

pensable in understanding 'Auden's changing ideas of poetry's social role' (xxi) and his fundamentally unchanged concern with human life and society. The editor suggests that 'each piece [of prose] should be read . . . in conjunction with the poems written at about the same time', for 'Some of the essays express the intentions that Auden, with varying success, tries to fulfil in his poems' (xxi). This seems no doubt a just suggestion.

Auden mentions the kind of readers he regards as ideal for any writer: 'The one thing a writer . . . hopes for is attentive readers of his writings. He hopes that they will read with patience and intelligence so as to extract as much meaning from the text as possible' (*Shakespeare: The Sonnets*, Signet Classics, 1964, xix). And also he says, 'What I need . . . is a good textual critic to make the proper emendations, for I am probably the worst proofreader in the world. This can be a source of unnecessary confusion' (Foreword to the *Bibliography*, 1964, viii). In both the *Collected Poems* and *The English Auden* the editor has proved himself to be what Auden hoped for and felt that he needed, the 'attentive reader' 'with patience and intelligence' and 'a good textual critic' of Auden's text.

Ronald Hayman: *Leavis*

London: Heinemann, 1976. xiv + 161 pp.

Reviewed by Makoto Nagai, Aichi Prefectural University.

At the beginning of this book Mr Ronald Hayman compares Leavis with other Cambridge dons and points out how unhistrionic his manner of lecturing was:

Some of the dons were performers, unable to disguise their relish for the effects they could produce in the lecture-hall with a histrionic pause following a carefully turned phrase of their own or a carefully selected quotation, recited almost as if they wanted applause. Either Leavis was totally untheatrical or he was giving an incomparably subtler performance. His voice could not have been less actorish and he did not affect an elocutionary tone for reading poetry. Like T. S. Eliot, he read astringently, anti-romantically, not without commitment, not without sustained tone, but rigorously refusing to emote, letting words and rhythms generate their own force (p. ix).

It is no wonder that Mr Hayman makes these theatrical observations on Leavis's and his colleagues' manners of lecturing. He is a well-known theatre critic who has written several books about contemporary playwrights, such as Samuel Beckett, Harold Pinter and John Osborne. As a matter of fact, Mr Hayman read English at Cambridge in the early 1950s and probably he is one of the disciples of Leavis. He is also the editor of a recently published book *My Cambridge* (1977). In this sense he is well qualified to write this biographical and critical study of Leavis who is, as it were, a typical representative of 'Cambridge English'.

In the Introduction Mr Hayman mentions in summary form eight reasons why he considers Leavis the most important critic of this century. First of all, he takes up the achievement of Leavis as a practical or analytic critic:

He provides more help than any other critic in coming to close grips with a text. The ideal critic is the ideal reader, and Leavis reads with enormous concentration and total commitment, using his ear as well as his eye, his memory as well as his judgment. The act of reading becomes more exciting because he prods us into making it a co-operative process in which we bring as much of ourselves as we can to meet as much of the writer as he has put into the words (p. xiii).

Mr Hayman, like many other critics, seems to believe in a myth—a myth that Leavis is a practical critic faithful to a text. At another place in this book he also expresses a similar view: "He is a better critic of verse than of fiction because his greatest strength lies in his capacity for concentrated attention on representative detail. The more closely he can approximate to the conditions of practical criticism, the better he writes" (p. 137). Is Leavis, then, a practical or analytic critic in the true sense of the word?

Indeed Leavis himself makes some remarks which do not altogether deny the myth. Let us quote them here:

By the critic of poetry I understand the complete reader; the ideal critic is the ideal reader (*The Common Pursuit*).

Analysis . . . is the process by which we seek to attain a complete reading of the poem—a reading that approaches as nearly as possible to the perfect reading (*Education and the University*).

In dealing with individual poets the rule of the critic is, or should (I think) be,

to work as much as possible in terms of particular analysis—analysis of poems or passages, and to say nothing that cannot be related immediately to judgments about producible texts (*Revaluation*).

But in reality Leavis does not think that analysis is everything. Even in *Education and the University* he says: "Literary study, of course, cannot stop at the analysis of verse- and prose-texture". And in the recent *Times Literary Supplement* (March 3, 1972) he makes a protest against the identification of him with 'Practical Criticism': "I have never thought of the critical discipline as something to be identified with the analysis of patches, short pieces, and extracts that can be contained on a page or an examination paper." Judging from these statements, we cannot conclude that Leavis is an analytic critic. I think Roger Fowler is right in saying that "Though Leavis is often regarded as a pioneer of close verbal analysis, he is actually anti-analytic" (*The Languages of Literature*). The credit for being pioneer in verbal analysis should be given to I. A. Richards and William Empson.

In my opinion Leavis's real value lies elsewhere. As Mr Hayman in fact says:

Leavis hits out hard against the idea (which some of the Structuralists have now taken over from the Symbolists) that 'art' should be kept in a separate compartment from 'life' and judged by different standards. Leavis's criticism proves the validity of his belief that 'the establishing of the poem (or the novel) is the establishing of a value. Any reading of it that takes it as a work of art involves an element of implicit valuation. The process, the kind of activity of inner response and discipline, by which we take possession of the created work is essentially the kind of activity that completes itself in a value-judgment' (p. xiv).

This feature of Leavis's criticism seems inconsistent with his achievement in practical criticism as mentioned previously by Mr Hayman. For Leavis's criticism, as it is suggested here, is nothing but moral criticism directed at value-judgment and is opposed to formal or aesthetic criticism, including symbolism and structuralism. Anyway Leavis's real value lies in his moral criticism. Formalism, I think, is the Continental and American type of criticism, whereas moral criticism is of the traditional English type. Leavis may be said, therefore, to be the most typical English critic who has inherited the critical tradition since Matthew Arnold.

Furthermore, Leavis's criticism is often said to be empirical and anti-

theoretical, as René Wellek pointed out as early as 1937. According to Leavis's view, it is because Wellek is a philosopher and he himself a literary critic. And the literary critic "must be on his guard against abstracting improperly from what is in front of him and against any premature or irrelevant generalizing—of it or from it" (*The Common Pursuit*). Mr Hayman is naturally on the side of Leavis and rejoices that he has not been a philosopher: "Looking back today on the whole corpus of Leavis's literary and cultural criticism, it seems obvious that his achievement is far greater than it could have been if he had chosen to adumbrate his value philosophically" (p. 57).

Another point we notice in this book is that Mr Hayman emphasizes the significance of Leavis as a teacher. The reason for this is to be found in his idea that a critic "can be understood only by taking account of the context in which he worked, and for the last fifty years Dr Leavis has been primarily a teacher" (p. xii). Thus Mr Hayman explains Leavis's greatness as a teacher: "Leavis has done more than any other teacher to win prestige for English studies" (p. xiii). The above-mentioned achievement of Leavis as a practical critic may also be included in this category—the achievement as a teacher. But on the other hand, Leavis is greatly indebted to students by teaching them. As for the discipline of analysis, Mr Hayman says: "Leavis would have been unable to cultivate it so successfully if he had not been teaching" (p. 49). In fact, many of his books have been produced as a result of teaching students. Leavis himself acknowledges this fact and dedicates some books to students or places of teaching. We recall his words at the end of the preface to *Revaluation*: "The debt that I wish to acknowledge is to those with whom I have, during the past dozen years, discussed literature as a 'teacher': if I have learnt anything about the methods of profitable discussion I have learnt it in collaboration with them." As George Steiner says, therefore, it is no exaggeration to say that "All his criticism has sprung from the context of teaching" (*Language and Silence*).

Among eight reasons given for Leavis's greatness, there are also some incidental and trivial ones. We can find, for instance, the following statement: "Leavis's judgment, though fastidious, is usually sound. He has made mistakes and he has hardly kept in touch with developments in literature since 1950, but his mistakes, by and large, have been less serious and less damaging to the corpus of his critical

achievement than the mistakes of T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound were to theirs" (p. xiii). Certainly this is not a very cogent reason for Leavis's greatness. It seems to me that Mr Hayman here speaks only in defence of his teacher.

As Mr Hayman himself calls this study "semi-biographical", it provides many important biographical facts on the Leavises. Above all, there are some very interesting and revealing episodes we were not familiar with. We are told, for example, that Mr and Mrs Leavis had Friday tea-parties in the early 1930s, and that "Queenie Leavis's home-made cakes and scones were delicious and the tea-parties were soon attracting many of the most interesting people in Cambridge, including Wittgenstein" (p. 17). This information surprises us greatly, because we did not see Leavis as such a sociable person.

Another interesting piece of information we did not expect is that Leavis is slow in writing: "Unlike his wife, Leavis has never found it easy to write. Once, when W. H. Mellers was staying in their house while studying for his Mus. B. after taking a degree in English, Leavis complained with wry envy about the speed at which his wife and Mellers could both write" (p. 51). This is also a quite unbelievable episode in the case of such a prolific writer as Leavis.

Moreover, it is especially helpful that we can get much information about Queenie Leavis. As Mr Hayman says, the intellectual relationship between Leavis and his wife is so "symbiotic" that "there is clear evidence of cross-fertilization between her book *Fiction and the Reading Public* and her husband's pamphlet *Mass Civilization and Minority Culture*" (pp. 10-11). It is probably under the influence of his wife that Leavis shifted his interest from poetry to the novel. But Queenie Leavis admirably performed her duties as a housewife, too. We are deeply impressed by a description of her devotion: "Apart from her writing and editorial work, she had three children to bring up, a house to run, food to cook and a series of serious illnesses which made the doctors forecast she had not long to live" (p. 68). Thus we fully realize that Leavis could not have produced such great achievements without her assistance.

In conclusion, Mr Hayman treats almost all the important problems about Leavis, such as the launching and death of *Scrutiny*, his shift of interest from poetry to the novel, that is, from T. S. Eliot to D. H. Lawrence, and his controversy with C. P. Snow over 'The Two

Cultures'. But in my opinion each chapter is too short to discuss them in detail. And the concept of 'organic community', which I think is most important as the basis of Leavis's ideas, is not satisfactorily discussed here. Nevertheless, we should highly appreciate this study as a first attempt to reveal the real nature of a great literary critic of our time.

Regina K. Fadiman: *Faulkner's "Light in August":
A Description and Interpretation of the Revisions*

Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia,
1975. 231 pp.

Reviewed by Kenzaburo Ohashi, University of Tokyo.

What are the most important and indispensable factors that should constitute a study of the "making" of a work of art such as a novel? A mere examination of the given materials—to compare, for example, manuscript, typescript, type-setting copy, and published text; to trace, through the comparison and through other internal evidences, the process of how or in what sequence the writer wrote the book; or even to point out what kind of literary effects, cumulative and well-integrated in it, he succeeded in producing by that process—could that be called an elucidation of the "making" of the novel? The answer to the question would inevitably be "no," because in the "making" of a work of art there must be involved many or perhaps innumerable factors and elements and motives, inherent not only in such physical aspects of writing as original handwriting or typewriting, revising, making the work into the final shape in which it is published, but also in other numerous, psychic spheres such as the social, moral and cultural environments of the writer, his intellect and art consciousness as well as his subconscious activities, or even some mythical and ethnic inheritances which he stores in the depth of his consciousness. Indeed, we could never even say exactly what things "make" a work of art, or a novel, unless we would limit those aspects and strata we handle to a certain definite number according to our own assumptions, which, however, should anyhow try to cover the *whole* process of the working