

1984

## Book Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

(1984) "Book Reviews," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 19: Iss. 1.

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol19/iss1/18>

This Book Reviews is brought to you by the Scottish Literature Collections at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Studies in Scottish Literature by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu).

## Book Reviews



David Daiches. *Literature and Gentility in Scotland*. Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press. 1982. 114 pp.

Professor Daiches' argument may be summarized briefly thus. Scottish literature resembles other European literatures in that it demonstrates the transition from an aristocratic ideal of courtliness to a bourgeois ideal of gentility. The first is shown in the work of Alexander Scott (c. 1515-1582), and in the work of the "Castalian Band" of courtier poets who followed the precepts of James VI in *Ane schort treatise: containing some reulis and cautelis to be observit and eschewit in Scottish poesie* (1584). This tradition was broken by the departure of James and his court to England in 1603. During the seventeenth century, Scottish poets who aspired to a courtly norm (Ayton, Drummond, Montrose) wrote in English. During the eighteenth century, the situation became more complicated, as linguistic uncertainty increased. Scots was "no longer a literary language but a vernacular that a writer would only use when deliberately trying to imitate popular speech" (p. 37). "Sprinkled Scots" is a feature of Scots songs throughout the eighteenth century, and "this is not a use of Scots as a confident poetic language of its own" (p. 49). "Most Scots wrote in standard English but spoke and (as

Edwin Muir argued in a famous passage) felt in Scots, so that their use of English can in a sense be compared with the use of Latin by Renaissance Humanists" (p. 54), and "poetry, where reason and emotion must go together, requires a language in which the whole man can speak" (p. 55). Because Scots was possible only as a language in which to imitate popular speech, the whole man could not use it; Scottish poetry as a consequence "did not mutate from the courtly to the refined or from aristocratic kinds of wit to middle-class kinds of elegance or from the heroic to the mock-heroic in a development that one might call organic, or at least that one might safely correlate with the changing pattern of the social and cultural scene" (p. 53). The result was the "gentility" illustrated by extracts from Ramsay, the letters of Burns, and elsewhere, a gentility from which the poetry of Fergusson is at least partly free. The Moderatism in church politics with which it was associated increasingly became the mark of the conformist, no longer concerned with cultural independence, represented by the Disruption of 1843.

Eighteenth century gentility was often combined with drunkenness, bawdry and coarse speech. The nineteenth century attempted to keep them separate in a way which inevitably weakened Scots poetry still further--to the level of *Whistlebinkie*, and the sentimentality of the kailyard novelists. Signs of revolt against the kailyard may be seen in George Douglas Brown and J. MacDougall Hay; against respectability and ideals of bourgeois success in Stevenson. The real revolt, however, "is associated with a contempt for the Establishment as representing a genteel anglicising of Scottish life and culture and a suspicion of all established reputations" (p. 92). Daiches is referring, of course, to Hugh MacDiarmid (1892-1978), for whom "any variety of the genteel tradition, including the debased post-Burns Scots tradition, was...no tradition at all, only a pretence of one" (p. 97). On the next page the thesis of the entire book is summarized: "We can see what happened, but what happened is not the mutations of a tradition: it is a series of compensations for a lack of one, or a series of adjustments between an English tradition and the orts and fragments of a Scottish tradition, or a precariously balanced personal tightrope-walking act." The book ends with some consideration of Sydney Goodsir Smith and Robert Garioch.

This extended summary may not be entirely fair, although I have done my best to make it so. The sequence of Professor Daiches' ideas is difficult to follow, at least partly because he often seems more interested in the illustrations (often brilliant, occasionally commonplace) which he advances, than in the argument which he intends them to illustrate. It must be said, too, that the argument itself has many obviously

unsatisfactory features. Gentility, for instance, is not the same as the genteel, and quite different from sentimentality, yet Daiches appears to accept an indiscriminate equation of the three concepts. An attempt to show how one emerged from the other, or how they grew in parallel, would have been eminently worthwhile, but the reader will look in vain for it in this book. There is also present a notable failure to compare like with like; see for instance the comparison on pp. 37-40 between Robert Sempill of Beltress' poem on Habbie Simson and some lines from Alexander Scott's "How suld my febill body fure?", a comparison much to the detriment of Sempill, and his literary use of language. It is however entirely improper; one poem is a comic mock-elegy, the other an elaborate lyric dismissal of love; the use of language, naturally enough, differs, but in context one is as effective as the other. Daiches is contrasting kinds rather than poems. The same comment might be made when he remarks (p. 54) that Ramsay's stanzas on the dead Maggy Johnstoun, who kept a pub just south of Edinburgh, are "a far cry from the courtly Scots of Alexander Scott." One should not forget that Scott wrote not songs only, but also "The Justing and Debait up at the Drum betuix William Adamson and Johine Sym," or that Dunbar, despite Professor Daiches a more typical court poet than Scott, also wrote mock epitaphs and celebrated the low life of Edinburgh in vigorous urban Scots.

Professor Daiches' treatment of early Scottish literature is curiously partial. I have myself written appreciatively of Scott, but why is he taken as the supreme example of courtly literature in Scotland, when he has so many predecessors, even in the lyric, to say nothing of the more extended works of Gavin Douglas, Dunbar, James I, even Barbour and Blind Harry? Courtly poetry includes, but is not limited to, song and song-related forms such as the sonnet.

The weakest moment in Professor Daiches' book is probably where he turns from an appreciative discussion of Fergusson's poetry to a dismissive account of Burns's letters, which he sees as irremediably genteel--save, that is to say, for one, the letter in Scots to William Nicol, describing his journey on horseback to Dumfries. "Only in one surviving letter do we find him writing as he spoke" is the comment. But the letter is surely caricature of country talk, intended for Nicol's amusement, not a specimen of Burns's normal conversation? It is to be compared with the letter written by Stevenson in the character of Johnstone to his friend Baxter (Thomson), quoted on pp. 82-3. Even this, however, is not my main complaint: it is rather that, to make a point, Daiches in effect ignores the poetry of Burns, and so misses the genuine organic development from the courtly in Scottish poetry--not to a bourgeois

gentility, but to something best described as radical or even republican, and exemplified in "Holy Willie's Prayer," "Tam o' Shanter," and "Love and Liberty." These poems are equally far removed from courtliness or gentility, although they make use of forms often in England associated with the latter especially. "Tam o' Shanter" is a mock-heroic, perhaps the supreme eighteenth-century example of the form, constructed in terms, not of aristocratic society, which it ignores, but the life of the Scottish peasantry. Holy Willie is not a prince of the universal church, but an elder of the kirk from Mauchline; he is nevertheless as universal as any hypocritical churchman condemned to Hell by Dante. The beggars in "Love and Liberty" are types of natural man, "the thing itself," as much as poor Tom in *King Lear*. In this context, aristocracy and gentility are irrelevant terms.

The disappearance of the court in 1603 obviously was a factor in the eventual production of such literature in Scotland, literature which is not limited to poetry, but also finds expression in the prose of the historical novel as established by Scott and Galt, neither of whom Professor Daiches discusses. The Scottish political tradition also owes much to this development, and it is certainly a link between Burns and MacDiarmid.

There are many incidental points on which I should like to take issue with Professor Daiches, but space forbids. The book contains a surprising number of misprints which once or twice distort or make nonsense of the content. As a whole, the book is not sufficiently rigorous to do justice to the subject which it proposes.

JOHN MacQUEEN  
*University of Edinburgh*

Arthur Melville Clark. *Murder under Trust or The topical Macbeth and other Jacobean matters*. Edinburgh. Scottish Academic Press. 1981. 208 pp.

Professor Clark worked on his book "intermittently, during forty years or more" (p. ix) impelled by his conviction that the Scottishness of *Macbeth* was not achieved by Shakespeare "from his imagination working on secondary sources" (p. 187) nor yet indicates lack of first hand experience of Scotland and its people. Rather, in his view, Shakespeare was almost obsessively occupied to plumb the character of the man who, in the first years of the seventeenth century, the world knew would become the English monarch. Interest alone did not send

him to Edinburgh in 1601 at James's invitation. Shakespeare, it is suggested, found it expedient to avoid London after the Chamberlain's company's performance of *Richard II*--a play which represented the forced abdication of an anointed monarch--on the Saturday before Essex's abortive uprising, even though the Privy Council dealt leniently with the Company. The author refers to "a tradition, which I see no reason to doubt, linking King James in a personal relationship" (p. 188); it was founded on the report of a letter, "now lost," in an advertisement to Lintot's 1709-10 edition of Shakespeare's *Poems*. If the relationship existed in 1601 it left no evidence after James became king in 1603 and D.H. Willson (*King James VI and I*, 1956) is apparently right about James in concluding that there was "little indication that he was interested in serious drama or that he detected the genius of Shakespeare." Indeed, "his taste in drama ran to clever satire and low comedy" (p. 191). These are not trivial matters. Apart from Shakespeare's thorough mastery of several recondite technicalities of Scots law, treated of in detail in chapter 3, and his use of those clever touches of local color which could only have arisen from personal experience (one is obligated to wonder whether the dramatist dabbled in witchcraft also, so convincing are his three sisters), Professor Clark's thesis obliges him to place Shakespeare at Holyroodhouse where alone he could have consulted the unique manuscript of William Stewart's *Buik of the Cronicles of Scotland* from which, as Mrs. C.C. Stopes suggested earlier, the playwright drew elements of the characterization of Macbeth and his wife for which there is no warrant in Holinshed's *Chronicle*.

The necessity for Shakespeare's Scottish visit--which is unknown to history--is not the main reason why Professor Clark rejects the conventional dating of *Macbeth*'s composition in 1606 in favor of 1601, although it is an important tactical consideration in the conduct of his argument. His principal finding is that Shakespeare was impelled to offer a tribute to his future king on the occasion of James's delivery from the Gowrie Conspiracy of August 5th, 1600, a date observed by James henceforth with solemn thanksgiving. The details of the affair even now, despite or perhaps on account of, the large number of contemporary accounts, are obscure. Unlike Guy Fawkes's later plot, knowledge of the incident has not survived in popular history; a brief account may be supplied from Willson:

On the morning of August 5th, 1600, the King was hunting near Falkland; that after the kill he rode to Gowrie House at Perth with Alexander, the Master of Ruthven, younger brother of the Earl of Gowrie;

that after dinner, James and the Master being withdrawn from the rest of the company, the Master assaulted the King; that James in terror shrieked for help; and that his attendants rushing to his assistance slaughtered both the Master of Ruthven and the Earl his brother. (pp. 126-7)

Professor Clark remarks justly that *Macbeth* shows little resemblance to the 1605 Gunpowder Plot but claims "extraordinary parallelism between the play and the Gowrie Conspiracy" (p. 180) on the basis of which the play must be dated 1601. I have two particular difficulties with his argument, aside from the fact that it totally ignores the considerable evidence for the late date marshalled by Sassenachs, it is true, but usually accepted by Highlanders. Whereas a play may be based on an incident in contemporary history, or an occasion may give rise to plays intended to capitalize on the interest of the event, they are rare in early English dramatic history. Dramatists were given little scope to treat of current affairs and when they did it was usually gingerly, with the events shadowed forth obscurely. On the other hand topical references to contemporary or notorious figures and events in plays not structured on a historical event are fairly common. Professor Clark notices many such references in Shakespeare's plays. The topicality of *Macbeth*, despite his arguments, seems to be of the last kind rather than the first, and it does not seem surprising to me that a play like *Macbeth* (written perhaps when the playwright's attention to the succession of Scots kings had been stimulated by the Gunpowder Plot) should make similar incidental reference to events which were partly analogous to those of his own plot.

Furthermore, even if the Gowrie Conspiracy did provide the originating occasion for the play's composition, it is difficult to understand how James would be complimented by the description and display of the cruel slaughter of two of his illustrious forbears, or Shakespeare so insensitive as to offer the show in response to James's invitation, and, secondly, if James had indeed escaped a murderous conspiracy in 1600, incomprehensible why the next year he would have been gratified by the performance of a successful one in which, moreover, such is the dramatist's art, he must have identified himself with the figure of the murdered king.

Apart from all this, the special interest of the Gowrie plot and *Macbeth*, as the author shows at length, is that they both involve "murder under trust or *homicidium sub praetextu amicitiae*," a particularly heinous offense in Scots law. However, it is certainly no more serious than the treasonous murder of a king. The author's treatment of the legality

demonstrates how far he has moved over his many years study from *Macbeth* as a play. Shakespeare wants "to make absolutely clear to his audience the criminal category of murder under trust" (p. 181) as if this were a chief or essential part of Shakespeare's design. Rather, it merely contributes to his rendering of the enormity of Duncan's murder, an event he regarded as of more spiritual than criminal significance. Apparently, too, Shakespeare would have found disapprobation of a host murdering a guest only in a number of contemporary Scots statutes and proclamations.

Despite the author's evident scholarship, his thesis will not be widely accepted. Readers will remark that the latest book to which he refers is apparently Halliday's *Shakespeare Companion* (1952). It would be tedious to note which of the sources he used have been supplanted in recent years. He cites *Macbeth* from the 1893 Warwick edition by E.K. Chambers. Kenneth Muir's New Arden edition (1951), the extensive discussion of *Macbeth* in J.M. Nosworthy's *Shakespeare's Occasional Plays* (1965) and H.N. Paul's *The Royal Play of "Macbeth"* (1950) are but three of the modern works apparently not used for Professor Clark's study. The saddest omission is the untimely publication for *Murder under Trust* of Stanley J. Kozikowski's "The Gowie Conspiracy Against James VI: A New Source for Shakespeare's *Macbeth*" (*Shakespeare Studies XIII* [1980], 197-212) which relates perhaps all that modern Shakespearian scholarship need know of the Gowie affair.

T.H. HOWARD-HILL

*University of South Carolina*

*The Party-coloured Mind: Prose Relating to the Conflict of Church and State in Seventeenth Century Scotland.* Ed. David Reid. Edinburgh. Scottish Academic Press, for The Association for Scottish Literary Studies. 1982. x + 222 pp.

Why, in the seventeenth century, did Scotland produce "so much religious and ecclesiastical writing and so little of real literary value?" That question is posed by Dr. Reid in his introduction to an anthology focusing on Scottish ecclesiastical politics. But the literary quality must be assessed in the context of the linguistic development of the Scottish nation. Most of the serious prose writing of the sixteenth century, whether political thought or history, had been in the Latin of John Major, Hector Boece and George Buchanan. The native Scottish tongue, while it had proved versatile and flexible enough in the verse of Henryson, Dunbar, Douglas and



Lindsay, and could furnish racy narrative prose in translations of Boece, had not yet been adapted to the style deemed appropriate for such lofty themes as philosophy and theology. Thus, as the country came increasingly under anglicizing pressure with the Reformation and the union of the crowns, Scots who essayed such subjects and decided to desert Latin were apt to turn to an English in which some of them were not completely at home. The foundation of a healthy tradition in historiography had been laid, especially in Knox's *History of the Reformation*, which might have been called "Memoirs of his own time," and in Sir James Melville's work, which is called "Memoirs of his own time"; but the anglicized Knox and the cosmopolitan Melville both wrote in something like English. Probably both of them would have disclaimed that they were writing literary history on a wide canvas in the manner of Major or Buchanan, for which they would have thought Latin more suitable.

Several of the writers from whose works Dr. Reid has made selections continued the succession of memoirs, for the Rev. James Melville, David Calderwood, Johnston of Wariston, Robert Baillie, Gilbert Burnet and James Kirkton all wrote accounts of contemporary events. However, those who now turned to the vernacular for their polemics, their political theorizing and their sermons had less of a tradition behind them and deserve credit as in some sense pioneers. Dr. Reid writes with something like disappointment about the failure to develop a prose which "unites plainness and vigour with ease and amenity" and he contends that although there was "a workmanlike plain style" it lacked "any pretension to elegance" except in so far as "literary elegance was something stuck on." True, if elegance is the yardstick, then seventeenth century Scots on the whole fails. Yet it is not without its qualities. All the writers had a wide vocabulary, based on their study of the classics, scripture and English literature, and the best of them had the command of cadence and balance, the dignified marshalling of words and phrases, which make fine prose. Dr. Reid admits that a sermon of the Presbyterian Hugh Binning and a piece of the *Apology* of the Quaker Robert Barclay "would surely have a place in an ideal anthology of seventeenth century English prose as noble examples of the intelligence of the time."

While the selection focuses on the great debate over the claims of church and state and the rights and wrongs of bishops and presbyteries, it ranges far beyond polemics. The extracts are not mere snippets, but can run to a dozen pages or more, and they present rich variety: vigorous narrative and lively dialogue in James Melville, Calderwood and Kirkton; character sketches of contemporaries by Gilbert Burnet; a

"sober and vigorous essay on government" formerly attributed to the Marquis of Montrose but now believed to have been written by Lord Napier. There is little that can be called theology, but there are religious themes only tenuously linked with the great debate. Hugh Binning, though a member of the radical wing of the Covenanters, displayed "a much finer spirit at work" than did his fellow-radicals Archibald Johnston and Samuel Rutherford and "shows the seventeenth century Calvinist mind at its best." A passage in his sermon on "God is a Spirit" reads: "Prayer in your family is a more substantial worship than to sit and hear prayer in public, and prayer in secret is more substantial than that"--an emphasis hard to reconcile with the current obsession with organized religion and with ecclesiastical politics. It is less surprising that Leighton, a moderate who reluctantly accepted a bishopric, pronounced conscience to be "the clearest beam of divine light and of the image of God in the soul of man." Nor do we find politics in the *Apology* of Barclay, in whose clear logic and reasoning one can see the intellectual appeal of Quakerism.

Even among the polemicists the moderates receive generous space. This is not because they necessarily wrote better prose, for the extremists could rise to something like eloquence precisely because they were deeply moved and enthusiastic: it is no accident that passages from Johnston are characterized as representing "private rapture" and "public rapture." Rutherford, whose prose is aptly styled "tumultuary," was carried away into imagery verging on the erotic. Even the more sober Calderwood owes some of the quality of his narrative to his strong convictions on the controversy over kneeling at Communion. But moderates did not allow their party affiliations to befog a vision of the rule of law as something not to be set aside in favor of private judgment. Leighton said there were those who magnified their own consciences "against the express laws of Jesus Christ" and he warned them not to expect to engage with impunity in rebellion simply because, as they would have said, "We did it according to our conscience." Almost like Elizabeth Tudor, who would not "make windows into men's souls," Leighton observed that "a man is not properly punished for his conscience, but for the evil, external acts of a wicked conscience." He saw the absurdity of the Covenanters' concept of the struggle as one between "King Jesus" and "King Charles" and, bearing in mind the injunction in Romans 13 to be "subject unto the higher powers," he declared that "such who now teach that Christian magistrates may be resisted, let them consider whether they be not preaching another gospel than Paul taught." He had no patience with those who argued that "if things be not modelled

and managed according to their foolish ridiculous fancies, those in authority are quite wrong and they cannot in conscience obey them." Barclay, a Quaker less tied to the letter of the Bible than Bishop Leighton was, denounced those who justified their wicked deeds not by their conscience but by quoting scripture.

Some other writers--mostly laymen--were even more detached than the moderates among the clerics. Sir George Mackenzie, with the cool approach of a lawyer and scholar, showed some skepticism about the rival ideologies which in turn prevailed: "Are we not ready to condemn today as phanatick what yesterday was judged *jure divino*?"; and he warned that probably more souls were damned by men taking arms and meeting "unprepared death in the fields" than were saved by attending churches under compulsion. Drummond of Hawthornden predicted the disastrous disappointment in store for the Covenanters when they joined the English rebels in the fatuous expectation that the latter would impose Presbyterianism on England. Sir Thomas Urquhart disliked Presbyterians because they undermined the status of the upper classes by making them "to stand before them on penitentiary pews." Gilbert Burnet, a moderate conservative who became a bishop, could hardly share laymen's skepticism about religious issues, but he was skeptical enough about the claims made for the antiquity of the Scottish royal line and its indefeasible right to rule.

Many of the authors produce phrases memorable for their aptness. Kirkton observed how ministers who accepted a compromise were restrained from "watering the dissatisfied party." Mackenzie took up the metaphor of Christ and His spouse the Church, with a quaint turn of words: "it were absurd to think that He will divorce her upon every error, especially seeing His blessed mouth hath told us that it is not lawful to divorce upon all occasions." Baillie accused the English of ostentation: "Ye know that the English sumptuositie both in warre and peace is despysed by all their neighbours." Even Urquhart's conceits could express profound truths: a union with England was to be "not heterogeneal, as timber and stone upon ice stick sometimes together, bound by the frost of a conquering sword, but homogeneated by naturalisation and the mutual enjoyment of the same privileges." Mackenzie described the Scottish Church as "tortured like Rebecca by carrying struggling twins in her pained bowels."

Those acquainted with the general range of writings of the period cannot fail to be struck by the recurrence of certain key words or phrases. "Fundamental laws," mentioned in Napier's "Essay on Government," were to be regularly appealed to by both parties after the Restoration; the "ends of government" of which Burnet spoke were to turn up again when the

Claim of Right roundly condemned James VII for "inverting all the ends of government"; Urquhart's reference to "preaching to the times" recalls Leighton's protest that if all other ministers "preached up the times, you may surely allow one poor brother to preach up Christ and eternity." One would like to know who first coined such phrases. James VI, alluding to the presumption of ministers, remarked, "Surely there is more pride under such a one's bonnet nor under great Alexander's diadem"; and this was echoed by Drummond: "There is more pride to be found under a monk's cowl and a broad jesuitical hat than under the fairest crested helms and the richest diadems of princes." Writers of that period unquestionably enriched the language.

Dr. Reid has his own gift for the apt expression and introduces a phrase or two which historians will cherish. "Mal-adroit" is a good word to use of Charles I's mismanagement, and the remark, "it is not possible to be tolerant of intolerance" suggests that Scotland was as ungovernable under Charles II as Ulster is today. His introduction is a comprehensive and penetrating survey of both the matter and the style of his authors; his biographical notes on the writers, sketching the historical background, are sound, judicious and perceptive; and he provides numerous notes to explain details. He observes acutely that when we have no original MS in the author's hand and a published version belonging to a period before the printing of texts came under scholarly discipline, we cannot be confident about the original words and phraseology. He therefore went to original editions and not infrequently to MSS, and, while modernizing punctuation and capitals, retained the original spelling.

It thus becomes possible to trace the progressive anglicization of the language. The minister James Melville, whose autobiography comes first in the anthology, wrote in unmistakable Scots. His contemporary David Hume of Godscroft (whom Dr. Reid quotes) defended the use of the Scots language, but the significant fact is that it was now thought to need defense. Robert Baillie, a minister of the next generation, wrote almost pure English, and his straightforward and direct narrative would hardly be amiss in the twentieth century. Among the post-Restoration authors, the field-preacher Peden, with his homely imagery, uses Scots words which the more polished would have despised, but his sermons may have been printed from notes taken by one of his hearers and it is impossible to be confident that the preacher's own words have been faithfully preserved. The final extract in the book, from Archibald Pitcairne's *The Assembly: or Scottish Reformation*, where a kind of caricatured Scots is put into the mouths of presbyterian divines, demonstrates that the Scots tongue

had come to be regarded with contempt. On the other side, Cilbert Burnet and Robert Leighton seem to have found their English accent a handicap in their dealings with their fellow-Scots, though they might have been encouraged by the example of John Knox. The episcopalian apologist Sage also wrote English, but he seems stilted, possibly because, as he was writing for English readers to excite their sympathy for the persecuted episcopalians in Scotland, he may have affected an English style which was not natural to him.

Dr. Reid's enterprise in extending literary studies to writings usually regarded as "historical sources" rather than as "literature" might well be carried farther. Apart from other candidates for inclusion, such as King James himself, Bishop Cowper, Archbishop Spottiswoode, Alexander Petrie and Henry Scougal, legal documents and formal records of the period can illuminate the development of the language, and official productions such as proclamations have a literary quality not to be despised.

GORDON DONALDSON

*Dysart, Fife*

*Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature (Medieval and Renaissance)*. Ed. Roderick J. Lyall and Felicity Riddy. Stirling/Glasgow. 1981. 456 pp.

Collections of conference papers are by their very nature uneven works, glittering new insights sitting next to further re-framings of the already obvious; accounts of projects which will last decades sharing space with hurriedly assembled articles, composed so that their authors might get their grant to come to the conference in the first place. To this general rule, the present collection proves no exception. Excellent articles there are, and on these I shall concentrate, but there were also rather many which showed a failure to keep up with recent criticism and owed their presence to the editors' generous policy of accepting all those offered.

The overall balance--something of course over which no one has any control--was rather disappointing. Just one article (a good one) on Gaelic; not a single discussion of Montgomerie or the other Castalians but the usual heavy emphasis on Henryson and Dunbar. Would it not be a splendid idea if the Fourth Conference forbade papers on these two masters, allowing them to re-appear some years hence, when people had really had time to digest the vast amount of material which has recently appeared concerning them?

Of the five major papers, I found A.J. Aitken's "*DOST: How we make it and what's in it*" and D.E.R. Watt's "Editing Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon*" the most interesting and informative. Both are, of course, really accounts of work in progress. The value of each for Scottish studies is immeasurable and it is sad to learn that economic pressures beset the first, while the second has not even found a publisher. After coming to appreciate the vast organization and skill that has gone into the creation of *DOST* it seems no less than a tragedy that lack of support has forced a perfectionist of Jack Aitken's calibre to conclude that the last third of the dictionary will have to be completed in "a somewhat makeshift" manner.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the *Scotichronicon* meets with a more enthusiastic response. Professor Watt sees it as "the greatest work of literature produced in Scotland in the Middle Ages" and if other competitors for that honor spring to mind, few can disagree that it is a brilliantly executed composition on a grand scale, which at the moment is known only to a few scholars because of the lack of an accurate edition and (for the non-Latinists) an adequate translation. In its pages we learn how Scotland's past was interpreted in the mid-fifteenth century, but we also see the problems of the present as faced by "an Augustinian abbot who was in the thick of affairs and knew what was going on." Professor Watt and his fellow editors are facing up to the many problems posed by so massive a work with honesty and fortitude. They are refusing to take any of the tempting shortcuts which would render their work easier and briefer, so that in the end we shall (hopefully) have a fully authoritative edition, whose value to scholars of varying disciplines will be inestimable.

The credit for producing the most ambitious title of the major papers must go to W.S. Ramson with "The Northern Imagination: its Defence against the Common Pursuit of the Renaissance." His thesis is a challenging one--that northern artists had "an empirical mode of thinking and working, established modes of expression; all of which were in many ways antithetical to Italian humanism." It is an idea with which I have some sympathy but, as Dr. Ramson partly admits, it cannot be established in the rigidly eclectic manner he opts for--comparing a very small group of Flemish painters with some Scottish poets. He is on safest ground when discussing Bannatyne's vision of "Divine Comedy," an argument more fully developed in his book *The Poetry of the Stewart Court*, but elsewhere his approach is too narrow and impressionistic. The best that may be said is that he gives some valuable leads but much more research is required before his "suggestions" can truly be said to formulate a thesis.

Matthew McDiarmid's "The Scottish Ballads: Appreciation

and Explication" demonstrates that a sensitive critic can profitably use a close reading technique to expand our awareness of narrative works whose major charm is their simplicity. An informed account of the Ballad's history in Scotland leads into analyses of "Sir Patrick Spence" and "Tam Lyn" among others. McDiarmid's greatest success is that somehow he manages to draw in his own knowledge without making the criticism "overweigh" the poems. Thus for example he notes that when Janet learns

Ay at the end of seven years  
We pay a teind to hell,

this refers to a tradition reported by King James in his *Daemonologie*. The challenge for anyone following his example will be to remain on this narrow path between mere re-telling and the introduction of irrelevant erudition.

Douglas Gray prefaces his study of "endings" in Henryson's fables with a valuable and wide-ranging discussion of medieval rhetorical theory. He discusses different types of closure--the closure of stanza, of formal speeches and of scenes for example--and the very variety of Henryson's techniques gives his essay a rambling appearance, which in fact is necessary if full measure is to be given to the poet's art. My major frustration was that he dwelt so briefly on the Moralitates, which are after all in one sense the real "endings" to the fables. He is right to emphasize Henryson's determination only to give "one possible" rather than "the comprehensive" meaning and that idea could profitably have been developed. Perhaps limitation of time was the true villain here.

Of the major papers, I have left Mrs. Bawcutt's to the end because it poses for me peculiar problems. I have always preferred Mrs. Bawcutt in positive rather than negative mood. In "Source-Hunting: Some Reulis and Coutelis" the positive contribution consists of seven basic rules to be observed by the comparative critic. The negative contribution consists of severe strictures on three articles which, according to her, ignore some of these rules. Now two of these are early articles of mine and I confess that after listening to the paper I felt that the only honest options open to me were suicide or taking up bricklaying. Having now had time to re-read my contributions, I feel that I may continue, chastized but relatively unbowed. I accept a number of Mrs. Bawcutt's reservations and objections but feel that in both cases she has lessened the force of my arguments by taking them somewhat out of context. In my discussion of *Reason and Sensuallyte* in relation to *The Goldyn Targe*, I was heavily influenced by René Wellek's contention that a series of similarities following

one another provide a strong argument for influence. I did not therefore propose that the ship in Dunbar's poem was suggested by Lydgate simply because "there is ships in both," but because in each poem we have in turn descriptions of nature *and* a ship *and* a list of goddesses, the last of which still seems to me (through the mention of Phoebus and other details) to account for Dunbar's choice of goddesses and erroneous inclusion of Apollo. On the second comparison between Drummond and Fowler, I feel Mrs. Bawcutt's arguments have more weight but it should be noted that I was arguing for a continued influence throughout the two sequences and that I had admitted that any imitation from one Scots poem to another would necessarily go along with variations of the sort she rightly points out (see my "Drummond of Hawthornden: the Major Scottish Sources," *SSL*, 6 [1968], 46). Therefore, while confessing that there are weaknesses in both articles, I find their overall arguments a good deal stronger than Mrs. Bawcutt would allow.

Of the remaining papers I was particularly impressed by J.D. McClure's careful study of the usage of "Scottis," "Inglish" and "Suddroun" as language labels through the centuries. His claim that a study of these words gives us valuable clues to changing linguistic attitudes is fully borne out by his numerous examples and makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of what has been, until now, a perplexing problem.

Finally, I move to two essays which succeeded in making me turn again in more benevolent mood to two authors, whose work I had hitherto dismissed as third rate. Margaret Mackay's study of the structure and language of Holland's *Buke of the Howlat* is thoroughly convincing, although I wish she had spent more time discussing the exact thematic relationship between the section dealing with Douglas and the rest of the poem. An even more heroic effort is that of David W. Atkinson in his reassessment of Zachary Boyd. One feels that he should be awarded laurels simply for having read all of that gentleman's voluminous works. Some of his conclusions:

But the religious dramas do possess a very definite sense of dialogue, a striking sense of psychological realism, and an astute understanding of the trials of spiritual life

Boyd does possess very real talents as a poet

still strike me as overly generous. But I am more than willing to agree that we should not wait for a hundred years and



a re-dusting of the volumes before another re-assessment appears.

R.D.S. JACK  
*University of Edinburgh*

*Edwin Muir: Uncollected Scottish Criticism.* Ed. and introd. by Andrew Noble. London. Vision Press. Totowa, N.J. Barnes and Noble. 1982. 269 pp.

The reader who wants to understand the literary accomplishments of Edwin Muir must be aware of the writer's relationship to Scotland. It embodies ambiguities and contradictions that baffle most Americans and Englishmen unless, perhaps, they too have grown up in a provincial community that steadfastly held on to a way of life by resisting outside influences. Perhaps if they have studied the other expatriate writers of the 1920s, they can begin to understand the need for a larger horizon that drove Edwin and Willa Muir from their native land and kept them living outside Scotland for many years. Such readers can also understand why the expatriate life, so necessary at a particular stage in Edwin's intellectual development, could not continue to sustain him, and why ultimately he had to return to his homeland. After more than fifteen years in Europe and England, he returned in the 1930s to live in Scotland, bringing with him the new ideas he had gained in his larger environment and from his involvement with avant-garde literature. These ideas were anathema to those who had remained at home and who felt that the intensity of their concentration on Scottish matters should be exclusive of any larger focus. Like other adventurers into the outside world, Muir found that his homecoming in the 1930s--and again in the 1950s--occasioned scorn, actual physical hardships, and, finally, dismissal. Indeed, after his difficulties at Newbattle Abbey, he left Scotland for good in 1955 and his death came to him in Cambridgeshire where, reassured by the acclaim of his reception at Harvard, he lived out of reach of Scottish provincial attitudes.

Now Scottish intellectuals are reconsidering the value of Muir's contribution to the national life and are bringing out new editions of his books concerning Scotland. Both the 1936 travel book *Scottish Journey* and the 1932 novel *Poor Tom* have been reprinted, the first with an introduction by T.C. Smout (Edinburgh, 1979), and the second with an introduction by Muir's biographer and editor of the *Selected Letters*, P.H. Butter (Edinburgh, 1982). In the volume here noticed Andrew

Noble has brought together pieces by Muir which (in the main) have never been reprinted and which have only been available to readers with access to a research library with extensive periodical holdings.

Obviously the potential value of such a volume is great. Yet *Edwin Muir: Uncollected Scottish Criticism* is a rather different book from what the title promises. The first quarter of the volume consists of Noble's introduction in which he declares that his "purpose...has been to demonstrate Muir's life as that of a modern writer of genius in a Scottish society which did little to nourish him and much to thwart and impede....I have developed an account of Muir's historical vision of the misalliances between the Scottish writer and his society." Noble concentrates on Muir the critic and refers only to poems in which Muir makes explicit, verbal references to Scotland. Since Noble aims to see Muir as a commentator on Scotland, he should not be blamed for passing over Muir's primary claim to fame, although his point of view indicates a self-imposed limitation. Noble is on the right side, but too often his point of view, as expressed here, is hedged in by parochial concerns. Further, his desire to defeat the provincial attitudes which he sees as opposing the Scottish writer does not allow him to treat Muir with the discrimination that the poet's genius deserves. Muir's understanding of Scottish matters developed through the forty-three years that he expressed himself in print, yet Noble uses the attitude of any given occasion as if it were Muir's only point of view. Such a practice obscures the richness of Muir's vision, for the paradoxes inherent in some of his ideas indicate the maturity of a thinker who has realized that not even the intellect of a Scotsman can resolve the paradoxes of life. Indeed, Noble's introduction often reads as though he wrote it first as a defense of the Scottish writer in general, Muir being the primary example, and then he tacked on the collection of critical pieces to his monograph. Thus while Noble appears to be expanding his gathering of Muir's work by quoting extensively from pieces other than those which are reprinted, he also gives about five pages of quotations from the collected pieces.

Noble also discusses Muir's main books on Scotland--*John Knox* (1929), *Scottish Journey* (1935), and *Scott and Scotland* (1936), but he never backs away from his specific arguments to give his reader a sense of Muir's engagement with the matter of Scotland. Surely it is significant that with only a very few exceptions Muir only wrote about Scotland in the course of his life as a professional journalist who earned his living by his pen. This fact has no necessarily negative bearing on the quality of his work (in one sense it actually

guarantees its value); but it explains the quantity and occasion of much of the writing reprinted here. Nor does Noble acknowledge that Muir incorporated material from some of these pieces in the three books on Scotland. Surely the conscientious editor should not silently put brief book reviews written against rigid space limitations side by side with contemplative essays written to express the critic's deep-held convictions. The editor of an anthology influences the reader first by his selection (Noble reprints about half of all of Muir's uncollected pieces on Scotland but never explains the basis of his selection or gives an account of what he omits), and second by his notes which provide the context against which the pieces must be seen. But Noble stopped working after he selected the pieces to be reprinted. For example, he quotes a brief review which Muir wrote in 1933 of a collection of academic lectures with a preface by Professor Grierson; but he does not give the significant fact that this generally negative review is one of the few unsigned reviews which Muir published after he made a name for himself as a critic.

Noble's primary concern with "the Scottish writer and his society" rather than with Edwin Muir is further shown by the arrangement of the thirty-five selections, almost evenly divided between reviews and essays. Noble first gives six pieces on general Scottish topics and then arranges the selections according to the chronology of the subject matter, beginning with a 1937 review of Percy's *John Knox* and ending with a 1943 (cited as "1934") review of Gunn's *The Serpent*. The reader who starts with selection number one will find ten pieces from the 1930s, will leap forward to 1958 with number eleven, back to the 'thirties with the next two, to 1923 with number fourteen--and forward to 1957 with number fifteen. Noble does both the reader and Muir a disservice by this arrangement, for the steady intellectual development of the poet was one of his most significant qualities, as was his constant education of himself. Thus Noble should not present the 1923 essay on George Douglas without acknowledging that the errors and misconceptions in it (actually corrected by a reader in a letter to the editor in the next issue of the journal) illustrate Muir's knowledge at that time, and that Muir wrote it while he was living in Germany and unable to research his information. The essay offers little accurate information for the reader of *The House with the Green Shutters* and only shows the intensity with which Muir consistently considered his topics. Thus, grateful as one is for a gathering of such pieces and for Noble's interesting essay, one wishes that the anthology had been put together with a more professional awareness of readers who might be concerned with more than Noble's single topic.

For the sake of the honor of Scottish printers and makers of books, one is relieved to see that this volume was printed in England, for it has more than its share of typographical errors, including at least six footnote numbers which are incorrectly numbered in the text. The information in the notes is presented in such a variety of forms that one has difficulty in finding all of the facts. They are present, but one must look closely at both text and note itself--except for number 96 (given as "95" in the text): Muir's discussion with V.S. Pritchett on 17 October was the October of 1940. Here is a useful book that could have been more useful and that, with the best of intentions, does not quite measure up to those good intentions.

ELGIN W. MELLOWN  
*Duke University*

Norah Parr. *James Hogg At Home*. Dollar, Scotland. Douglas Mack. 1980. 142 pp.

Mrs. Parr's book is not an academic study. It was originally undertaken for private reasons and circulated in typescript within her family in New Zealand and in Australia. She explains how she began to try "to find out what I could about our less-known ancestors" and, in the process, became interested in James Hogg, her great-grandfather. Her interest was stimulated by unpublished letters in her possession between Hogg and his wife; these form the core of the book and are printed in full, without editorial emendation (the original letters are now in the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington). Douglas Mack who, among others, has urged a thorough re-evaluation of Hogg's largely neglected work, read Mrs. Parr's typescript and turned publisher. "It seemed to me," he writes in a prefatory note, "that it deserved a more general circulation."

Students of Scottish literature generally, and of Hogg's work in particular, will find Mrs. Parr's volume at least a useful source-book throwing further light upon the "real" James Hogg. It is an especially interesting volume in that it covers the period of Hogg's married life (1820 until his death in 1835)--a period roughly co-extensive with that of the *Noctes Ambrosianae*, that highly popular series of sketches which did nothing to advance Hogg's critical fortunes. In the *Noctes* Hogg appears as a sort of stage comic to be taken seriously neither as a man nor as a writer. When we turn from this image of Hogg and listen to the dialogue between himself and his wife in the letters of Mrs. Parr's book the distortion

of the *Noctes* image is immediately apparent.

Hogg had much less education than Burns--about six months of formal schooling in his entire life, by his own account. He had been obliged by his father's bankruptcy to start work at the age of seven herding cows--a task, he records in his *Memoir*, "the worst and lowest known in our country." It took him several years to rise to "the more honourable [employment] of keeping sheep." When this essentially self-taught writer's poetry began to appear in Edinburgh his lack of formal education and his humble social background provoked the snobbery of "the Athens of the North." John Wilson and John Gibson Lockhart--both of whom Hogg regarded as friends--provided the "Athenians" in the *Noctes* published throughout the 1820's in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (a magazine, ironically, which Hogg had helped to found) with an image of Hogg with which they felt comfortable. It was the image of a country boor who had somehow blundered into print.

Wilson once described Hogg as "a stout country lout, with a bushel of hair on his shoulders that had not been raked for months." He and Lockhart enjoyed themselves in public at Hogg's expense although in dedicating his *Life of Burns* to Hogg as well as to Allan Cunningham (1828) and in declaring in the *Quarterly* in 1831 that Hogg was not the drunken clown of the *Noctes* Lockhart seemed to dissociate himself from the image he had helped to create. But when he wrote his *Life of Scott* Lockhart reverted to his *Noctes* vein depicting Hogg, to quote Douglas Mack, as an "unkempt buffoon reclining on Lady Scott's chintz." It was, ironically, more this impression of Hogg than the merits of his poetry and fiction that made him the talk of the town when in 1832 he visited London to arrange for the publication of his *Altrive Tales*. No doubt influenced by what he had read Carlyle described Hogg at the time as appearing "in the mingled character of Zany and raree show." But Carlyle, himself an able caricaturist, was unsettled by James Hogg in the flesh. He might refer to him condescendingly as a "herd body" but he confided to his notebook his surprise that Hogg "behaves himself quite easily and well." He found Hogg charming, in fact, and asked himself whether his attraction stemmed from the possibility that "he *is* a Product of Nature, and able to speak *naturally*--which not one in the thousand is?"

Modern critics have appreciated the naturalness of Hogg's voice among many that were artificial (Wilson's, for example). They have been concerned with Hogg as he was, not as he was recreated, and so has Hogg's family. In 1884 Mrs. Parr's great-aunt and James Hogg's youngest daughter, Mary Garden, published her *Memorials of James Hogg* though, for some influential writers, the book was not enough to erase the *Noctes*

image which they perpetuated. This is the case with Edith Batho, for instance, who in her book *The Ettrick Shepherd* (1927) takes the grotesque distortions of the *Noctes* as fact and ironically remarks that no one reading Mrs. Garden's *Memorials* "would be likely to suppose that Hogg had any faults except an amusing vanity and perhaps a slight tendency to envy."

By wisely allowing her great-grandparents to speak for themselves Mrs. Parr thereby allows them to reveal their own strengths and weaknesses though she obviously likes the subject of her book. Perhaps the greatest strength both of Hogg and his wife, Margaret, was their capacity for love. Their letters often read like love-letters, especially when one is away from home for any length of time. Then the other writes of disappointment at not receiving a letter, and of longing for reunion. "Why have you not sent me a single line per post or other-wise knowing how much my heart is with you and those in your care," writes James to Margaret when she had to visit Edinburgh to have their daughter Harriet (Mrs. Parr's grandmother), who had a leg ailment, fitted with a steel boot "like the ancient Covenanters." On her part the woman whom Edith Batho loftily terms Hogg's "moral superior," in a letter headed "My dearly beloved," writes "I anxiously expected a letter from you yesterday but got none it is too bad not to write and tell me how you are all, and particularly yourself as you mentioned in your last letter not having been well" (in the manner of the time, neither husband nor wife is much concerned in their correspondence about punctuation).

Although he married late Hogg was a "family man" who needed his wife and children around him in order to be happy. In a letter of December, 1830, he writes to Margaret from Edinburgh: "I find that I cannot live here now unless for two or three unhappy days unless I had my whole family with me and could get my hours of study my nap and my glass with you late at night." His care for others extended beyond his own immediate family. He took care of his aged father; he provided a home for Margaret's parents when they fell upon hard times (an ironic reversal in that James had once regarded Margaret and her parents as his social superiors); and when his brother-in-law died he wrote a compassionate and moving letter to his sister-in-law which goes beyond condolence. It indicates a genuine charity in the widest sense of the word for he offered a home for two of her children and he writes that had he been in better worldly circumstances himself (he, too, had to cope with hard times) "I for one would insist on keeping you and the family in one farm or another."

The James Hogg which the letters printed in Mrs. Parr's book reveal is a warm, compassionate, essentially honorable

should play their part in helping him escape the bondage of a derogatory image.

KEITH COSTAIN  
*University of Regina*

William B. Thesing. *The London Muse: Victorian Poetic Responses to the City*. Athens, Georgia. University of Georgia Press. 1982. xviii + 230 pp.

One welcomes any work that examines relatively unexplored topics and themes, and certainly William Thesing's book is one of these; perhaps one reason for the sense of disappointment that remains after finishing *The London Muse* is the feeling that the writer has missed an opportunity to make a really important contribution to this significant subject. While much of the discussion in the book touches on both poetic response and "the city" in different forms and concepts, there is no real drawing together of "Victorian responses" to the city, as the sub-title promises; and there is certainly no real sense of coming to know what the Victorian poets felt about London or any city in England, cities such as Manchester, Liverpool, or Birmingham. What emerge, instead, are a series of generalizations about what different poets said in different poems concerning their moods and feelings about urban or "non-country," if that is the word, existence. One looks in vain for specific comments and ideas about particular places and locations and ways of life that are, in fact, urban or city or industrial, comments and ideas found in such works as those by Raymond Williams and G. Robert Stange, two great influences on Thesing's study. What one finds, instead, is the very thing the author states at the beginning he will not do: a descriptive catalogue, and certainly not comprehensive, of various responses by different poets to what he calls "the experience of the city." However, since he does not really define what he means by the "city" and since he does not bring into his discussion such important Victorian figures as the Brownings and the Rosettis, the result is, as I have stated, a sense of disappointment.

When the author does, in fact, concentrate on the "city" and does take up poets that deal with it, James Thomson for instance, he provides some insight into the subject of a poetic response to the city. His treatment of Thomson's poetry, particularly "City of Dreadful Night," is detailed and at times perceptive. His contrasting Thomson's treatment with that of the earlier Romantic poets is helpful to those who are

interested in a "Victorian" response, and his discussion of "City of Dreadful Night" in terms of what he calls "a new emblem" of the personal hell suffered by isolated individuals, the "nightmare city of the mind," is thorough and insightful. Even here, however, he seems unduly dependent on other critics, in this case, William D. Schaefer; this heavy dependence on previous writers (as I have already indicated) detracts from the impact of the book.

There are other elements that serve to undermine the overall effect of the study. Most noticeable is the structure of the work, a structure that seems far out of balance. To call it a book dealing with "Victorian" responses and then to spend roughly about one fourth of the discussion on those we do not think of as Victorian writers seems disproportionate. Chapter One deals largely with Blake and Wordsworth; the epilogue takes up Lawrence and Eliot. There is also much in other sections that seems general rather than specific in terms of the topic. Indeed, the impression one has is a sense of merely adding material rather than, as is usually the case, deciding what must be reluctantly excluded. If one is to take up "Continuities," for instance, then one should in fact do so. What Thesing has done, however, is provide rather cryptic comments on two "early twentieth-century poets who had more than sporadic contact with London." So much for continuities.

More disturbing, however, is the author's failure to define terms and discuss in detail responses to the city. He makes the "city" stand for almost anything other than rural, the very thing Williams avoids, and then discusses what seem to be works that have a special meaning for him. Is "Michael" really a poem about a character "trying to come to grips with the urban experience"? Are Arnold's "A Summer Night" and "The Buried Life" poems that particularly treat the city as arena? Are the poems of Wilde and Symons chiefly concerned with the city? What the author fails to acknowledge in his approach to these authors and works is a far greater context or contexts than simply "the city" or "urban life." What, for instance, of Wordsworth's treatment of the old shepherd in "Michael"? Is the entire poem to be thought of in terms of the few lines devoted to Luke's experience in the City? What of Arnold's interest in Eastern philosophy, such a strong element in his letters to Clough? To talk of Buchanan's poetry as "groping and coping in the city" is to place it at what must be its lowest denominator. To talk of "The Harlot's House" simply in terms of the "theme of prostitution" is, again, to reduce the entire period of the eighties and nineties in Victorian England to a study more on the level of the "other" Victorians. It is the richness of context and theme that is missing in Thesing's discussion of these various figures and their works;



it is that which is sorely needed to make his study far richer than it is. One is grateful for those places where the author suggests important themes and ideas, but *The London Muse* neglects too many important writers and too much of the Victorian ethos to be more than a noble attempt at an introduction to a very complex subject.

MICHAEL TIMKO

*City University of New York*

Liselotte Glage and Jörg Rublack. *Die gestörte Identität: Wahn und Wirklichkeit in James Hoggs "The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner"*. Anglistische Forschungen, 155. Heidelberg. Universitätsverlag Carl Winter. 1981. 116 pp.

André Gide's rediscovery of Hogg's major novel, originally published in 1824, has also influenced the German reputation of the "Ettrick shepherd." Four years after the Frenchman had stimulated interest in the *Confessions* with his introduction to the 1947 Cresset edition, the first German translation (by Peter Dülberg) was published under the title of *Vertrauliche Aufzeichnungen und Bekenntnisse eines gerechtfertigten Sünders* (Stuttgart, 1951). A second German translation (by Fritz Güttinger) came out in 1969 in the renowned series "Manesse-Bibliothek der Weltliteratur," for which the Zürich publishers adopted the title of *Der Widersacher (The Fiend)*. 1969 was also the date of the first German thesis on Hogg's *Confessions*: Walter Pache's "James Hoggs *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* und die Darstellung des Bösen im Roman der englischen Romantik" (Cologne). The present study by Glage and Rublack is the second German monograph on Hogg's masterpiece.

While Pache put the emphasis on the representation of evil and placed Hogg's novel in the context of the Romantic Movement, Glage and Rublack read the *Confessions* as a literary case study in the social origins of insanity and try to analyze the relation between the "past significance" and "present meaning" (Robert Weimann) of the text. They claim that former critics have paid too little attention to the historical perspective of the *Confessions* (pp. 35-36), and that even the two principal "intrinsic" (werkimmanent) approaches to the novel must be dismissed as inconsistent. Thus the theological reading, concentrating on Robert Wringhim's demoniacal possession, is rejected because it neglects the numerous references to Robert's mental illness, while the psychoanalytical interpretation that takes Gil-Martin to be a projection of Robert's

perverted super-ego is criticized for leaving the allusions to the devil-figure as a real person unexplained (pp. 10-13, 37). The approach the two German critics favor is a combination of socio-psychological analysis, structuralism, and reader-orientated interpretation.

Perhaps Glage and Rublack are somewhat biased when they view "Robert's story" solely "as the story of his illness" (thus the title of chapter 3). They examine Robert's disturbed identity in the light of the modern theory of the social genesis of schizophrenia, as developed by Bateson, Laing et al. They derive the cause of Robert's illness from interactional patterns and, above all, from the situation of his family, which reflects the religious and political disension of the time of the fictional action. The two critics present the reader with a causal chain of marital schism, double-bind situation, establishment of a false-self system, creation of and escape from the alter ego, and loss of the ego. Hence Robert's mental dissociation, his physical decay, his social isolation, his murders, and eventually his suicide are seen as following an inescapable pattern (pp. 17-26). Glage and Rublack are aware of the danger of methodological anachronism in applying modern theories of social psychology to an early 19th-century novel (p. 2), but they seem reassured by the fact that one of their authorities also makes use of a 19th-century text (Gregory Bateson, who in 1961 edited *Perceval's Narrative* of 1830-32) to corroborate his tenets (p. 27). In a short survey (pp. 28-31) they assess the state of psychiatry in Hogg's days. Of course, the social genesis of insanity was then quite unknown, a madman being held morally responsible for his state, but there were some first hints at "remote causes" of insanity (education, religion, etc.) that may have suggested to Hogg the idea of viewing the individual case in its social context and thus of "changing the individual pattern into a social pattern" (p. 31).

Taking up Pache's idea of "Normabweichung," Glage and Rublack see the central conflict of the novel as consisting in the deviation from set standards (p. 38). While in Part I this conflict determines the historical frame of reference, it is shifted in Part II into Robert's psyche. His insanity is explained as the result of a desperate but unsuccessful attempt to conform to an abnormal standard, for which Hogg introduces the devil-figure as a metaphor. "The devil in our fellow man is produced by society" (p. 44). Thus the religious and the social aspects are closely linked together. Again following the arguments used by Laing and other modern social psychologists, Glage and Rublack relate Robert's loss of communal sense to his loss of common sense--unlike the reader and the "normal" characters in the book, the "justified sinner"

does not recognize the true nature of the devil.

In the second half of their study, when the two German critics turn towards an analysis of the narrative technique of the *Confessions* in order to determine what it is that distinguishes Hogg's novel from a mere case study, they single out the creation of ambiguity (rather than of suspense) as the principal aim of the text, i.e. they give preference to Douglas Gifford's reading (*James Hogg*, Edinburgh, 1976) over the position held by Robert L. Chianese (*Mystery and Detection Annual* [1973], 97-112). They claim that the conception of the devil both as a social and a schizophrenic reality is not dependent on the modern reader's disposition, but that it constitutes part of the "sense potential" of the text (pp. 61-2). Their lengthy discussion of the different narrators of the book, of the narrative modes, and of the aesthetic procedure establishing the metaphorical function of the devil (pp. 64-85) is somewhat wearisome because of its repetitiousness and its mixture of various modish terminologies. Moreover, it is in this section that the study is most derivative.

In the appendix to their book Glage and Rublack expand on Hogg's preoccupation with the theme of insanity. After a short discussion of *The Three Perils of Woman* (pp. 90-1), they reprint the complete text of the "Strange Letter of a Lunatic" (pp. 92-103), which is now also available in Hogg's recently published *Selected Stories and Sketches*, edited by Douglas S. Mack (Edinburgh, 1982).

While one can surely agree with the two German critics' conclusion that the novel's "past significance" lay in its warning against a newly revived religious radicalism, which Hogg interpreted as a social event rather than a metaphysical necessity, and that part of its "present meaning" consists in its impeachment of objective reality and in its discussion of the transgression of psychological normality (pp. 86-9), there remains a certain uneasiness with regard to their main thesis. Although other critics before them have called the *Confessions* "a modern psychological case-study that anticipates the many case-studies in twentieth-century fiction" (cf. D. Eggen-schwiler in *SSL*, 9 [1971], 26), the interactional categories of Bateson and Laing are made to fit the book a little too perfectly. Ascribing sole responsibility to the evil forces in Robert's social environment, Glage and Rublack have little to say on the subject of personal moral decisions, although the much talked-of ambiguity of the novel covers this aspect, too. It is no doubt legitimate to stress the "present meaning" of a literary work, but one has the feeling that the critics' late 20th-century position is also often projected onto those passages that try to reconstruct the historical context of Hogg's novel. In their effort to analyze the

structural device of ambiguity they do not always escape the temptation to try and logically clarify the ambiguous itself. Hence their one-sided decision to interpret Robert's condition as an "illness" (reversing the equally one-sided view of his being possessed); hence also their dissatisfaction with the novel's ending (p. 85), which resists all attempts at a rational explanation.

Even if Glage and Rublack place themselves in conscious opposition to the main currents of Hogg criticism, many details of their interpretation sound familiar, and it is regrettable that they have not always given full credit to the sources they have made use of. Moreover, their bibliographical references are often faulty or misleading. Thus "Laing 1975" and "Laing 1978" in the notes (p. 104) may each refer to two titles in the bibliography (pp. 111-16), while "Bateson 1961" (p. 105) should read "Bateson 1962," and "Black 1972" (p. 107) is a misprint for "Black 1962"; "Birkhead 1963" (p. 106) actually refers to a study published in 1921, and "Iser 1979" (pp. 108-09) is correctly dated in the bibliography as 1975; "Weimann 1971" (p. 110) is left out in the bibliography altogether; "Gide 1947" in the notes refers to that author's introduction to the English edition of the *Confessions*, while the bibliography only mentions the German translation of 1951; the second German translation of the novel, though alluded to in the text (p. 33), is not listed in the bibliography.

These inaccuracies may have been occasioned by the joint authorship of the study, which is also no doubt responsible for the puzzling structure of the book (for example, a short survey of Hogg criticism is given in chapter 2, to be fully elaborated in chapter 5) and the many repetitions. These flaws are all the more annoying since they detract from the value of a work that is a stimulating addition to the controversial criticism of Hogg's long-neglected novel.

PETER ZENZINGER

*Technische Universität, Berlin*

Robert L. Kindrick. *Robert Henryson*. Twayne's English Authors Series, 274. Boston. Twayne Publishers, G.K. Hall. 1979. 214 pp.

During the past thirty years a number of scholars have come to recognize Robert Henryson as one of Scotland's greatest poets. Even so, many students of British literature have had little opportunity to read or study Henryson's poetry. *Robert Henryson* by Robert L. Kindrick makes Henryson and his poetry more

accessible by providing a long overdue introduction to the poet and his world as well as a comprehensive overview of his poetry. In addition to the usual preface, chapters, endnotes, and index, this book contains a chronology and an annotated bibliography, making it a valuable research tool. Moreover, in the second chapter Kindrick provides a technical description of Henryson's language which includes a pronunciation guide to Middle Scots and a list of common spelling variants.

The first two chapters focus upon Henryson, his world, and the literary traditions which shaped his poetry. Kindrick depicts Henryson as a man who was well educated, politically astute, and deeply religious; his ruling principle is said to be *caritas* which results in his poetry being permeated with "a broad sympathy for human nature and love of mankind" (p. 27). Kindrick finds Henryson's poetry was influenced for the most part by two literary traditions: the developing Southern (Chaucerian) tradition and the tradition of native Scots verse. From the former, Henryson learned literary realism and techniques in allegory and irony; he also derived his verse forms and limited "aureate" vocabulary from the Chaucerians. In spite of this substantial debt to the poets of the South, Kindrick argues that Henryson was equally influenced by the poetry of his native land, especially by its oral nature and "aural appeal." Kindrick also acknowledges traces of French and Italian influence in some of Henryson's poems.

The third, fourth, and fifth chapters comprise more than half of the text and provide a rich overview of Henryson's poetry. Kindrick's readings of the individual poems include his original, critical insights in addition to comprehensive surveys of previous scholarship and relevant textual information. Chapter three is devoted entirely to *The Morall Fabillis* which Kindrick believes have not received the critical plaudits they merit. He praises Henryson for creating a remarkable variety of characterizations and for employing the best techniques of both medieval allegory and medieval realism. Moreover, Kindrick observes that in substance these fables reveal Henryson's humanitarian spirit and sympathy for the poor.

In the next chapter Kindrick presents Henryson's most acclaimed work, *The Testament of Cresseid*. In discussing this long narrative poem, he enters the controversy about the significance of the Christian-pagan elements in the poem and concludes that much of the meaning of the poem is lost if its Christian theme is ignored. Kindrick argues that Henryson regards the character of Cresseid sympathetically, depicting her as a woman who experiences genuine penance and contrition and, in the end, is made wise in the nature of love, both *eros* and *agape*.

Henryson's shorter poems are examined in the fifth chapter where they are categorized as being love poems, religious poems, or poems on social themes. At this point Kindrick mentions that he has excluded from this study a few poems of doubtful authorship; however, he fails to develop this scholarly topic. Instead, he focuses on the most famous of the shorter love poems, *Orpheus and Eurydice*. He describes the Orpheus as telescopic in nature, incorporating several religious, philosophical, and political themes. The Orpheus is seen as a kind of Neoplatonic allegory containing some sharp criticism of James III. Kindrick's discussions of the other love poems, "Robene and Makyne" and "The Bludy Serk," are compressed but include significant scholarly evaluations.

Kindrick proceeds to a discussion of the religious poems, stating that aging and death are their most prevalent themes and observing that in them Henryson experimented with a variety of themes and structures common to religious poems of the period. Kindrick then turns to Henryson's social poems which he finds more instructional than satiric; he recognizes that these often contain a dark humor which masks the poet's severe judgment of those being castigated.

In concluding his discussion of the poetry Kindrick defends Henryson's use of poetic convention, arguing that in this respect Henryson was following the common practice of his day and was no different from Chaucer.

In the brief final chapter Kindrick asserts that Henryson's influence on subsequent Scottish poetry scarcely can be overstated. Not only was he a source of inspiration for the poets who came after him, but he also made Middle Scots an acceptable literary language. Kindrick's careful and comprehensive discussions of the poems in the earlier chapters provide a convincing argument that his assessment of Henryson's significance is one to be taken seriously.

DEANNA DELMAR EVANS

*Bemidji State University*

Alan Bold. *Modern Scottish Literature*. London and New York. Longman. 1983. xii + 332 pp.

Alan Bold set himself a difficult task--and he has succeeded admirably--in providing a survey of twentieth-century Scottish literature that is neither superficial nor too detailed. One of the problems in viewing recent writing critically is to deal adequately with the outstanding authors of the period

while giving a reasonable showing to the many competent writers of the second rank whose work has always the adventitious interest for us that it is written by a contemporary.

After a general introduction of twelve pages in which he discusses the Scottishness of Scottish literature Alan Bold looks at the three main literary forms, dealing with poetry (in 80 pages), fiction (162) and drama (44). He gives his references at the end of each part, amounting to 23 pages in all, and there is a twelve-page index. In each section he discusses his chosen authors in remarkable detail, avoiding vague generalizations and summary judgments, but with a neat turn of phrase suggesting an approach or a point of view, and above all directing the reader's attention to the texts and encouraging him to explore these for himself. He writes of Hugh MacDiarmid's "justifiable immodesty," of the Kailyard school of fiction as "a collective aberration," that Neil Gunn's characters are "recognisably real (most of the time)." He accepts the general view that MacDiarmid's *To Circumjack Cenerastus* is inferior to *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle*, adding "but then so are most Scottish poems." Burns Singer's ideal was "the wordless eloquence of shared silence."

Alan Bold takes a comprehensive view of Scottish literature and places its twentieth-century authors in the context of the tradition as he sees it. This is a survey that fulfills its purpose excellently.

If one has a criticism it is that the author confines his attention almost exclusively to literary writing in the stricter, narrower sense, to *belles-lettres*. For example, in discussing James Leslie Mitchell (Lewis Grassie Gibbon) he mentions the titles of only three of his non-fiction books--*Hanno*, *The Conquest of the Maya*, and *Nine Against the Unknown*--and he does not refer at all to *Niger*, in which Lewis Grassie Gibbon took over from his "distant cousin" as a historian of exploration. John Buchan's biographical and historical studies--*Montrose*, *Sir Walter Scott*, *Oliver Cromwell*, *Augustus*--are not mentioned, though they form a significant part of Buchan's work, even if Hay Fleming once advised him to "eschew historical writing and devote [himself] to avowed fiction." A novelist's or a poet's non-fiction writing is relevant and essential evidence in assessing his work.

The answer, of course, is that to have included more would have necessitated some omissions. Alan Bold's study is an admirable length, and there is nothing in it as it stands that the reader would willingly do without.

W.R. AITKEN  
Dunblane, Perthshire

John Walker, ed. *The Scottish Sketches of R.B. Cunninghame Graham*. Edinburgh. Scottish Academic Press. 1982. xii + 204 pp.

As Lafcadio Hearn (1850-1904) in Japan, so also R.B. Cunninghame Graham (1852-1936) in Argentina: An author whose native language is English often casts a different literary shadow when his life and works are transplanted into an alien culture. Aside from a few supporters, for instance, the political leftist and nationalistic activist Hugh MacDiarmid, Graham looms larger in Latin America than in his native Scotland. This reputation comes from his having lived among the gauchos in Argentina for most of the years from 1869 until 1883 and his drawing upon his New World experiences for much of the material in his approximately thirty volumes of travel accounts, histories, sketches, and short stories. For English speakers the label "amateur writer of genius" has stuck to him. He is often mentioned as a literary appendage to his friends Joseph Conrad, W.H. Hudson, Oscar Wilde, Max Beerbohm, and others. A venturer of the stripe of Sir Richard Burton, he published an account of an incident in Morocco in his *Mogreb-el-Acksa* (1898) that inspired George Bernard Shaw's *Captain Brassbound's Conversion*.

In recent years several critics have tried to elevate Graham's works to independent literary merit. Noted among these have been Herbert West and A.F. Tschiffely in the 1930s and more recently Cedric Watts, Andrew Maitland, Laurence Davies, Richard Haymaker, and Lady Polwarth (Graham's grand-niece). Beyond these other critics, however, stands the staunchest defender of Graham, John Walker, Professor of Spanish in Queen's University, Ontario, Canada. Professor Walker grew up in the Graham region of Dumbarton and, as he recognizes now, first became fascinated with stories about "Don Roberto" preserved by persons along the Clyde. Besides articles explaining Graham's Argentine links and bibliographical studies, Walker edited *The South American Sketches of R.B. Cunninghame Graham* (1978). Now comes the companion collection for the Scottish sketches (1982). In the future Walker hopes to produce editions of the sketches for Spain, Morocco, Mexico, and Southwestern United States.

The present collection consists of thirty-three descriptions of places, human traits, and individuals selected from approximately fifty Scottish sketches Graham produced over a period of forty years. These brief prose paintings vary from glances at nature and objects to recordings of events, usually sombre in color. Walker has arranged the sketches in six categories and for each category has provided a small preface that often explains Graham's evolution of theme and style. The groups are the following: Landscapes and places; the



Scottish character; scenes and situations; types and figures; Scots abroad; Scottish stories. David Daiches has written a preface, and Walker has given both a foreword and an introduction as well as a glossary and bibliography. The introduction, since it provides biographical material highlighting the Scottish details and Scottish elements in the sketches, is particularly useful in understanding the one whom Walker praises as "a great man, a true Scot, and a sadly neglected writer" (p. 12).

The sketches that deal with the district of Menteith, "the district of the moss," display Graham's embarking on his literary career through writing a travel guide and also convey Graham's fascination with what he called the "refuge of our wild ancestors, moulder of character, inspirer of the love of mystery, chief characteristic of Celtic mind" (pp. 26-7). The precision of place is deepened by echoes of the mythic past.

Graham's bitter denunciations of the Scottish traits strike an odd note when one recalls that he was the first President of the Scottish National Party in 1928, was proclaimed on his tombstone as "patriotic Scot," and eulogized shortly after his death by the newspaper *Scots Independent* as "Scotland's outstanding citizen." For instance--on schools: "O education, how a people may be rendered brutish in thy name!" (p. 58). On sex: "Our sexual immorality, and the high rate of illegitimacy, we explain thus. No thrifty man would buy a barren beast" (p. 59). On charity: "Going to church with us replaces charity...A man may cheat and drink, be cruel to animals, avaricious, anything you please, but if he goes to church he still remains a Christian and enters heaven by his faith alone" (p. 59).

In the section on scenes and situations, "A Braw [i.e., brave, happy] Day," which records the impressions at the sale of an ancestral home with its land for bankruptcy, is the best. A sentence like the following shows Graham at his strength: "From out the spaces where the pictures once had hung, the well-known faces seemed to peer, but unfamiliar-looking, with an air as of reproach" (p. 77).

His sketches of local odd personalities fasten on the individuals whom Graham thought as passing away upon the arrival of modern conformity. "Heather Jock" begins: "To differ from the crowd, whether as a genius, an idiot, a politician, or simply to have a differently shaped beard from other men, will shortly be a crime" (p. 101). What he wrote about "A Retainer" explains the mixture he found in numerous Scots, probably himself included: "...so strange a mixture of the present and the past; on the one side a representative of the rough-footed Scots who harried and who reived, and, on the other, of the laborious race of ploughmen (loved of the sea-gulls) who have

made Scotland what she is" (p. 132).

In the section on Scots abroad Walker has chosen the pieces that show Graham's conviction about the continuity of Scottish traits whether the Wandering Scot should be in New Zealand, the Mediterranean, Africa, or Argentina. The sketch of the African missionary given in "A Convert" bears a resemblance to Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, in my view, though without the bitterness of the short novel.

The final group demonstrates the style of the writer who has been called (probably in exaggeration) the "Scottish Maupassant." Since these pieces are so short that they cannot even fall into the genre of the abbreviated narrative, they gain strength from the qualities pervasive in Graham's writings--awareness of place, recording of language, and the sense of mortality in nature and humanity. A statement in "A Princess" sums up not only this final section but the entire collection of sketches: "...exposed to all the harshness of a land in which, though hearts are warm, they move so far beneath the surface that their pulsations hardly can be felt, except by those accustomed to their beat" (p. 192).

Walker has put together a varied and well-edited selection of Cunninghame Graham's impressions of his native Scotland. Here lies the proof that Graham was more than a transposed Scot developing in Argentina. His writings deserve recognition in his homeland, particularly for readers who feel Scottish cultural rhythms.

ROBERT G. COLLMER  
*Baylor University*

*The Complaynt of Scotland (c. 1550) By Mr Robert Wedderburn.*  
Introd. by A.M. Stewart. Edinburgh. The Scottish Text  
Society. 1979. lx + 149 pp.

This edition redounds very much to the credit of Dr. Alasdair Stewart, Lecturer in the University of Aberdeen, and very little to the credit of the Council of the Scottish Text Society, which has allowed him scant space for an introductory comment, and none at all for the annotation and glossary that the text requires. A policy of such meagre allowance of room for editorial explanation and remark invites censure, and here particularly in respect of a complex political and religious situation and the writer's many allusions to Scottish romances, tales, poems, ballads, songs and dances. J.A.H. Murray in his rarely obtainable 1872 edition narrates the historical circumstances at greater length, yet in short

space Dr. Stewart is able to make a more significant review. Murray was especially remiss as regards the literary allusions in being content merely to repeat what he found in Furnivall's Introduction to *Captain Cox, his Ballads and Books* (London, 1871), but the Society has been equally remiss in not taking advantage of Dr. Stewart's studies over many years to update the information on such references. Of course, the reader will be glad once more to have an available text with Introduction, but he will be puzzled by many an unexplained word, citation, name or title, both in the main text and the celebrated insertion or interlude, the "Monologue Recreative."

In view of such prescribed limitations it is astonishing how much information, how much scholarship, Dr. Stewart has contrived to convey, under the headings, "Historical Background," "Sources Influences Methods," "Facets And Styles Of *The Complaynt*," as also in the "Notes" to the Introduction which tell us so much about this remarkable political polemic and literary *étallage*.

The time of composition is given here as early 1549 to mid-1550, though at the outset the writer himself specifies 1548, a year-date which could then include the beginning of 1549. It is a fairly long period for the writing of so short a work, and explicable only by the patent textual fact that the author had found cause to rewrite portions and to insert the laboriously concocted Monologue. The main cause, as the editor convincingly argues, was the altered political situation of 1549-50, when the Scot's appeal for a defensive war did not have so urgent an occasion, when the new English Protector, Warwick, sought peace with the "auld allies" France and Scotland, a peace confirmed in early 1550 by the Treaty of Boulogne. At this stage of his work the author could not have wholly modified the anti-English rhetoric and home-directed criticism, even if he had wished to do so, an unlikely supposition, but he could now relax a little the seriousness of his political and moral appeal to his countrymen, and in his naturally pedantic way introduce some light and even comic matter. After all, it was to courtiers and the governing class that he chiefly appealed for a national re-awakening and reform, and a little entertainment would be acceptable. Dr. Stewart's understandable preoccupation with Renaissance features of the Monologue, such as the pastoral setting and the varieties of word-play that he connects with what he calls "the philological revolution" of contemporary France, prevents him from remarking that besides being a learned self-indulgence the Monologue is a literary joke--its dreamer fears for his health yet wanders through a damp, dark night; describes the dawning in astronomic detail; plays with alliterative and aureate language in his natural descriptions; catalogues fantastically,

with a thoroughness that recalls Sir Thomas Urquhart, the characteristic sounds of birds, seamen, artillery, the names of poems and dance-tunes; discourses lengthily on cosmography; concludes with the experiment of trying to see through shut eyelids but falls into the sleep that introduces his vision of the plaintive Dame Scotia.

Naturally the question of the identity of the writer engages the editor. He has no doubts about the claims of Robert Wedderburn, though there is no colophon confession, no title-page in the four extant copies, and no ascription except in the Harleian Catalogue of 1743-45: *Vedderburn's Complaynte of Scotlande vyth ane Echortatione to the thre Estaits to be vigilante in the Deffens of their Public Veil*. The sole sign of authenticity in this descriptive title is the use of *v* for *w*, a Scots usage that ceased in the seventeenth century. But any reader of the printed text would find the *v* everywhere, for example, in the first sentence of the book, "the public veil"; and an antiquary with a seemingly authentic title to invent would use both *v* and such phrases as the one just quoted. The name Wedderburn, significantly given without Christian name, could have been suggested to such an antiquary by two ill-considered facts, the author's general criticism of the clerics of Scotland which would recall the heretical tradition of the Wedderburn brothers, and his mention of folk-tunes, which would recall those used in the later *Gude and Godlie Ballatis* attributed to John Wedderburn. If there ever was a title-page it is most unlikely that it bore the author's name, since the book ends with a citation that translates thus: "Nothing is more shameful for the wise man that that he should let his life [reputation?] depend upon the talk of fools." He may have feared that his moralistic (not doctrinal) criticism of the hierarchy might be construed as heresy, or thought that the spirit and content of the *Complaynt* had elements in it that would compromise the "image" that his promised religious works should create for him.

Robert Wedderburn, Dr. Stewart tells us, was abroad from about 1534 to 1548--certainly in France, probably in Germany and England where his brothers James and John had fled at different times--in which year, according to the reliable Calderwood, he helped to burn an effigy of Cardinal Beaton. Unless we assume a change of heart within a few months, we cannot consider Robert as the writer who denounced "schismatics" abroad and the infection of their views in Scotland. A charter of March 1552 discovered by Dr. Stewart makes provision for Robert's mistress and their two children (legitimated the same year, shortly before his death), and reveals a life-style that is not exactly the one recommended by the author of the *Complaynt* who so vigorously deplores the "sensualite" and

"vile abusione" in the lives of Scottish clerics. Again, from at least July 1548 to mid-1550 Robert was an absentee vicar acting at Torphichen as Chamberlain of the Knights of St. John, the period during which the author was at Paris overseeing the printing of his book and the subsequent alterations to it. A final point is that the writer reserves his most extreme invective for "Labour": if a laborer "becum industreus in policie and in conquessing of reches be marchandreis" he soon shows himself "mair ambicius and arrogant nor any gentil man sperutual or temporal." One cannot imagine a Wedderburn speaking in this way about his merchant forebears and connections. Both the book and the facts about Robert Wedderburn as marshalled by the editor speak against his authorship.

Who then was the author? Only a speculation is possible. Such a speculation was advanced by this reviewer many years ago in *Notes and Queries*, and concerns the distinguished scholar Patrick Cockburn, a scion of the Cockburns of Choicelea in the Merse. His dates are 1510-1570. Since his family was involved in it, he might have witnessed the Jedburgh (Jedburgh) Raid of Whitsunday 1520, a great and violent "convention" of landowners like that seen by the author on a Whitsunday. He was in Paris in the years that are relevant to the *Complaynt*, 1548-50. There he could have picked up the late 1547 translation of a work by Antonio Fregoso that is quoted in the book. His *Oratio de Utilitate et Excellentia Verbi Dei* describes itself in the French version as "Oeuvre tres utile et necessaire à tous fideles Chrestiens," a phraseology that recalls the anonymous writer's description of forthcoming religious works, "verray necessair tyl al them that desiris to lyur verteouslye." His *Meditatio* (1552) compares the Queen Regent, Mary of Lorraine, to Judith, as does the *Complaynt*, and like it it lists the three plagues--war, hunger and pestilence. Writing about Cockburn in his *De scriptoribus Scotis* Peter Buchanan remarks that, distinguished as he was in Biblical and classical studies, his special interest was natural science, that is, astronomy, a remark that his known works do not support but that would be illustrated by the brilliantly concise outline of the Ptolemaic system in the *Complaynt*, if that were indeed his work. By 1560 Cockburn, then a Professor at St. Andrews, had at least come to terms with the new ecclesiastical order. Like the anonymous writer he had known how to adjust to a change in events; like him too he had never thought burning an effective argument. As already said, such facts encourage a speculation, no more. The *Complaynt* remains anonymous, as its author intended.

But if we do not have a name we have the man in his work, a patriot who is very fond of the phrase "my native cuntrye,"

and whose criticism of it is inspired as much by classical models as Christian values. He may speak of a defensive war, but too much has been written about this aspect of his pleading; what he most pleads for is a Scotland that knows justice and a unity in neighborly peace. Of course, he is an omnivorous reader and dextrous manipulator of his reading. Dr. Stewart does right to warn us against noting the many plagiarisms without attending to the very effective use that is made of them. As plagiarist he follows a literary principle respected in his time. That he practices a variety of styles is noticed in this edition for the first time, as also the fact that such variety does not derive simply from his diverse sources. He can be very good, as the editor observes, in all three of the traditionally accepted categories of style--the low, the middle and the lofty. His cleverness of treatment is sufficiently indicated here by his use of the third category both to build the grand effect and to make fun of himself, as in the very relevant *ubi sunt* theme applied to Scotland and in the learned comedy of the Monologue.

No scholar or critic actively interested in the literature of sixteenth-century Scotland can fail to be stimulated by Dr. Stewart's edition.

MATTHEW P. McDIARMID  
*University of Aberdeen*

*Thomas Carlyle 1981: Papers Given at the International Thomas Carlyle Centenary Symposium.* Edited by Horst W. Drescher. Frankfurt and Bern: Verlag Peter Lang. 1983. 418 pp.

Festschriften are not new; for years they have been convenient vehicles to honor one's commitments and colleagues. *Thomas Carlyle 1981* is no exception. For a week in August of 1981, Herr Professor Dr. Horst Drescher and his expert staff were able to bring together an international array of scholars with the view of honoring the Centenary of Carlyle. The milieu was idyllic: poets and poet-tasters of Carlyle, sitting side by side, imbibing the juices of knowledge--all punctuated by the periodic scream of low-flying American jet aircraft, there for protection if not remonstrance. It was the best of all possible worlds that week at the Scottish Studies Centre of the Johannes-Gutenberg Universität Mainz. Both in the morning and afternoon the life and writings of Carlyle were, in his own words, "probed, dissected, distilled, desiccated, and scientifically decomposed," which in turn gave way each evening to the venturesome wonder of southern Germany. Carlyle would

have been proud. His beloved "prelapsarian" Germany, as one contributor puts it, which had honored him with the Order of Merit in 1874, was bowing to him once again. Yet, even this prelapsarian idealism, nurtured in the balmy beauty of Germer-sheim, was not enough to mask entirely the brutal fact that most of the papers delivered contributed little to an understanding of Carlyle the man or Carlyle the writer.

The weakness of the conference papers is the weakness of this festschrift: an unevenness of quality that is not rescued by the contributions of distinction. There are a variety of reasons for this lapse, of course; but the overwhelming fact is that too many papers pretend an authority in Carlylean text and context that does not exist. Time after time errors in critical judgment are made; time after time subjects are addressed with little reserve beyond superficiality; and time after time intellectual discourse is lost in the forest of self-aggrandizement. What is most surprising, however, is the papers in *Carlyle 1981* seem to have profited little from the spirited criticism offered at the conference. Of the nineteen papers delivered (twenty-one published here), less than half achieve any level of permanent distinction. And, regrettably, most rehearse time-worn theories, and often with less precision than their predecessors.

Because of the number of papers involved, any in-depth consideration is precluded. However, some general observations can be made. Let us begin with what is *not* in *Carlyle 1981*. Incredibly, there is no consideration of the friendship and influence of Goethe. Georg Tennyson in "Carlyle as Mediator of German Language and Thought" broaches the topic as he adroitly asserts Carlyle's position as the "Voice of Germany in Britain." Gerhart Meyer's "Zu Carlyles *Life of Schiller*" does set the tone for Carlyle's devotion to German literature in the 1820s. And, Peter Zenzinger's excellent "Thomas Carlyle's Reputation in Germany," one of the few essays to cover new ground, does in part help us to see through Goethe to Varnhagen von Ense and the Young German Movement. Still, there is nothing specifically on Goethe, which in turn points to the larger weakness of the collection. The opinions of many *established* Carlyle scholars are absent. Indeed, there were authorities available who could have spoken to the issues of Carlyle as mathematician, as letter writer, as historian, as poet, as chronicler of reminiscences, to name but a few. In addition, there were scholars available who could have spoken to the very important subject of stylistic nuances of text, although Robert L. Oakman's non-delivered, republished "Carlyle and the Machine" points in the proper direction. How these and other similar oversights occurred is not at issue here; but that they did occur is vital to the pretended evalu-

ation of Carlyle in this august volume celebrating his centenary.

To be certain, papers on freemasonry, on patterns in *Sartor Resartus*, on concepts of history in *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, on epic heroes in *The French Revolution*, not to mention personal friendship papers, implication papers, and reputation papers, have their niche. Yet such uneven eclecticism is also misleading; for, except in the most minute way, it skirts the much needed focus of re-evaluation. The question mark in Ian Campbell's summation "Carlyle: Sage of Chelsea or Sage of Ecclefechan?" addresses, ironically, the perceived chaotic value of the papers. The scholarly muddle over Carlyle is also sensed by David Daiches in his reworked "Carlyle: The Paradox Reconsidered," even though his paper was delivered in Edinburgh not Germersheim, and even though we are not always certain that the paradox Daiches articulates is Carlyle's. It is, however, the most irreverent of the papers, Peter Keating's thinly veiled assertion of Carlyle as proto-fascist, aptly entitled "Backward or Forward? Carlyle's *Past and Present*," that perceives the vacuum that has been created by too much run-of-the-mill, industry scholarship. "Blockheads we surely would be," declares Keating, "if we took Carlyle too seriously as a social prophet." What Keating intends, of course, is "if we took Carlyle too seriously" *at all*. Sadly, *Carlyle 1981* ducks such outrageous but provocative innuendo.

We have here, then, a collection of essays held together by the thread of caution woven into the introductory essay by K.J. Fielding. In his "Thomas Carlyle The Letter and the Spirit," Professor Fielding neatly anticipates the problem engendered by the stasis of conference scholarship: "Carlyle was a man deeply-rooted in his own time, whom we can reach only through a leap of the imagination." It is unfortunate that the explicit challenge laid down in these words has not been met. In *Carlyle 1981*, the letter is there, but the spirit is not. Challenge has been lost to the loom of opportunism, and once again Carlyle studies is the weaker for it. Yet in all this there is a silver thread. Horst Drescher can forever remain confident that his honorific foray, whatever its perceived weaknesses and strengths, causes all others of its kind to pale in comparison. Germersheim 1981 was a privilege; *Carlyle 1981* confirms that.

RODGER L. TARR  
*Illinois State University*



W.R. Aitken. *Scottish Literature in English and Scots: A Guide to Information Sources*. Detroit: Gale Research. [1982]. xxiv + 421 pp. Vol. 37 of the American Literature, English Literature, and World Literature in English Information Guide Series.

Trevor Royle. *Companion to Scottish Literature*. Detroit: Gale Research. [1983]. xi + 322 pp.

One of the more difficult books to review is a bibliography, and another is a companion which is presented in encyclopedic form; to both one is tempted to seize upon an incorrect or neglected entry; in neither case can one chide the author for his pedantic style--the more pedantic the better.

W.R. Aitken has spent his life as a librarian and later as a university lecturer on librarianship, so he knows at first hand what readers need in the reference field. His first task in compiling a work such as this was to decide upon the limits of its scope; in Aitken's case he opted for including work in English and "Lallans" but excluding work in Gaelic and Latin. At first glance one is tempted to find fault with the exclusions, but there has been a recent (1972) Donald Maclean's *Typographia Scoto-Gadelica* of 1915 which contained works printed in Scottish Gaelic between 1567 and 1914, and there have been bibliographies of the work of the Scottish Latinists. The problem after that is the "English" Scots; Aitken quotes Harvey Wood: "...Scottish literature is literature, whether in Scots or English, written by Scotsmen to whom the Scottish habit of mind and Scottish literary conventions were more natural than English." Thus Aitken finds Thomas Carlyle's prose "inherently Scottish."

The six major divisions of the work are as follows: Scottish literature in general, to 1660, 1660-1800, 1800-1900, 1900 on, popular and folk literature. I am a bit uneasy with the sixth category, as though folk literature exists in some sort of limbo disconnected from the main body of written, as contrasted with oral, literature. The problem is that many writers (Robert Burns is one of the best examples) were profoundly influenced by the oral tradition. The principal divisions follow *NCBEL* which enables scholars to use the two interdependently.

A few observations on sections 2 through 5. Medieval and Renaissance works and studies occupy only thirty pages whereas the first eighty years only of our century take up a hefty 162. It is interesting to note that there are editions of the correspondence of comparatively few writers, even those of the first rank. James Hogg, Walter Scott, J.M. Barrie come to mind, while there are ongoing editions of the Carlyles and

R.L.S., but the field is wide open for many other names. Perhaps to keep the quantity of material under control, Aitken has rarely included articles about his subjects. In the case of major figures this presents no problem--with books on Scott and Stevenson appearing at a rate of about two per year, and assuming that the authors of these studies will have digested many of the studies in writing the books, it is perhaps best that way.

It is certainly instructive browsing through the pages of this guide, and I suspect that Ph.D. candidates looking for a dissertation topic would do well to do so. Who would have thought that all Aitken could come up with for Annie S. Swann (1859-1943) was George Blake's *Barrie and the Kailyard School* (which has only a couple of references to her) and an article in the *Library Review* of which Aitken was the able editor for many years? She has always been a favorite of mine, who, in addition to her over two hundred novels, also wrote barely passable verse.

The companion volume to Aitken's, although not advertised as such, is Trevor Royle's *Companion to Scottish Literature* which combines author entries with some subject entries ("Kailyard" one page; "Scottish Renaissance" one page; Thomson's *Seasons* as a separate entry one half page; James Thomson one half page). This in addition to sensible cross-references. At the end of entries for authors a list of the major works, the major editions, and modern biographical and critical studies (books only) is appended.

If I have a complaint about this most useful companion it is that there have been omissions in the list of studies given for the various authors. When the figure is one of the first rank like Burns or Scott then it is a matter of choosing which of dozens of good books should be included in the list, but when the subject has had only a book or two written about him/her the omission of one of them is more serious. For instance, under Henry Mackenzie we find listed only H.W. Thompson's fine *A Scottish Man of Feeling* published in 1931 and long out of print. Should Royle not have added Gerard A. Barker's *Henry Mackenzie* (1975, in print) which gives the reader a good introduction to Mackenzie along with a page of bibliography for those who wish to further their study of the 'Man of Feeling'? Like its nineteenth-century forerunner the Famous Scots Series, the Twayne's English Authors Series is uneven, but anyone compiling a list of modern interpretations of English authors should examine all the pertinent titles.

It would, of course, be impossible to think of all the entries which were to be desired in such a work, but while making entries for John Jamieson's *Etymological Dictionary of*

*the Scottish Language* and its successor the *Scottish National Dictionary* (but no title entry for Jamieson, and no editor entries for the *S.N.D.*) there does not appear to be any entry at all for the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* which carries us from the earliest recorded Scots to 1700. Nor is there a general entry under "Dictionaries" which might have sent the curious reader to appropriate entries.

I am surprised too not to find an entry for Alexander Wilson (1766-1813) the "father of American Ornithology" and also author of the enormously popular "Watty and Meg" (1792?) which was a staple of chapbook printers and was in its day so highly regarded that it was popularly ascribed to Burns for many years. Considering that this work contains references to books published as recently as 1982 (Iain Crichton Smith) I wonder why two major Scottish novels and their authors are omitted: William MacIlvaney's *Docherty* (1975) and Alasdair Gray's *Lanark* (1981) are landmark publications; the former is as penetrating a study of the debilitating effect of the Glasgow slums as has been written, the latter a novel which raises the Scottish novel to an international level of quality as did Scott, Hogg and George Douglas Brown in their times. Perhaps, though, MacIlvaney and Gray will have to wait as did Hogg and Brown for the significance of their contributions to be recognized. We hope not.

Both Aitken and Royle have produced indispensable works of reference which are essential to every research library and deserve a place on the shelf of all students of Scottish literature.

G.R.R.

George Garrett. *The Succession: A Novel of Elizabeth and James*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co. 1983. ix + 539 pp.

George Garrett's superb historical novel *Death of the Fox* (1971) presented us with a wealth of information and insight into the people, the places, and the period of what we now call Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Narrated from several points of view, including first-person accounts by Sir Henry Yelverton, Attorney General at the time of Sir Walter Raleigh's execution on 29 October 1618, James I, King of England at the time of the execution, and several others, such as the Lord Lieutenant of the Tower of London, a soldier, a sailor, and Raleigh himself, the novel gave us in its brilliantly evocative and rhythmic prose the real flavor and texture of a time

long passed and usually recaptured only in its greatest contemporary literature.

Garrett wrote of the difficulties encountered while writing the earlier novel in an essay entitled "Dreaming with Adam: Notes on Imaginary History" (*New Literary History*, 1 [Spring 1970], 407-21): "It is one thing to seek to create a sensuous affective experience in words, dealing with known and familiar things. It is quite another to imagine and recreate the surfaces of a world and a time, and a man, that world ever more different the more one 'knows' about it, so alien, in fact, so removed that it is difficult to believe at all." Therefore, he concluded: "The proper theme of the work...is the human imagination, the possibility, limits and variety of imaginative experience."

Now, in an equally imaginative sequel to *Death of the Fox*, Garrett has again recaptured time past in his aptly titled *The Succession*. As in the earlier novel, *The Succession* makes use of real and imagined materials, actual letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI of Scotland (who, of course, became Elizabeth's heir and James I of England) and the reminiscences of such other historical figures as Sir Robert Cecil, Principal Secretary to the Queen and Council (and second son to the late William Cecil, Lord Burghley, Lord Treasurer of England); and Sir Robert Carey, cousin to Queen Elizabeth, Lady Jane Grey, and Mary Queen of Scots (and a younger son of Lord Hunsdon, Lord Chamberlain to Queen Elizabeth), as well as scenes involving Sir Francis Walsingham, an earlier Principal Secretary to the Queen and Council (preceding Robert Cecil); and all manner of other political and social events and intrigues. It also features the first-person narratives and dialogues of a messenger, a priest, some Scots reivers, and a spy/actor.

If the main theme of *Death of the Fox* was "the human imagination," the same can be said of *The Succession*. As Garrett says in a prefatory note to the recent novel: "These people, real and imaginary alike and equally, were generous guests and good company, but altogether unhurried. For what does expense of time mean to a ghost?" If one were to object to anything about the novel, perhaps it is its leisurely pace, because at times the descriptive passages seem not so much to slow as to halt the narrative flow of events. But rather than cavil, perhaps we should rejoice in the richly complex structure of the book, as well as the psychologically acute portrayals of people chronologically remote and yet strangely akin to our own intellectual and moral value system.

Structurally, *The Succession* is divided into sixteen chapters, beginning with Queen Elizabeth in March 1603 pondering her past life and imminent death (she died on 24 March). The book ends with the Christmastide season of 1603-03, a few

months before the Queen's demise. In between, a major narrative strand focuses on the trip of an imagined messenger making his way from Scotland to London in 1566 to deliver the news (we learn it on p. 486) to Sir Robert Cecil that James VI of Scotland has been born--"And thus has brought word that all of the world that matters to them has been altered. Changed because of this and will not be the same again. Come what may...." And a richer narrative strand takes us into the world of Cecil himself, who although physically inferior to his lordly peers, is more than a match for anyone in the realm of intellectual contest and political intrigue. Mr. Secretary, in fact, is portrayed as the most clever politician in England, equalled only by Queen Elizabeth herself, and some of the most interesting pages in the novel tell us how both of them ruthlessly used and manipulated the callow James--"*the wisest fool in Christendom*"--for their own ends. Other narrative strands take us into the more superficial, but nonetheless fascinating, minds of Sir Robert Carey, who first carried the news of Elizabeth's death to the anxious James, and of the arriviste James I himself. We have imaginative recreations of the famous entertainment that the Earl of Leicester gave at Kenilworth for Queen Elizabeth in July of 1575, of the equally famous rising and subsequent trial of Essex in February of 1601, of the contemporary productions of some of Shakespeare's plays (such as *Troilus and Cressida* and *Richard II*), and perhaps the most poignant and moving section of all--a contemporary priest's first-hand account of the persecution of Catholics and execution of Mary Queen of Scots during Elizabeth's reign.

*The Succession* has been called a grand and luxuriant tapestry, and it is that. It is also a narrative madrigal, the work of an author who loves to tell (and listen to) a good story--for its own sake. Just as his Scots reivers do:

Who knows if Sly believes the tales he tells?  
 They will listen to him, anyway. While they are all  
 waiting here together. Passing time.  
 . . . . .  
 . . . . After a pull or two, and time for the sky  
 to settle in and warm the innards, they will all be  
 ready and willing to believe this tale and any other  
 tale that is told. At least for time it takes to  
 tell it. Which is all that matters, after all....

GEORGE L. GECKLE  
*University of South Carolina*