



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

out special words; *a fortiori* in the case of the king, whose grants are interpreted more strictly and in which grants nothing passes without express words. And as to the words of prohibition of all others to print &c. these words cannot amount to a grant, neither can anything pass thereby."

The course of the argument was, that the prohibition ended with the king's death and did not vest an interest in the grantee. The court inclined for the defendants, says Skinner. This is what one would expect at a time when monopolies were so much opposed. The argument above shows clearly that the attorney construed the "sole" as vesting *exclusive* rights in the grantee, *i. e.*, as vesting in him an interest in an exclusive property right.³

EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT.

University of Chicago.

REVIEWS

Materials and Methods of Fiction, Revised and Enlarged. By CLAYTON HAMILTON. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1918. Pp. xxvi + 233.

In revising his well known manual, mainly by the addition of review questions, sectional "heads," and a few deprecatory remarks about O. Henry, Mr. Clayton Hamilton has effected little alteration in the original. By a clever publisher's trick, however, the new edition has been put forth under two titles, both as given above and as *A Manual of the Art of Fiction, Prepared for the Use of Schools and Colleges*; but prospective purchasers should be warned that the two apparently distinct works differ only in the title page and in the wording of one sentence in the "Foreword."

During the ten years that have elapsed since the *Materials and Methods of Fiction* was first published it has become a standard work. In spite of the many competitors which the decade has brought into the overcrowded field of textbooks for story writers, it remains perhaps the most thoughtful and the most genuinely

³Since this article went to press, Mr. Pollard has informed me of the intended publication of an investigation by Mr. A. W. Reed, who presented a paper on this subject before the Bibliographical Society of London in November.

helpful. Certain chapters, particularly such as Chapter VI, entitled "Setting" (on the whole the most original contribution of the book), or Chapter VII, "The Point of View in Narrative," present the student of the mystery of story telling with a clear-headed and penetrating analysis such as he may seek in vain in other hand-books. The chapter on "Characters" is almost as good; but it contains one passage that seems to need reconsideration. After an illuminating distinction between the typical and the individual method of character drawing, we are referred, quite correctly, for examples of characters that are purely typical to the personages of the morality plays; but for the other extreme, that of purely individual characterization, the illustrations given are the minor figures in Ben Jonson's plays and Dickens' novels. The truth is surely, however, that Jonson and Dickens in their personifications of exaggerated single traits use essentially the same method of characterization as the moralities, a method historically in large part derived from them; for the evolution can be traced by imperceptible stages of the personified abstraction into the moral type or "humor." Very different results are produced by the opposite method of character-drawing; for a character becomes more individual, not as it is more simplified, but as it is made more complex. An instance of this extreme, where the portrait has been overloaded with detail beyond the point where the imagination can fuse it into unity, is perhaps to be found in George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*; and the error of attempting to present personalities that are too many-sided, in a way that may be true to life but is not true to art, occurs often enough in over-scrupulous historical novels and dramas. Mr. Hamilton's inadvertence here, however, if it be one, is small, and his treatment of the problems of characterization is as a whole sound and suggestive. Many of his other pages also, such as his analysis of the triple process of the writer thru scientific discovery and philosophic understanding to artistic expression, his discussion of the relation of fact to truth in fiction, and of what constitutes immorality in a work of art, and his description of the necessary endowment of a writer of fiction, summed up in the happy phrase "an experiencing nature," are altogether satisfying. The unflinching evidence of painstaking and penetrating reflection, and the always lucid and often notably effective expression, set this work agreeably apart from the crowd of hasty and commercialized

guides to would-be practical story writing, with their foggy thinking and muddled style.

While there is so much in the book that commands instant agreement and warm approval, there are not a few passages that would have gained by a more thoro reconsideration than the present revision has received. The admirer of the treatise of 1908 cannot but regret to find still unaltered in the new edition the old inadequate and misleading theory of the difference between romance and realism—a theory which was first put forth by Mr. Hamilton as early as 1904 and has perhaps become a hobby with him, but which surely ought to have been revised out of existence. The unfortunate identification of romanticism with deduction and realism with induction as the fundamental distinction between the two literary methods of presentment rests upon a false basis and leads to absurd conclusions. If the methods of fiction bear any analogy at all to those of argument, such terms as induction and deduction would more appropriately describe the difference between a detective story and an ordinary narrative: the ordinary tale, in which the suspense is aroused about the effects to follow upon given causes, might be described as *a priori* or deductive, whereas the detective story, which arouses its suspense about the causes that have produced given effects, is perhaps safely to be characterized as *a posteriori* or inductive. But neither realist nor romanticist *per se* is concerned to prove anything by the processes of logic, nor is the main appeal of either to the intellect, the only field where logical categories have a just application. Were classicism, the third great literary attitude, which Mr. Hamilton has unaccountably omitted altogether, the subject under discussion, words like deduction and induction might be in place, for the classic artist is predominantly intellectual, just as the romanticist is predominantly imaginative, and the realist predominantly merely an observer. Mr. Hamilton mentions and dismisses, rather superficially, several other solutions to this problem beside his own. But he has ignored altogether the most satisfactory analysis of the three perennial tendencies in literature that has yet appeared. So important a book as Professor Neilson's *Essentials of Poetry*, published in 1912, should certainly have found a place at this point at least in the bibliography of the new edition.

Merely as a passing analogy, Mr. Hamilton's theory might be harmless enough. But it leads immediately and quite logically to

certain unhappy conclusions. We are informed, first, that realism is essentially a modern product, because, forsooth, induction was first introduced into philosophy by Bacon. "All fiction," says Mr. Hamilton, "was romantic till the days of Bacon. Realism is contemporaneous with modern science and the other applications of inductive thought. Romance survives, of course; but it has lost the undisputed empery of fiction which it held in ancient and in medieval times." Readers of the *Acharnians* and the *Symposium*, of the first oration of Lysias and the fifteenth idyl of Theocritus, of Plautus and Petronius, of *Maître Pathelin*, the *Townley Shepherds' Play*, and the *Prolog to the Canterbury Tales*, not to speak of many a medieval fabliau or Icelandic tale, will be surprized to learn that genuine realism waited for its first appearance in literature till after the *Novum Organum*. A second consequence is equally surprizing, namely, that almost all short stories are necessarily romantic, because the inductive process is practically impossible in the brief space allotted. Kipling and even Maupassant are expressly affirmed to be romanticists in their short stories. One wonders if Mr. Hamilton is consistent enough to hold that the Russians Gogol and Gorky and Tchekhoff, whom he nowhere mentions in this treatise, are also romanticists. Surely such a method of classification darkens counsel.

There are other evidences of a failure to take into account modern developments in the art of fiction, none of which perhaps lead to lapses so serious as have just been discussed, but some sufficiently unfortunate. Beside the omission of the great Russian story tellers, there is no mention of the stories of Conrad and Wells, with their noteworthy innovations in technique; and there is even an attitude of contempt toward the whole modern movement of naturalism, which is dismissed with the following bit of sentimentalism: "So-called 'naturalism,' a method of art which casts the unnatural emphasis of photographic reproduction upon phases of actual life which are base in themselves and insignificant of the eternal instinct which leads men more naturally to look upward at the stars than downward at the mud." Whatever one's attitude toward the work of Zola and Hauptmann, their influence on later literature bulks too large to be disposed of in quite so rhetorical a fashion.

A less prejudiced attitude toward the naturalists would perhaps have saved Mr. Hamilton from the blindness which he reveals to

another distinctive manifestation of our day—namely, the return of the epic mood to literature. In an otherwise judicious chapter on “The Epic, the Drama, and the Novel,” he declares that the epic today is dead. The reasons assigned for its decease are that “we have lost belief in a communal conflict so absolutely just and necessary as to call to battle powers not only human but divine”; that “we have grown to set the one above the many, and to believe that, of right, society exists for the sake of the individual rather than the individual for the sake of society”; and that the epic “presents the individual mainly in relation to a communal cause which he strives to advance or retard.” These affirmations about the spirit of modern society read strangely in the present year of grace. Surely every one of the marks which Mr. Hamilton finds necessary for the epic mood are essentially present today to an overwhelming degree. For at least a century we have been constantly becoming less individualized and more socialized; and the result in our literature has appeared in the steadily increasing predominance of the community and the environment over the individual, shown so distinctly in modern naturalism, in the modern way of bringing the background into the foreground as is done by Hardy and his disciples, and finally in the notable modern revival of the epic itself in such examples as *The Dynasts*, *Drake*, *The Dawn of Britain*, and many another genuine modern reincarnation of the ancient type.

Another belated observation that has likewise escaped revision is that the novel today tends necessarily to shorten. In spite of the support which Mr. Kipling lent to this theory in his *The Passing of the Three Decker*, it is more than debatable, in the face of the astonishing and unprecedented lengths to which leading modern novelists have been extending their productions. *The Old Wives' Tale*, *Somehow Good*, *Jean Christophe*, and the host of recent trilogies and “life novels,” suggests that it is time for Mr. Kipling to issue a supplement in which he might consider the coming of the literary leviathan and the convoy.

Closely connected with the theory that fiction is becoming, or ought to become, shorter, is the doctrine of the short story derived from Poe. In spite of many signs that the so-called “short-story,” the literary type fathered by Poe, is passing in modern literature, Mr. Hamilton stands out strongly for the Poe ideal. His definition

of this distinctive American product of the later nineteenth century as designed "to produce a single narrative effect with the greatest economy of means that is consistent with the utmost emphasis" is easily the best yet offered; for it not only defines the type, but, perhaps unintentionally, indicates its essential artistic defect. The American variety of the ancient tale succeeded only too well, especially in the hands of its later practitioners, in its efforts after "the utmost emphasis." It is too emphatic, too "loud," to take a permanent place in the gallery of the really great types of literature. It embodied the current ideal of "efficiency" as applied to story telling, and as such was eternally false to the principles of true art. Today, in spite of or perhaps a little because of the throng of manuals and textbooks that essay to teach it, we are returning with relief to the unemphatic but unartificial masterpieces of the Russians as truer models. The mechanical ideal to which the theory of the "short-story" inevitably leads is illustrated by Mr. Hamilton's assertion that there is only one right way to construct a story, that the theme of *Ligeia*, for instance, could be developed in story form only as Poe has developed it. By a highly debatable analysis he attempts to show that the structure of this tale is "at all points inevitably conditioned by its theme, and that no detail of the structure could be altered without injuring the effect of the story." Today most of these inevitabilities are cheerfully discarded by really original writers such as Conrad and Tchekhoff; and the result is as refreshing as it always is when genius disobeys the codifying dogmatism of the would-be literary lawgivers.

It is perhaps inevitable that any book on literary technique should bristle with points that invite controversy; and if space permitted one would like to take issue with several other affirmations found in Mr. Hamilton's treatise. To affirm, after Maeterlinck and Andreyeff, that the dramatist must select from life only its active moments, and that his characters must "constantly be doing something"; that a drama must be based on a struggle between individual human wills (a doctrine ascribed to Brunetière, who expressly recognized many other forms of dramatic conflict beside the struggle between two characters—a limitation that would exclude equally *Oedipus*, *Macbeth*, and *Ghosts*); that the connotation of a word inheres solely in the sensuous appeal of its sound and the suggestions thereby called up—these and other dicta might well be subjected to prolonged discussion. To do so, however,

would give an impression disproportionate to the larger number of sound and thoroly convincing pages with which the book is filled. Had Mr. Hamilton designed it, as perhaps he did, and as his predecessor Aristotle is said to have done with his manual on the materials and methods of Greek fiction, merely as a codification by induction of the principles of the generation just preceding, the number of passages that call for disagreement would be considerably diminished; and the measure of accomplishment which the comparison suggests is after all not undeserved by the book's real achievement.

ROBERT L. RAMSAY.

University of Missouri.

Georg Rudolf Weckherlin. The Embodiment of a Transitional Stage in German Metrics. By AARON SCHAFFER, Ph. D., Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1918. (Hesperia: Studies in Germanic Philology, No. 10.)

In this monograph Dr. Schaffer presents the results of a careful and exhaustive study of the metrics of Georg Rudolf Weckherlin, the German poet of the seventeenth century, who, it may be incidentally remarked, was Milton's immediate predecessor as Secretary for Foreign Tongues to the Committee of the Two Kingdoms.

Weckherlin's verse-technique has been a much discussed topic since the days of Herder, who was the first to rescue the poet from oblivion. The critics are clearly divided into two camps, the one holding that Weckherlin wrote in conformity to the then prevailing principle of the so-called *Silbenzählung*, of which Hans Sachs is supposedly the most renowned exponent; the other, that he wrote according to the free accentuating principle of Early Germanic versification, of which again Hans Sachs is looked upon as the highest representative. It was, therefore, with the purpose of reconciling these differences of opinion that Dr. Schaffer undertook this difficult investigation.

The first part of the dissertation is devoted to a survey of "Germanic Metrics from Earliest Times to Opitz," in which the attempt is made to get at the underlying principles of German verse-technique in so far as they may be applicable to Weckherlin's poetry. This review is decidedly the most unsatisfactory part of the mono-