

University of Arizona Document Delivery

Journal Title: Ariel

Trans. #: 652058

Article Author: Carnie, Robert



Article Title: Review of 'W. J. Bate
(1978) Samuel Johnson, New York'

Call #: PR1 .A7 v.9-10 1978-79

Volume: 9

Location: Main Library

Issue: 4

Item #:

Month/Year: 1978

Pages: 97-100

Imprint:

CUSTOMER INFORMATION:

ANDREW H CARNIE
carnie@email.arizona.edu

STATUS: Faculty
DEPT: LINGUISTICS

University of Arizona Library
Document Delivery
1510 E. University Blvd.
Tucson, AZ 85721
(520) 621-6438
(520) 621-4619 (fax)
AskILL@u.library.arizona.edu

Paged by TM (Initials) 7/12 4:32

Reason Not Filled (check one):

- NOS NFAC (GIVE REASON)
- LACK VOL/ISSUE OVER 100 PAGES
- PAGES MISSING FROM VOLUME

work is particularly useful and rich in its exploration, not only of Macbeth, but also of Banquo, Duncan, Lady Macbeth, and Malcolm. While it cannot avoid the vexed question of Macbeth's offspring, his speculation on the importance of dynastic succession in the play does much to illuminate its central themes and symbols. And our feelings for the wonderful and irreducible complexity of the play grows as we read. Finally, "we go with Macbeth" says Mr. Rosenberg, because, despite the murders on his hands, "our polyphony responds to his." Shakespeare's *coup de maître* in this play is to command both this polyphony and this response; Mr. Rosenberg's is to help less gifted and less diligent readers open themselves to everything the play offers.

One final word: this is certainly a book to be chewed and digested, but Mr. Rosenberg offers us a banquet, not a Businessman's Lunch. About certain things we could wish to hear more (one reference to John Wilkes Booth in the role of Macbeth is unfair); about certain others we could bear to hear a little less (some readers may not altogether relish the thirty-two page discussion of the stage direction "Enter three Witches"). But *The Masks of "Macbeth"* is written with unflinching humour and deftness, and with unfeigned admiration both for the play and for all those who have struggled with it. Reading these pages, we cannot doubt that, whatever his own struggles, Mr. Rosenberg has listened long and thoughtfully to the music of *Macbeth*; now, thanks to the labour he so evidently delights in, all of us may hear that music the more clearly.

William Blackburn

W. Jackson Bate, *Samuel Johnson*. New York and London: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1977, pp. 646. \$19.95.

The author of yet another biography of Samuel Johnson has to be, of necessity, a courageous spirit. He will be uncomfortably aware, as a close student of the Johnsonian biographical tradition, that there have been, between William Rider's first attempt in 1762 and the present day, over two hundred biographical accounts of Lichfield's most famous citizen, and that nearly all of these biographies are forgotten except by a handful of Johnson specialists. He must surely ask himself the question whether his own work might well prove to be equally ephemeral. Any current biographer, and his publisher, will also be very conscious of the fact that two admirable general biographies of Johnson, from the talented pens of John Wain and Margaret Lane, were produced in 1975 and are still on the market. In attempting to justify the publication of yet another, it might be argued that it is a tribute to Johnson's greatness as a man and as a writer that each succeeding generation finds Johnson vital enough to relate what he was, what he said and what he wrote to that generation's predominant cultural interests and concerns. The irony is that it is not Johnson the moralist, or Johnson *Agonistes* who remains alive and well, but the all-powerful myth of Johnson, the great bear-like eccentric. There is little evidence, alas, that Johnson's own writings will ever be as widely read as Bate's

biography. I am also doubtful whether Bate's compelling literary portrait of the near heroic struggles of Johnson against poverty, psychosomatic illness and all other ills which assail the scholar's life will ever seriously modify that overwhelming impression of the Boswellian portrait of a great original dominating the conversations and opinions of all the lesser mortals who flocked to see and hear him. The greatest challenge facing any new biographer of Johnson is how effectively does his work rebut the assertion that, as long as Boswell's *Life* exists, further biographies can offer nothing more than supplementary material or a new and striking emphasis.

Walter Jackson Bate has less reason to fear a lukewarm reception than most biographers of Johnson. His qualifications for writing a new popular biography of Johnson are as impeccable as they are various. He has already demonstrated his skill in the genre with his studies of Keats (1963) and of Coleridge (1968). He does not have to apologize, as John Wain over-modestly does, for not being a Johnson specialist. Bate's critical study, *The Achievement of Samuel Johnson*, is deservedly popular amongst students and teachers. This new biography is a work aimed at the non-specialist and the general reader. In such biographies it is the biographer's task, to use Bate's own words, "to select and distill as honestly as he can". This particular popular biography, however, arises out of scholarly excellence, as Bate's editorial work on the Yale *Johnson* abundantly demonstrates. Bate also reveals that deep basic sympathy or love for his subject which is so necessary for successful biographical writing, and he never crosses that dangerous line which separates loving sympathy from idolatry, and biography from panegyric. Johnson might well have been startled by some of Bate's observations on his intimate relationships with Tetty, but he would surely have approved of Bate's balanced mixture of sympathy and objectivity. When Malone suggested to Johnson that Joseph Addison's character was so generally admirable that it was a pity that Johnson's account of him should have mentioned some minor flaws, Johnson insisted that a man's vices, as well as his virtues, should be treated in his biography. As Bate says, Johnson believed "that hardly a single life has passed from which we could not learn something, if only it were told with complete honesty". Johnson's life, whether we read of it in his own letters, or in Boswell's masterpiece, or in Wain or Bate, or in all of these places, is compellingly instructive.

The major virtues of Bate's solidly satisfying life cannot be easily summarized in a short review. I was particularly pleased to find that it is largely free from the tiresome polemical tone which has disfigured some other recent work on Johnson. It is a pleasure to read a biography of Johnson which establishes its own perspectives without attempting to demean or diminish the achievement of earlier biographers and critics. It is not necessary to indulge in anti-Boswell sentiments in order to be a good Johnsonian. Bate's attitude towards, and use of, Boswell, strikes me as being very sensible. He amplifies Boswell's account of Johnson's early life with the aid of the assiduous researches of

Reade and Clifford, and extensively uses Boswell's treasury of materials for those parts of Johnson's life for which Boswell is the main source. He tactfully enlarges Boswell's picture of Johnson's later days by drawing on our extensive 20th century knowledge of the Thrales. Bate mentions the interesting fact that, in the twenty-one years Boswell knew Johnson, he spent only 426 days in Johnson's company. This is, of course, exactly 426 days *more* than any 20th century biographer can claim, and Bate is well aware that Boswell, with his notebooks, had a marvellous facility for recreating living personalities. Bate rightly calls Boswell's *Life* "a masterpiece of world literature," and avoids the curious excesses of Donald Greene, who, in an article recently published in *The Georgia Review*, fails miserably to convince me that Boswell's *Life* is "in 1978 a most inadequate biography of Samuel Johnson." Greene sets Boswell up against mythical ideals of biography and uses all kinds of special pleading. Bate's biography is mercifully free from this kind of thing.

Bate makes extensive use of Freudian and post-Freudian concepts and terminology in analyzing some of Johnson's inner conflicts. He does so with characteristic good sense and restraint, and works largely within the limits of the evidence provided by Johnson's prayers, meditations and letters, and by the testimony of Johnson's most intimate friends. One wonders occasionally what Johnson himself, and his friends in holy orders, who naturally saw Johnson's psychological problems in terms of religious and moral imperatives, would have made of the "super-ego" explanations which Bate provides for the rigorous demands which Johnson made on himself and which caused the subsequent breakdowns. Bate very briefly dismisses conjectures that some of Johnson's personality disorders may have had physiological or organic origins, strongly preferring the explanation that Johnson's "tics" and compulsive mannerisms were psychoneurotic symptoms. With Johnson's continuous history of ill-health, it is surely not unreasonable to believe that such painful afflictions were both physical *and* psychosomatic in origin. Had they been purely psychosomatic, a man of Johnson's strength of character might well have been able to overcome them. Generally speaking, however, Bate's psychological explanations of Johnson's inner torments and outward infirmities show a balance and restraint frequently absent from discussions of this kind.

One of the most difficult issues for a twentieth century biographer of Johnson is how much weight he should give to the "padlock and fetters" business in view of the problematic and incomplete nature of the evidence. Bate's assertion that a sexual explanation of Johnson's padlock and of the cryptic note in the *Diaries*: "De pedicis et manicis insana cogitatio" flies in the face of psychological probability and practical good sense, is persuasive, as is his argument that twentieth century minds are too prone to assume sexual abnormality in everything described as "secret". He believes that Johnson's "secret" was his belief that he had actually been insane during his breakdowns and kept padlock and fetters — the normal means of restraint for the insane in the eighteenth century — by him as a precautionary

measure. There is certainly no hard evidence that the relationship between Johnson and Mrs. Thrale had sado-masochistic overtones. Bate might have been wiser to use the old Scottish legal verdict of "not proven" rather than his emphatic verdict of "not guilty" in view of the puzzling tone of a later exchange of letters between Mrs. Thrale and her house guest.

One result of Bate paying so much attention to Johnson's tormented "inner life" is that insufficient attention is paid to Johnson in the metropolitan and public context of the tavern, salon and the streets of London, where Johnson's lively humour and wit were so noticeable. Boswell, of course, does this supremely well, and Bate may have felt that it need not be repeated.

I have said nothing so far of the numerous critical analyses of Johnson's writings which are of the greatest importance in a biography of a literary figure. It is not because I undervalue them, and I am at a loss to understand the harshness of the criticism of some early reviewers about this aspect of Bate's work, making as they do, such judgements as "weak", "conventional" and "perfunctory". The literary analyses seem to me to exemplify both Bate's sound critical positions and the maturity of his critical insights. They are written in that deceptively simple, graceful, jargon-free prose with which his students and readers have long been familiar. Bate's views on *Rasselas*, the *Rambler* essays and the poetical imitations are already well known, and it may be that they lose a little from this familiarity, and from the compression consequent on the subordination of the study of the works to the interpretation of the man necessary in a biography. They remain, however, an important and insightful part of a splendid biography which will remain permanently on my shelves alongside Boswell, Krutch and Wain.

R. H. Carnie

W. J. T. Mitchell, *Blake's Composite Art: A Study of the Illuminated Poetry*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978. pp. xix + 232, illus. \$16.50.

Mitchell's book is on the whole an excellent study of the relationship between text and design in Blake's illuminated poetry. The first two chapters cover very helpful background examining Blake's theory and art in the context of various aesthetic traditions. Having established the background and principles of Blake's unique composite art, Mitchell turns in the last three chapters to practical critiques of *The Book of Thel*, *The Book of Urizen* and *Jerusalem*.

Mitchell argues that what makes Blake's poetry and illustrations distinctive is that each stands on its own and that the two forms, while complete in themselves, join and conflict to create a composite art. Although neither of the forms is subordinate to the other, Blake achieves a unity which is not simple "painting plus poetry," but "painting times poetry," a complex "dialectic between vigorously independent modes of expression." This dia-

lectic between text and design reflects Blake's theory that "without Contraries is no Progression." Mitchell's point that the form of Blake's art reflects his vision is well-taken and he frequently comes up with perceptive readings based on the principle that various aspects of Blake's "execution" or style are metaphors in themselves. For example, he argues that in *The Book of Urizen* the separation of text and design, the two-column format of the pages, and the division of the text with chapter and verse numbers reflect Urizen's mania for dividing and measuring.

Another area in which Mitchell is particularly effective is explaining the reason for Blake's creation of a dynamic relationship between text and design: "the contrariety of poem and picture entices the reader to supply the missing connections. In this light, the problematics of reading text and design serve as an 'allegory address'd to the Intellectual powers' which is 'fittest for Instruction, because it rouses the faculties to act.'" Blake's composite art demands a creative partner and Mitchell argues convincingly that he designed "pictures as vortices which draw the reader inward, into a dialectic of ironies, ambiguities, paradoxes, and concentric unfoldings," and that he "intentionally designed *Jerusalem* to allow only an approximate sense of structural orientation" in order to draw "our attention inward, onto the Minute Particulars of text and design." In light of this his reading of the frontispiece to *Jerusalem* is particularly apt — the figure entering the dark doorway with the burning sun-imagination in his right hand symbolizes "with equal force the activities of the author, hero, or reader of the poem. To assert that the figure is 'primarily' to be seen as Los is simply to restate this universality of reference, for Los symbolizes the imagination of *both* the author and the reader, personified as the hero of the poem."

Mitchell's choice of *The Book of Thel*, *The Book of Urizen* and *Jerusalem* is appropriate (covering as they do a wide variety of Blake's poetic and visual styles and themes) giving his study a rising crescendo from the apparent pastoral simplicity of *Thel*, through the more complex mythic parody of *Urizen* to what Mitchell describes as the "encyclopedic anatomy" of *Jerusalem*. In spite of this chronological arrangement Mitchell does not fall into the trap of dividing Blake's artistic life into periods or stages (cf. E. D. Hirsch's attempt to stuff Blake's work into a grid of menopausal periods in *Innocence and Experience: An Introduction to Blake*). In fact, Mitchell's treatment of these three works, covering approximately thirty years of Blake's life, implicitly illustrates how organic Blake's vision was. Unlike Wordsworth or Byron, Blake did not undergo any great retractions or reversals for, to use Mitchell's term, Blake's vision is "centripetal" rather than linear and it never hardened into a fixed teleology or philosophy. Mitchell at one point apologizes for referring to Blake's concept of "Self-annihilation" in discussing *The Book of Thel* because this theory is not developed until *Milton* fifteen years later. But this concept, though not articulated as completely as in the later works, was certainly an important part of Blake's vision in 1789 and Mitchell's use of it in reading *Thel*