and this enriches the human and moral significance of the play.

To organize dramatically the great mass of facts centring on Wallenstein's career was a difficult task for any dramatist. The petty intrigues, the military and political maneuvres, the complexity of motivations that prompt Max to stand against

Wallenstein whose rebellion against the emperor forms an essential part of the drama—all this and variety of other facts presented a gigantic challenge to Schiller. The objectivity of approach towards character and action was another problem. Being a subjective and reflective type of writer, Schiller had to strain all his nerves to be objective. It is said that a careful study of the works of Sophocles, Euripides, Aristotle (especially *Poetics*), Goethe and Shakespeare (*Julius Caesar* and *Richard III* influenced him much) helped him in planning the drama. But what helped him much in forming an objective view of art was Goethe's works. In a letter to Goethe Schiller acknowledges (January 5, 1798) :

> It is obvious to me that I have gone beyond myself, which is the result of my association with you; for it is only the frequent and continued intercourse with an objective nature so opposed to my own, my active striving after it, and the combined effort of contemplating it and reflecting upon it, that could enable me to keep the subjective limits of my own at such a distance.

Schiller had to twist history and invent characters, and change the chronology of history—some of the greatest poets such as Shakespeare and Goethe did the same. Wallenstein, however, was to be presented objectively—he is one of the greatest tragic characters in history. Schiller's impression of Wallenstein, in his account of Thirty Years' War is, on the whole, unfavourable. But the final image as emerges out of the fourth book is known to be just and objective. He writes:

> '. . . His ambition was the cause of his greatness and his fall. With all his failings he was great, admirable, unequalled, had he kept himself within due bounds. The virtues of the ruler and the hero, prudence, justice, firmness and courage, rise in colossal proportions in his character, but he lacked the gentle virtues of the man, which adorn the hero and make the ruler beloved. Terror was the talisman with which he worked . . . His clearness and liberality of thought raised him above the religious prejudices of his age . . . Wallenstein fell not because he was a rebel, but he rebelled because he fell. Unfortunate in life that he made a victorious party his enemy, — unfortunate in death that the enemy survived him and wrote his history'.

While Wallenstein is a historical figure, Max Piccolomini and Thekla are imaginary characters, and Winkler thinks, that some personal reasons must have induced Schiller to highlight the Max and Thekla scenes. They were the subjective projections of his own vision of life. (Schiller's correspondence also confirms that he took personal interest in these two characters. Schiller, we may note here, was criticized for bringing in such episodical scenes with Max and Thekla as their poetry disturbs the progression of dramatic action). It may be relevant to note here that Schiller's early manhood was spent in the reign of a tyrant The moral degradation of the high and the mighty who were involved in the game of power politics disturbed the young sensitive Idealist. This moral anxiety is reflected in most of his plays.

Max Piccolomini is an able army officer, respected for his high idealism. He has to take a decision against Wallenstein, his mentor and idol, who has proved disloyal to the emperor and whose daughter Thekla he loves. Here is a moral dilemma before the young idealist. Should be forsake Wallenstein whom he loves and admires and follow the dicates of his conscience? Thekla urges him to remain true to his conscience and this complicates Max's situation. His military move against the Swedish army is an act of desperation and despair, and his death in the battlefield is in the nature of suicide. His death resolves for him the conflict of divided allegiance and gives a spiritual significance to the play. And it is this moral dilemma, this uncertainty regarding means and ends which must have made a profound impression on Coleridge's sensitive mind. Coleridge himself says that the 'moral influence' of the characters of Max is 'grand and salutary.'[28]

II

There are scholars who believe that Coleridge's performance is commendable : 'on the whole a very faithful and fairly successful attempt to render Schiller's manner and thought', says F.W. Stokoe.[29] Carlyle thought that, excepting Sotheby's

Oberon, this is 'the best, indeed the only sufferable translation from the German with which our literature has yet been enriched'.[30] In his article 'What Happened to Coleridge's *Wallenstein*', B.Q. Morgan observes that 'no famous translation is (or ever was) less deserving of its repute than the translation of Schiller's *Wallenstein* by S. T. Coleridge,' but he admits that he 'should be the first to acknowledge the fine qualities it does possess . . . . . Whole passages have the sweep and power of original creation, and, any reader who could not follow Schiller's text, or who did not make detailed comparisons, might easily be persuaded that here was one of the great translations.'[31] R.M. Fletcher remarks that the translations have been criticized for 'hastiness,' 'yet', he thinks, *'The Piccolomini* and *The Death of Wallenstein* constitute one of the finest dramatic translations into English from a foreign language'[32] H. N. Coleridge has particularly referred to act I, scene IV and act IV, scene VII of *The Piccolomini* and act V, scene I of the *Death of Wallenstein*. To him, 'they are the most powerful and characteristic; and in the intermediate one of the three there is an interesting, but perhaps unintended, parallel with the scene of Macbeth's conference with his wife previously to the murder of Duncan'.[33]

In the Preface to his translation of *The Piccolomini*, the first part of *Wallenstein*, Coleridge says :

> In the translation I endeavoured to render my Author *literally* whereever I was not prevented by absolute difference of idiom; but I am conscious that in two or three short passages I have been guilty of dilating the original; and, from anxiety to give the *full meaning*, have weakened the force . . . (Emphasis added).

In the Preface to *The Death of Wallenstein* Coleridge makes some significant comments on the translator's task :

> A translator stands connected with the original Author by a certain law of subordination, which makes it more decorous to point out excellencies than defects: indeed he is not likely to be a fair judge of either. The pleasure or disgust from an afterview of the original. . . . . Translation of poetry into poetry is difficult . . . . But the translator of a living author is

encumbered with additional inconvoniences. If he renders his original faithfully, as to the sanse of each passage, he must necessarily destroy a a considerable portion of the *spirit;* if he endeavours to give a work executed according to laws of *compensation,* he subjects himself to imputations of vanity, or misrepresnlation. I have thought it may duty to remain bound by the sense of my original, with as few exceptions as the nature of the languages renderd possible. (Italics mine).

Translation is a difficult and hazardous work, but when Coleridge says that the 'exceptions' in his translation are due to 'the nature of the languages,' his statement is only a half truth. His own creative spirit is unmistakably at work even while he seeks to follow the original faithfully, and this is particularly evident in the passages that especially appeal to his imagination. Sun and moon imagery was favourite with Coleridge. Wallenstein, in *The Piccolomini* makes some observations on astronomical facts which are Coleridge's own additions.

Coleridge himself admits that in act II, scene iv (lines 82 ff.) of *The Piccolomini,* in Thekla's speech and in Max's reply to it, 'I have taken more liberty than in any other part of the play—except perhaps in Gordon's character of Wallenstein (act III Scene ii). In truth, Max's reply after the first nine lines is almost my own, as are the first seven lines of Thekla's description.' Twelve lines of Schiller here become twenty. Coleridge obviously wanted tc add some more strength and beauty, more profundity to the speeches of Thekla and Max Piccolomini, and the additions have a visionary quality that is Coleridge's own. The first seven lines of Thekla's description that are Coleridge's own evoke the tranced sensation of a mysterious twilight;

> It was strange
> Sensation that came over me, when at first
> From the broad sunshine I stepped in; and now
> The narrowing line of day-light, that ran after
> The closing door, was gone, and all about me
> 'Twas pale aud dusky night, with many shadows
> Fantastically cast.
>
> (II, iv, 82-8)

Coleridge's additions to Max's reply have a similar haunting beauty; when Max speaks of the enchanting world of love, of pagan divinities and of the spirit-haunted valleys, mountains, forests and fountains, of the loss of faith in an age of reason, and of the language that the lover needs to convey his feelings, we hear Coleridge's own voice.

The enchantment of nature and the enchantment of love haunted Coleridge throughout his life, but his most pressing concern was with moral and philosophical issues, and the moral predicament in which Wallenstein and Max Piccolomini find themselves must have touched the deepest chord of Coleridge's heart. 'We act as we are forced,' Wallenstein says, (*The Piccolomini*, V, ii, 149); but while superstitious nature finds a moral sanction in such deterministic philosophy, his decision also shows the power of evil :

The implication of Wallenstein's statement is that success justifies even the wrong means, and this is a dangerous proposition. His subsequent observations show a deep distrust of the power of goodness and suggests that the moral order is perverted: 'To the evil spirit doth the earth belong,/Not to the good'.

Max's response shows his bewilderment and also his deep aversion to moral evil. He says that treachery is not a mere error, it is 'black as the pit of hell', and he exhorts Wallenstein to shun the path of evil and accept his fall with honour.

The major concerns in Coleridge's plays are the mystery and potency of evil and the question of moral choice involving means and ends. In Schiller's portrayal of Max Piccolomini and Wallenstein he found a reflection of the same anxiety and concern: his rendering of Schillar's plays receives thus an added significance and forms part of his original dramatic writings.

Department of English
Visva-Bharati
Shantiniketan

References

1. George Watson, *Coleridge the Poet* (London, 1966), p. 55.
2. See *Schiller's Poems and Plays*, ed. Henry Morley (London, 1889), Introduction, XXIX.
3. See Alois Brandle, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the English Romantic School*, English edition (London, Murray, 1887), p. 271. See also *The Complete Poetical and Dramatic Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. J. D. Campbell (London, 1909), p. 546, Notes, and George Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 55. Campbell's volumes will henceforward be referred to as *PW*, Campbell.
4. *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E.L. Griggs, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1956-71), Vol. I, p. 575. Grigg's volumes will henceforward be referred to as *Letters*, Griggs.
5. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 586-87.
6. Cf. Coleridge's sonnet, *To the Author of The Robbers*, *PW*, Campbell, p. 34
7. *Letters*, Griggs, I, p. 587.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.* p. 648.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 643.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 579.
13. *Ibid* , II, p. 611.
14. Quoted in E. K. Chambers, *S. T. Collridge : A Biographical Study* (Oxford, 1950), p. 125.
15. *PW*, Campbell, p. 647.
16. *Letters*. Griggs, I, p. 575.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 610
18. *Ibid'*, p. 621.
19. *Ibid.*, II, p. 863.
20. *Wallenstein : A Historical Drama in Three Parts*, translated by Charles Passage (London, n. d.), Introduction. XXI.
21. See *PW*, Campbell, p. 647, Notes.
22. *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleiidge*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge, 2 volumes (Oxford 1912), Vol. II, p 588. All quotations from the texts of Coleridge's English rendering of Schriller's plays and the English Poet's prefaces are from this volume, henceforwared referred to as *PW*, 2. H. Coleridge.
23. Schiller's *Wallenstein*, ed. Max Winkler (London, 1916), Introduction, XIX.

24. *Ibid.*, Introduction, XI.
25. *Ibid.*, Introduction, LXIV-LXV.
26. *Ibid* , Introduction, LVI.
27. *Ibid.*, Introduction, IXI-IXIII.
28. *PW.* II. E. H. Coleridge, p. 598 (Preface to *The Piccolini).*
29. F. W. Stokoe, *German Influence in the English Romantic Period* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 121.
30. Quoted by Campbell, *PW.* p. 647, Notes.
31. *Modern Language Journal,* April, 1959.
32. Richard M. Fletcher, *English Romantic Drama* (New York, 1966), p. 45.
33. *Coleridge : the Critical Heritage,* ed. J. R. de Jackson (London, 1970), p. 638.
34. *PW,* E. H. Coleridge, II, p. 599.

Arjya Sircar

LINGUISTIC-STYLISTICS : THE DANGERS OF AN AUTONOMOUS APPROACH

Stylistics as a branch of linguistics which studies variation in language use—say in the field of commercial correspondence, science or officialese—has made steady progress through the years. Its utility even in the area of second language teaching—teaching the learner not merely the correct structures but appropriateness of use—is not entirely inconceivable. But when the stylistician—for that is how he often chooses to call himself—enters the continent of Circe—literature—his doom is total as it is inevitable. He neither knows what he is nor what he was. In what follows we should like to systematically characterize how the linguist as a linguist must fail to come to tarms with himself in this venture just as the student of literature must forever look askance at this intruder. and an intruder he certainly is.

The literature student's impatience with the antics of the linguist is obvious, and not a shade less genuine for its obviousness. And this impatience. minus the frills, boils down to his inability to accept the dichotomy between *form* and *content* which the stylistician presupposes. Style as a matter of choice between equivalent or near equivalent structures is the first premise of the stylistician's trade. The literature student's retort that there are no choices as far as creative literature is concerned needs to be examined with due concern. He would maintain that when a work of art succeeds *form* and *content* interpeneterate and fuse into one. There is a certain inevitability of choice, hardly a choice therefore, which

is the hall mark of all creative art. If there is a choice, the choice is not linguistic but 'epistemic'. That is to say that the mode of expression is inseparable from the experience and perception of the world. When Comte de Buffon said '*le style est l'homme meme*'[1] – the style is the man himself—he was obviously implying that the style cannot be studied independently of the man. If it were a different style it would be a different man. It is precisely this element of *une mot juste* which makes the stylistician's labours in this field resemble what Schopenhauer called the search of a blind man in a dark night for a black cat which isn't there. The linguist may have perfected discovery procedures to segment and classify language—even this is questioned these days—he certainly does not have the machinery to segment and classify life or literature. There are more things to literature than the linguist dreams of. The linguist (as a linguist) has no access to the moral and aesthetic values or the literary tradition which weave complex patterns in literature and literary style.

The formal stylistician, if he talks in terms of scientific principles will achieve precious little for his labours. Any attempt to approach the whole as a sum of the parts in literature in particular and the arts in general can only lead to disaster. Responding to, and being able to recognize 'word mystery' and 'word magic'- which makes literature, literature – is by definition a matter of taste and sensibility and to that extent, spontaneous, intuitive and subjective, which can neither be explained nor characterized in any adequate manner in terms of scientific principles. (Would 'magic' be magic or a 'mystery' remain a mystery if it could be explained) ? And this is something that even the stylistician does not seem to deny.[2]

The linguistic stylistician, therefore dare not embark on the explanatory plane, he must content himself by confining himself to the statistical plane. And here too it is doubtful how much the gain is in real terms. Consider for example

Ian Watt's analysis (1960 p. 250-74) of the first paragraph of *The Ambassadors*. He meticulously tabulates the number of non-transitive constructions, the passives, the average number of words in a sentence, the delayed reference etc. But the conclusions he draws are that there is a kind of lyricism, psychological perceptiveness, irony, suspense etc. in James' style as well as in his fictional technique. It may be noted here that this statistical analysis has revealed nothing that a sensitive reader of James did not already know. Moreover, the analysis consists of terms like *lyricism*, *psychological perceptiveness*, *irony*, *suspense* etc. with which the linguist (as a linguist) is totally unfamiliar. The most that a linguistic-stylistician can do is to make a statistical analysis and invite the literary critic to make whatever use he may want to make of it. If he can combine both the offices in himself—as has been done as we shall see later—excellent; but if he wishes to maintain his autonomy as a linguist he must often run the risk of mistaking the wood for the trees.

It is not merely the literature student's bickering that the stylistician has to contend with; his linguistic conscience will not let him have a moment's peace either. A scientist—and a linguist claims to be a scientist—always prefers to speak in terms of generalizations and idealization of raw data. There is always an attempt to control one set of variables so that other variables may be studied each individually and one at a time. But in literature one doesn't even know whether one can break up things into discrete units—'how can we know the dancer from the dance ?'—and even if we could conceivably do this we would probably find that each individual part is in a dynamic relationship with all the others. The slightest change in any one of the units—one cannot really call them variables because they cannot be varied—affacts all the other parts just as it affects the whole. Seientific enquiry, linguistisc included, is most happy when a linear relationship exists; but literary style is so reflexive : it perpet-

ually refers not only to what immediately preceedes or follows but to many things not stated or mentioned at all. Perpetually, there is a reference to ethnic, cultural or literary traditions and what is more, to life itself.

Moreover, the linguistic stylistician knows that all his enquiries are paradigmatic and theory-bound. He may choose whatever theory or framework he likes but having made his choice he must scrupulously adhere to its terms, axioms and definitions. This is the price that a scientist must pay for the precision and explicitness of his analytic techniques. He is bound to know, if his grounding in his theory is sound enough, that no major linguistic theory allows him to taste of the forbidden fruit of literature. Saussure, Bloomfield and Chomsky—perhaps the three most influential theorists in modern times—have each in their own way ruled out any possibility of the linguist's extending the scope of his field to include in it a study of literary style.

Saussure (1916) made a systematic distinction between *Langue* and *Parole;* where *Langue* was the *knowledge* of the code and *Parole* was the *use* of the code. He categorically stated that the scope of linguistics was confined to *Langue* and could not be extended to *Parole.* And what is more relevant to this discussion, Saussure excluded the *sentence* from the domain of *Langue* i.e. linguistics. It is obvious, therefore, that no theory of stylistics can be based on the Saussurean structuralist paradigm.

Bloomfield (1935 chapter 9) was even more categorical : he banished *meaning* itself from linguistics. But it is not only the linguistic presuppositions behind the structuralism of Saussure and Bloomfield that makes a stylictic analysis of a literary text inconceivable but the psychological and the philosophical presuppositions as well. The behaviouristic and positivistic bias of both the theories assume an atomistic approach which is so enemical to the study of literary style.

Chomsky (1965) on the contrary, apparently, provides the

most helpful basis for stylistic analysis. He not only allows *meaning* admittance into linguistics but makes use of unobservable, abstract, conceptual structures. In his theory there are also provisions for talking of *deep structural* semantic equivalences and *surface structural* syntactic variations. And it is precisely for this reason that Richard Ohman (1966 pp 261-267) straightaway opts for a transformational approach even though he had so perceptively seen the difficulty elsewhere (Ohman, 1959).

Any transformationalist who understands the full implications of his theory—and transformational grammar is so theory-oriented that it spills over even to the neighbouring disciplines of psychology and philosophy—will know that any kind of analysis of literary style in this framework is not without difficulties. Even though there is a *semantic component* there is a very rigid distinction between *linguistic semantics* and *natural semantics*, between the *dictionary* and the *encyclopaedia* (Katz and Fodor, 1964 p. 479-510). What is more, there is a fundamental difference between (universal) *competence* and (individual) *performance* (Chomsky, 1965) which rules out the possibility of studying individual literary styles. Ohman bases his entire analysis on an earlier and very short-lived belief that transformations are meaning-preserving. Practically nobody holds this view today, except generative semanticists, who, on the contrary,do not accept the existence of a syntactic deep structure at all.

British linguists—notably Firth—do indeed talk of *contexts* and *situations* but they do not forget the essential difference between general *types* and individual *tokens*. Zellig S. Harris (1952) talked of *discourse analysis* but his analysis is confined to the distributional properties of sentences in a text. However, everybody knows that Harris' aversion to meaning is final and irrevocable. The European school of Textlinguistics comprising Van Dijk (1978), Reiser (Petofi and Reiser, 1973), Petofi (1975), Enkvist (1978), Dressler, Kummer and their associates

do indeed talk of texts but their inclination is very much for formal semantics and they seem to be moving towards a theory of Artificial Intelligence.

When linguists have realized the limitations of their methods they have done exceedingly well but when they have not, they have lapsed into the most amusing errors. A.A. Hill (1955) makes a penetrating analysis of some of the poems of Wordsworth and Hopkins but at a crucial juncture he reveals at what price his success is bought. 'Upto this point I have concerned myself with matters of stress and word order; now I shall discuss broader structural problems. I shall therefore sound more like a literary critic and less like a linguist.' (Hill, 1955 p. 972). The linguistic-stylistician has all but given himself away. Halliday, too, clearly concedes that there is a point at which the literary critic must take over from the linguist. (Halliday, 1971).

On the other hand the grand old man of linguistics, Roman Jakobson (1967 p. 322) fearlessly claims, 'the linguist whose field is any kind of language may and must include poetry in his study.' Not surprisingly he pays dearly for his *hubris*. Consider Jakobson and Levi Strauss' (1962 p. 5—21) detailed examination of Baudlaire's sonnet 'Les Chats.' Among other things they base their analysis on what they call a sexual ambiguity. The analysis rests on their discovery that there is a kind of androgyny – *feminine* words in a *masculine* rhyme.

However ingenious their analysis it will not pay to forget, as indeed Michael Riffaterre (1966 p. 188-230) reminds us that *feminine gender* and *masculine rhyme* are terms in grammar and rhetoric respectively and they do not necessarily carry the cultural and aesthetic conotations that the terms *masculine* and *feminine* carry. So what we have is an extremely interesting but an equally irrelevant analysis.

This is not of course to imply that language-consciousness has no role to play in the description and evaluation of literary style. Far from it. Analysis of linguistic structures plays a

very significant role but for all that, the linguist if he is to succeed he must learn to go beyond his trade and learn to breathe the free air of aesthetics and morality and cultural and literary traditions before he can understand the full significance of his discoveries. Finally the linguist must remember that he is a descriptive scientist; he must hand over his analysis to the literary critic when judgements and evaluations are called for, as indeed they are called for, the New Critics notwithstanding, at every juncture of literary criticism.

Department of English
Banaras Hindu University
Varanasi

Notes

1. 'Discours Sur le Style' An address delivered before the French Academy by Comte de Buffon translated by Lane Cooper in Cooper (1968 p. 170-179).
2. 'Style in this sense is more easily recognized than anatysed, more easily caught in an impressionistic phrase than revealed in detailed grammatically or statistically described complexity. . .' Turner (1973 p. 23)

References

1. Bloomfield, L. (1935) *Language*, London
2. Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the theory of syntax*, Cambridge : Massachusets.
3. Cooper, L. (1969) (ed.) *Theories of style in literature*, New York.
4. Enkrist, N. E. (1978) 'Stylistics and textlinguistics' in M. Dressler (ed.) *Current trends in textlinguistics*, New York and Berlin.
5. Halliday, M.A.K. (1971) 'An inquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*' in *Literary Style a sympossium*. Seymour Chatman (ed.), London.
6. Harris, Zellig S. (1952) 'Discourse analysis' *Language 28*.
7. Hill, A. A. (1955) 'An analysis of *The Windhover* : an experiment in structural method' *PMLA LXX*. 5.
8. Jakobson, R. (1967) 'Linguistics and poetics' in *Essays in the*

language of literature. Seymour Chatman and Samuel R.Levin (eds.), Boston.

9. Jakobson R. and Levi-Strauss, C. (1962) *'Les Chats'* de Charles Baudelaire' *L'Homme* 2.
10. Katz, J. and Fodor, J. (1964) 'The structure of a semantic theory' in J. Fodor and J. Katz (eds.) *The structure of language.* Englewood Cliffs : New Jersey.
11. Ohman, R. (1959) 'Prolegomena to the analysis of prose style' in H. Martin (ed.) *Style in prose fiction,* New York.
12. Ohman, R. (1966) 'Literature as sentences' *College English XVII* (261-267).
13. Petofi, J.S. (1975) 'Beyond the sentence, between linguistics and logic' in M. Ringbom (ed.) *Style and text* Studies presented to N. E. Enkvist. Stockholm.
14. Petofi, J. S. and Reiser, H. (1973) *Studies in text grammar* D. Reidel.
15. Riffaterre, M. (1966) 'Describing poetic structures : two approaches to Baudelaires *Les Chats*' in Jacques Ehrmann (ed.) *Structuralism,* Yale French Studies.
16. Saussure, F. (1916) *Cours de linguistique generale,* Paris.
17. Turner, G. W. (1973) *Stylistics,* Penguin.
18. Van Dijk, T. A. (1978) *Text and context,* London.
19. Watt, I. (1960) 'The first paragraph of *The Ambassadors :* an explication' in *Essays in Criticism* X (250-274).

BOOK REVIEW

Aspects of Drayton's Poetry : By S. NAQI HUSAIN JAFRI, Doaba House, Delhi, 1988, pp. xi+210

A poet's contemporary fame is an unreliable guarantee for his continuing critical reception. Quite often it may be the result of his extra-poetic merits, such as his social or political personality, his relative affluence, his connections and relative status. His works are sometimes uncritically held in high esteem by his contemporaries because of the charms or influence of his personality and status. This is more so when he decides to flow along the currents of the generally accepted and valued ideas of his time. But, as it must be, when temporally distanced, his works are put to objective scrutiny because the extra-literary factors, which had contributed to the contemporary laudatory appeciations of his works, do not have any longer the living presence to vitiate judgement. Though hailed as a 'Second Ovid' by his contemporaries, Michael Drayton was fated to critical neglect after the seventeenth century. Besides a few pages on him in surveys and histories of English literature and some occasional articles on certain aspects of his poetic composition, not many serious and detailed studies of Michael Drayton's works have been undertaken to date. It is in this context that Dr. Jafri's book has a special significance and is likely to fill up a gap in Draytan scholarship.

Dr. Jafri's study of Drayton is comprehensive, rather too ambitiously so. It ventures to analyse within restricted space the entire poetic output of a once 'major' poet. Such a study will naturally give tantalizingly brief analyses—or to put it

more candidly, summary—of individual works. The critical perspective, determining the theoretical framework, with reference to which the different works have been 'described', is unambiguous and neatly presented. Yes, the works have been 'described' because the nature of study regrettably does not permit their in-depth analysis. The critical reference is to show Drayton as firmly rooted in his contemporary literary conventions and to project his endeavour in voicing the then current patriotic and heroic sentiments which were a strong strand of the fabric of his contemporary national ethos.

The study has been presented in a neatly categorised format of dealing with the diferent forms of poetry written by Drayton—Sonnets, Funerary Elegies, Odes, Pastorals, Epistolary Verses, Satirical Poems, Verse-romances, and Historical Poetry. A triadic critical reference has been used in the analysis of the poems, long as well as short. This reference is compounded of source, autobiography, and contemsorary history. In recounting the narrative sources and relevant events of contemporary history which have gone into the making of Drayton's verses Dr. Jafri gives an impression of a meticulous registrant rather than of a critical analyst. This is because the sources are mentioned in the spirit of 'roll calling', without their illuminating bearing upon the analysis of the texts. However, the study is a positive service to Drayton scholarship, because the richness of sources would tempt many a student of Elizabethan poetry to undertake fresh enquiry with a more rigorous critical probing into the texts themselves, the results of which may perhaps explain more fully the relative neglect of Drayton by his posterior readers.

The themes, structures, style and imagery of the different forms of poems written by Drayton have been analysed to demonstrate his contemporary rootedness as well as his inventiveness. The chapter on Historical Poetry is particularly

interesting where Drayton's artistic acumen is more obvious in his selecting and modifying historical events and details to suit his poetic purpose. The critical attitude adopted by the writer throughout the study, excepting a very few strayings into objective appraisal, is largely idolatrous. The consistently approving and appreciative critical stance of Dr. Jafri tends to detract from the otherwise solid scholarly value of the study. It is doubtful that the study, inspite of its eulogistic tones, will truly help in retrieving Drayton from critical oblivion on the basis of our knowledge that he was securely rooted in his time and place. What makes a literary artist acceptable to later ages is his temporal and topographical transcendece, and this is precisely the point with which the study does not grapple, and thus perhaps ironically explains the writer's inadvertent regret for Drayton's neglect by posterity. The book, however, has the merit of clear presentation and is richly, rather profusely sometimes, documented. It is hoped the book will be a useful reference on Drayton's poetry in particular and the poetry of his age in general.

K. S. MISRA

Department of English
Aligarh Mulim University
Aligarh

THE ALIGARH JOURNAL OF ENGLISH STUDIES
(BI-ANNUAL)
(DECLARATION FORM IV, RULE 8)

1.	Place of Publication	Aligarh
2.	Periodicity of Publication	Bi-annual
3.	Printer's Name Nationality Address	N. R. Farooqi Indian International Printing Press 4, Abdul Qadir Market Jail Road, Aligarh
4.	Publisher's Name Nationality Address	Munir Ahmad Indian Professor Department of English Aligarh Muslim Univesity Aligarh
5.	Editor's Name Nationality Address	Munir Ahmad Indian Professor Department of English Aligarh Muslim University Aligarh
6.	Owner's Name	Aligarh Muslim University Aligarh

I, Munir Ahmad, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

MUNIR AHMAD

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

by

Members of the Department of English

Aligarh Muslim University

A. A. Ansari :
—ARROWS OF INTELLECT : A Study in William Blake's Gospel of the Imagination

Masoodul Hasan :
—FRANCIS QUARLES
—RARE ENGLISH BOOKS IN INDIA : Select Bibliography
—NINETEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH LITERARY WORKS : A Bibliography of Rare Books Available in India

Salamatullah Khan :
—EMILY DICKINSON
—MILTON AND THE DEVIL'S PARTY

O. P. Govil :
—BROWNING'S POETICS

H. Raizada :
—R. K. NARAYAN
—THE LOTUS AND THE ROSE : Indian Fiction in English (1859-1947)

A. U. Tariq :
—OLIVER GOLDSMITH : The Man and the Poet

Maqbool H. Khan :
—EDWARD DOWDEN'S SHAKESPEARIAN CRITICISM
—SHAKESPEARE'S 'PERICLES' AND OTHER STUDIES

Mohammad Yasin :
—CONRAD'S THEORY OF FICTION

Z. A. Usmani :
—SHAKESPEARIAN AND OTHER ESSAYS

Iqbal Hasan :
—ROBERT BRIDGES : A CRITICAL STUDY

Iqbal A. Ansari :
—USES OF ENGLISH

Reg. No. 29062/76

Department of English
Aligarh Muslim University
PUBLICATIONS :

ESSAYS ON JOHN MILTON
edited by A. A. Ansari

Milton's compelling genius has elicited admiration down the ages, and this notwithstanding the occasional dissent. It is now felt that the denigration of Milton earlier in the twentieth century was actually directed against nineteenth century 'reading' of his poetry. The collection of essays, originally read at a seminar organised by the English Department, is a contribution towards a re-assessment of Milton.

1975 *Rs. 40.00*

ESSAYS ON JOHN DONNE
edited by A. A. Ansari

The essays in this volume cover a wide range of subjects—Donne's social milieu, his verse-letters, Donne the preacher, his divine and love poetry. Originally contributed to a seminar in celebration of the quater-centenary of Donne's birth.

1975 *Rs. 18.00*

ESSAYS ON WORDSWORTH
edited by A. A. Ansari

A collection of critical essays on different facets of Wordsworth's poetic genius.

1973 *Rs. 12.00*

Printed at : International Printing Press, Aligarh