Lehigh University
Lehigh Preserve

Theses and Dissertations

1965

The reaction to romanticism in the North American Review, 1835-1860

James A. Rhody
Lehigh University

Follow this and additional works at: https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd

Part of the English Language and Literature Commons

Recommended Citation
Rhody, James A., "The reaction to romanticism in the North American Review, 1835-1860" (1965). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3325.
https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd/3325

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

THE REACTION TO ROMANTICISM IN THE *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, 1835-1860

by
James Andrew Rhody

A Thesis

Presented to the Graduate Faculty

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Lehigh University

1965

THE REACTION TO ROMANTICISM IN THE *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, 1835-1860

by
James Andrew Rhody

A Thesis

Presented to the Graduate Faculty

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 28, 1965
(date)

Carl F Strauch
Professor in charge

J. Burke Severs
Head of the Department

Contents

	Abstract	1
I	The Background	3
II	The Reviews and the Reviewers	41
III	Conclusions	107
	Notes	115
	List of Works Consulted	124
	Vita	127

Abstract

Between 1815 and 1860, the writers of the North American Review, serious scholars from the Harvard-Unitarian community, took a keen interest in the development of American culture, and they appraised all of the major American authors of the period--except Melville--and a number of foreign Romantics. The literary criticism in the Review reflected the critics' nationalistic self-consciousness, as well as their religiosity and belief in progress. Commitment to these ideas produced in the critics a mood of optimistic expectation, a spirit generally referred to as a "romantic" impulse and, hence, seemingly congenial to Romantic literature. The key to literary Romanticism, however, is dynamic organicism, a principle that, especially in its negative aspects, frequently gave rise to literary works that were at odds with the world-view of the critics for the North American. Confusion about the definition of Romanticism and differences in evaluation procedures have led modern scholars--namely, George E. DeMille, Harry H. Clark, and Robert E. Streeter--to differ considerably in their estimates of the overall attitudes toward Romanticism expressed in the Review from 1815 to 1860.

During Alexander H. Everett's editorship (1830-1835) the North American generally carried favorable notices of the Romantics. Everett himself wrote a laudatory review

of Carlyle's Sartor Resartus in 1835. During John G. Palfrey's editorship (1836-1842), the writers of the North American, critics like Palfrey, Cornelius C. Felton, and George S. Hillard, approved of Hawthorne, but were out of sympathy with Carlyle and the emerging American Transcendentalists. During Francis Bowen's editorship (1843-1852), the literary critics, especially Bowen and Felton, who wrote most of the criticism, grew even more hostile to the American Transcendentalists and the foreign Romantics. Edwin P. Whipple, however, an able critic, did respond sensitively to Wordsworth and Byron. Between 1853, when Andrew P. Peabody became editor, and 1860, a new generation of critics began writing for the North American, and these reviewers--namely, Edward E. Hale, Charles C. Everett, and Frederick H. Hedge--tended to be much more sympathetic to foreign and American Romantics. They wrote favorable reviews of Whitman, Browning, and Goethe, among others.

Nearly all of the critics for the North American from 1835 to 1860 were professional men--ministers, professors, and lawyers--who conceived of themselves as a cultural elite. They could accept the more affirmative Romantics--Wordsworth, for instance--but their optimistic Christianity, belief in progress, and cultural pride made them unfriendly to Romantic works that, in their estimation, were irreverent, anti-social, and misanthropic in outlook. In the 1850's this attitude toward Romanticism gradually gave way to one of greater tolerance and understanding.

CHAPTER I

The Background

Dealing as it does with human reactions to literature, the history of literary criticism can be almost as fascinating in its psychological aspect as the literature whose past it investigates. Moreover, studies of contemporary criticism have the additional value of providing new and unconventional insights into the literature by illuminating the cultural milieu which gave rise to it. To be of maximum utility, however, such an analysis of criticism must attempt not only to ascertain what the critics had to say, but in some measure to explain just why they responded as they did. To interpret the critical reaction to Romanticism in the North American Review during the years 1835 to 1860, therefore, I have found it necessary to characterize the magazine against the national cultural background and to consider the origin of the magazine as well as the rationale on which its editorial policies were based. This, of course, necessitated going back to the year 1815, the founding date of the Review.

In the interest of comprehensiveness, it also seemed expedient, when dealing with individual critics, to take into account any available biographical data that would help to clarify the critic's world-view, his credentials and reputation, and his critical standards and method; in short, I used any information that shed some light on the

criticism. With the same intent, I have also sought out essays and reviews which the major critics and editors published in journals other than the North American Review.

No other quarter century in American literary history has been so richly productive as the years 1835 to 1860. Beginning just a few months after the first American publication of Carlyle's brilliant and influential masterpiece, Sartor Resartus (1834), and ending with the publication of Hawthorne's Marble Faun (1860), this twenty-five-year period spans the emergence and full flowering of Emerson, Hawthorne, Melville, Thoreau, and Whitman. I am concerned, on the one hand, with the critical reception in the North American Review of the American and foreign Romantics, and, on the other hand, with the editors and critics who did the reviewing. So far as I know, I have accounted for every critical article on Carlyle and the major American Romantics mentioned above that appeared in the North American from 1835 to 1860--Melville was not reviewed. In my coverage of the criticism of other American, English, German and French Romantics I have attempted to include the most representative reviews rather than to be complete. I have emphasized the individual critics and editors according to the quantity of criticism of Romantic literature contributed, the importance of the Romantic works reviewed, and the quality of the criticism.

This study is based for the most part on primary sources, but I have tried to acknowledge contemporary scholarship which has dealt at any length with the criticism of Romantic literature in the North American Review during the period 1835-1860.

The Bostonians who founded the North American Review in 1815 looked upon their venture not as a business enterprise but as a worthwhile contribution to the national culture. Assisting William Tudor, the first editor, were such men as Willard Phillips, Alexander Hill Everett, Richard Henry Dana, Walter Channing and John Gorham Palfrey, each of whom was aware that the United States had no journal comparable to the Edinburgh Review--then in its thirteenth year--and capable of refuting the vituperative anti-American diatribes of the magisterial Scottish journal that at once served as model and antagonist for the North American Review. Tudor had just returned from a trip to the Continent in 1815, and some of the other founders-- A. H. Everett, for instance--had the sort of intimate familiarity with European culture that dramatically revealed America's cultural isolation and the sorry state of American art, especially literature.[1] Thus, the desire for a national culture that would justify their considerable patriotic pride motivated the North American reviewers at the outset.

As a result of their preoccupation with the state of American culture, the first writers of the North American conducted what amounted to a forum on the development of American art. Literature was their primary concern. In the pages of the Review, these writers discussed the question of a national literature in America. Did we have one? If not, would we ever have one? If so, what sort of literature was it to be, and in which subjects and themes did the potential greatness of American literature reside? All of these questions received extensive speculative consideration in the North American and gave rise to an extraordinary self-consciousness in literary matters. Not all the critics agreed that America was destined for literary greatness of any sort, but their concern with the question reveals both the extent to which these men identified with their country and their selfless interest in its cultural development.

The debate over a national literature had pretty well subsided by 1835, but the writers of the North American Review were still inspired by the same patriotic altruism that distinguished the magazine from the beginning. A. H. Everett, then editor, had once declared, "I doubt whether the president of the United States has a higher trust to be accountable for than the editor of the 'North American'."[2]

This solicitous gravity was not without consequence. In influence at home and abroad no other American magazine quite matched the North American Review in 1835. In the first place, it had outlived a raft of similar reviews--the American Monthly Review (1832-1833), and the United States Review (1824-1826), for instance.[3] The twenty-year-old journal was soon to be affectionately referred to as the "Old North" by William Hickling Prescott, who called it "the best periodical we have ever had."[4] Indeed, twenty years constituted remarkable longevity for such a magazine, since the publishing of serious literary reviews, always economically precarious, was especially so in the early and mid-nineteenth century. By 1860 another impressive group of periodicals had come and gone. Probably the most important of these were the New York Review (1837-1842), the Dial (1840-1844), Arcturus (1840-1842), the Whig Review (1845-1852), the Democratic Review (1837-1859), and Literary World (1847-1853). Of the magazines that coexisted with the North American throughout the period, the Knickerbocker Review (1833-1865) and the Southern Literary Messenger are most outstanding. Harpers' magazine did not begin publication until 1850, and the Atlantic Monthly did not appear until 1857.

The North American did more than grow old in the years between 1815 and 1835. Jared Sparks' circulation list in

the 1820's indicates that New York, Albany, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other American cities took substantial numbers of the Review,[5] which had by then become the standard for aspiring American literary magazines to match. Likewise, as early as 1820 it had earned the respect of many English readers; the Edinburgh Review that year called it America's "most promising production."[6] The Bourbons in 1823 considered the North American to be powerfully subversive enough to warrant banning it in France.[7]

By 1835 the business of the North American Review was exclusively criticism. There had been some belles lettres in the early days, but virtually every article now at least purported to be a review of one or more books. Not always could the articles--averaging twenty-five pages--be strictly considered critical. The reviewer sometimes did little more than quote at length from the work under discussion, or, quite frequently he merely used the book as a point of departure for a lengthy disquisition of his own on a related subject. But, for all that, the North American Review did serve to evaluate the works that in the editor's estimation were most significant. The range of subjects covered included literature and language, history, biography, science, politics, and religion, with literature accounting for perhaps one fourth of an average issue.

The writers for the North American came mostly from the Boston-Harvard community. This group included clergymen, lawyers, and professors--learned men all. The writing of many of the best scholars in the nation--men like Edward Everett, George Bancroft, William Hickling Prescott, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and James Russell Lowell, who are well known even today--appeared in the magazine during the period from 1835 to 1860.[8] Also enhancing the status of the Review were some lesser-known but perhaps equally talented foreign scholars who came to the United States in the early nineteenth century. This group included the Harvard professor, Charles Beck, a German, and the Italian scholar and lecturer, Antonio Gallenga. Therese A. L. von Jakob (Mrs. Edward Robinson) contributed six articles on such subjects as Teutonic, Slavic, and Spanish poetry. Two other women contributors on literary subjects were the Countess de Bury, a French noblewoman, who wrote six articles and a number of critical notices, and Madame de la Barca Calderon, who did some reviewing of Italian literature in the 1830's. With writers and subjects like these the North American could scarcely be branded parochial in outlook. And, of course, a great many of the reviews were written by the editors during the period--namely, A. H. Everett, J. G. Palfrey, Francis Bowen, and Andrew Preston Peabody--all of whom, except Everett, were Harvard professors.

The nation that the North American Review was keeping informed in 1835 had just a few more than fifteen million people,[9] most of whom lived on farms where they toiled an average of twelve hours a day, six days a week. Leisure was then far from becoming a middle-class luxury. Factory workers usually put in a sixty to eighty-hour week for which they netted from three to ten dollars.[10] The masses, then, had neither the ease nor the means to be patrons of the fine arts. Thus, painting and sculpture did not flourish in the period, although a few painters, Samuel F. B. Morse and George Caleb Bingham, for instance, earned a national reputation.[11] Even more popular than the meticulously detailed paintings of Morse and Bingham were the Currier and Ives prints, usually depicting the sentimental charm of rural America. The neo-classicists, Hiram Powers and Horatio Greenough, dominated American sculpture. As for music, Stephen Foster's songs, beginning with Oh! Susanna in 1848, were undoubtedly the most popular. The titles of his more than two hundred tunes tell a lot about the popular culture of the day. Symphonic music and opera, while comparatively rare, were available in the larger cities, especially Boston, where Mozart and Beethoven were well received.

The North American reviewers consistently encouraged the development of fine arts in America. They reported with obvious relish any praiseworthy achievements of American artists, and they waxed optimistic over artists and academies that showed promise of eventually producing worthy art or artists. Music lagged somewhat behind the other arts. The marked scarcity of composers and virtuosi in 1836 prompted Samuel Atkins Eliot to say of the three-year-old Boston Academy of Music: "It is time for such an institution, for the prevalent ignorance has been, and indeed still continues lamentable."[12] Tracing the history of music since primitive time--in typical North American Review fashion--Eliot notes that all cultures have developed some form of music, the quality of which serves as an index of the culture. He concludes, naturally, that the United States will in good time turn out a plethora of able composers and musicians. Painting and sculpture were given the same optimistic encouragement. In an 1856 survey of America's achievement in art, Eliot singles out for special praise the sculptors Greenough and Powers, and the painters Gilbert Stuart and Gilbert S. Newton.[13] Pleased with America's record, Eliot proclaims that, barring civil war or other catastrophe, "a career of brilliancy in almost every department of human life is possible for us" (p. 84).[14]

The North American Review was most concerned with literature, however; and publishing records indicate that of all the fine arts literature also won the greatest share of public patronage. Books had the advantages of inexpensiveness and availability--after 1842 paper-bound volumes sold for as little as twenty-five cents;[15] hence, they came to be the major source of private diversion in that age when movies, radio, and television were, of course, unknown, and when travel to the occasional community entertainments was frequently inconvenient and dangerous for the many rural-dwelling citizens. Thus, Americans read innumerable volumes of poetry and fiction as well as such popular magazines as Godey's Lady's Book, whose monthly circulation--always ahead of the North American Review--reached a phenomenal 150,000 in 1860.[16] Of course, much of the popular literature turned out to be every bit as ephemeral as the bulk of the writing in Godey's. The novels of Hawthorne and Melville, although they sold well, did not achieve the popularity of such now-forgotten works as Susan Warner's The Wide, Wide World and Mary Jane Holmes' The English Orphan.

The literary critics of the North American had the same nationalistic self-consciousness that Eliot so often revealed. Foreign poetry and fiction, when reviewed in

the North American, were almost inevitably compared to their American counterparts, while the reviews of American works included a consideration of their significance as national literature. The critics, however, did not allow their patriotism to influence their literary evaluations. These men were well aware of the folly of unmerited praise bestowed on native writers. If anything, they were more demanding of American authors. With the exception of Melville, who is unmentioned in the North American Review during the period, the North American at one time or another reviewed the productions of all the contemporary American authors whose reputations have lasted to the present day. All of Hawthorne's novels were noted and generally approved. Irving, Cooper, and Bryant got rather extensive coverage and mixed reactions, while Emerson, Thoreau, and Whitman later received less attention and scanter praise, on the whole. Nothing favorable was said of Poe. Occasionally, reviewers in the North American overpraised books that did not live much beyond their own age. In this category were the novels of Maria Edgeworth and Susan Warner; those popular novelists from whom the more lavish encomiums were withheld included Robert Montgomery Bird, and G. P. R. James. Some of the now-forgotten female poets fared well in the North American too.

This preference for female authors generally can be attributed to the moral niceness of the ladies' literary sensibility.

The nationalistic sensitivity that the writers for the North American reveal in their comment on the fine arts comes through even stronger in their reviews of foreign accounts--mostly English--of American culture. The men who wrote the North American had not reached the level of sophistication at which they could produce or tolerate an indictment of their nation of the sort represented by the modern pasquinade, The Ugly American. Instead they squirmed with embarrassed discomfort each time a foreign traveller published a disparaging account of America, and they never failed to rise to the defense of their defamed country. Some of the foreign travellers exaggerated the rugged rawness of the nineteenth-century America, which they mistakenly took for cultural insensitivity; others were simply snobbishly unkind in their evaluation of the ex-English colony; while still others were simply reporting as accurately as possible the comparative and understandable lack of refinement in the manners and living conditions of Americans. In most cases the North American responded with sweet reasonableness, but occasionally the accumulated insults became unbearable and prompted a jocularly malicious outburst, such as Bowen and Felton's "The Morals, Manners, and Poetry of England" in which even Shakespeare is reduced

to a literary poacher.[17] Such inordinate philippics and the inability of the critics to ignore any denigrating comment offer clear evidence of the quality of American nationalism in that age and the role that the North American reviewers felt obligated to play as defenders--as well as critical guiders--of American culture.

Besides optimistically championing the growth of American art and defending the nation from foreign detractors, the North American Review also contributed to the development of a more cosmopolitan outlook at home by introducing American readers to foreign culture. A typical issue of the Review between 1815 and 1835 contained at least one article on the literature of a European nation. Italy, France, Sweden, and Spain all figured in the Review during those years, but perhaps the most significant and influential group of articles on foreign literature were those that dealt with the eighteenth and early nineteenth-century German Romantics. The North American commented, generally with approbation, on the writing of Goethe, Schiller, Richter, the Schlegels, and Heine--among others. Along with the Christian Examiner, a kindred Boston-Unitarian journal, the North American was the leading exponent and disseminator of German culture in the nation.[18]

This respect for German art and learning among the writers of the North American Review is easily understood. A number of the contributors had studied in Germany and were impressed by the obvious academic superiority of German universities. The six scholars whose German educations are described by Orie Long in Literary Pioneers wrote at one time or another for the North American. Three of them, Edward Everett, George Bancroft, and Henry Longfellow, were major contributors.

On the whole the writers of the North American during the period had an awesome respect for German literature, but their esteem was tempered by pietistic reservations about what seemed to them to be immoralities in the writing-- of Goethe, especially. It was more than the literary aberrations of the Germans, however, that disturbed these Bostonians when they studied at German universities. These expatriate scholars were characterized by a refined gentility bordering on prissiness, an attitude that is made clear by their comments upon German manners. Edward Everett was deeply shocked to hear a professor utter "Gott im Himmel,"[19] and in his letters George Bancroft often incredulously remarked upon the slovenliness, vulgarity, and irreverence of the German students.[20] Ironically, these Americans

complained of the same sort of coarseness in Germany that foreign visitors described in their published accounts of travel in the United States. Perhaps the accusations of barbarism that foreigners levelled at Americans produced in them an aristocratic squeamishness. At any rate, a solid sense of propriety distinguishes the writing in the North American Review during the period, and certainly has a marked effect on the literary criticism. Despite their qualms, however, the North American reviewers were not blinded to the merits of German literature and with the exception of Andrews Norton, who so detested everything German that he forbade his son to study German at Harvard,[21] this group of men recognized the merits of German literature and education.

In a great many ways, however, the North American Review was shaped more by the domestic culture it defended than by the foreign culture it admired, as the writers invariably reflected prevailing modes of thought. One of the most notable influences was religion--namely, Christianity--and it tended to be a much more pervasive and effective force in American intellectual life than it is today. While the twentieth-century intellectual might well be a nominal or even a devout Christian, his range of scientific speculation is seldom limited by a religious cosmology.

Modern theorists of the creation of the world, for instance, find it unnecessary to refer to the Divinity. The intellectual of the earlier period, however, did not relegate his religion to his private life; his thought, therefore, inevitably bore the stamp of his religious convictions. Thus, to say that a man was irreligious, or even to say, as Cornelius Felton once said of Emerson, that he was "impartial" toward religion,[22] was to make a damning imputation not only of the man's character, but of his competence as a thinker. Irreligion was by way of being a species of bad logic.

In the North American the religiosity of the age is especially apparent. It crops up in virtually every type of article, including, of course, the literary reviews, but it is perhaps even more obvious and inappropriate in the comment upon the sciences. Of the numerous scientific pieces published in the North American, none reveal the supernatural outlook more clearly than those that deal with the rapidly developing study of geology. The findings of this comparatively new science had already shocked and alienated those who interpreted Genesis literally. Francis Bowen, commenting on the writing of the English geologist Sir Charles Lyell in 1849, grants that educated Christians can no longer take Genesis literally, but he decries the

fact that among some scientists any reverence for scripture has become suspect.[23] Two years later, Mrs. John Ware reveals the same religious outlook.[24] The fundamentalists who resent and fear the findings of modern science she refers to as the "timidly pious." "God's words and works have seemed to disagree only on account of our imperfect knowledge", she optimistically declares, and she urges the "timidly pious" to devote their intellectual energy to scientific inquiry in order that they might refute the "irreverent men who love their theories better than the word of God" (p. 450). To those who wrote on scientific subjects for the North American Review there was really no battle between science and religion. They wholeheartedly embraced both in the belief that science would provide the ultimate vindication of religion.

The religiosity of the North American Review is easily accounted for. From its beginning in 1815 the magazine had been identified with Unitarianism. Four of the eight editors in the period from 1815 to 1860 were Unitarian laymen.[25] And until the 1840's the contributors were almost to a man Unitarians. Their religion represented, in the early nineteenth century, the attempt to reconcile the exalted view of man that underlay the Declaration of Independence and Constitution with the

pessimistically grim Calvinistic view. The doctrine of predestination and the concept of a heaven existing only for a fortunate elite did not at all square with the democratic notions of universal freedom and equal rights. In its Unitarian orientation, then, the North American Review was in the mainstream of the national trend toward religious liberalism in the nineteenth century.[26] This trend was reflected in the West by the more emotional Evangelical Protestant movement, which grew substantially faster than the population between 1835 and 1860.[27] The gathering strength of organized religion in the United States contrasted with the general decline of religion in Europe. Thus, the writers often found it necessary to castigate the impieties of European scientists like George Lyell and literary artists like Victor Hugo and Edward Bulwer-Lytton. By and large, the reviewers abstained from sectarian controversies, however.

The North American reviewers' wholehearted and optimistic commitment to the American variety of religion is likewise reflected in their attitudes toward the political and social issues of the day. They extended their belief in universal redemption into a conviction that if the wiser and cooler heads prevailed, the world would continue to improve just as it had improved in the last fifty years. Most of the

writers for the North American would have subscribed to Jonathan Chapman's verdict that the purpose of history was "to represent man in his gradual march from barbarism to civilization, from civilization to refinement."[28] Thus, they found it possible to advocate those measures which called for a gradual amelioration of existing evils. They endorsed temperance but not absolute prohibition. On the more vital issue of slavery they embraced a number of policies short of outright abolition--including colonization--but they had nothing but disdain for the Abolitionists. If anything, the attitude expressed by the Review became increasingly pro-slavery as the Civil War neared. Jared Sparks in 1824 wrote an essay in favor of colonization, in which he acknowledged the slave's basic right to be a free man.[29] Sydney G. Fisher, however, while reviewing Uncle Tom's Cabin in 1853, advocated the continuance of slavery as an institution with the modification that instead of owning the man the slaveholder owned only his slave's labor.[30] Slaves would then be entitled to legal protection from the abuses described by Miss Stowe. Fisher explicitly based his position upon the notion of inherent Negro inferiority.

As for the Utopian communal living schemes, they were seldom mentioned and then only with scorn--as in Andrew P. Peabody's review of Hawthorne's Blithedale Romance[31]--because

they upset the long-established social structure. Nor were any of the experimenters in communal living, men like George Ripley and Bronson Alcott, among the contributors to the North American.

Until the disintegration of the Whig party in 1854, the North American Review was almost as thoroughly Whiggish in political outlook as it was Unitarian in its religious viewpoint. George Bancroft was one of the few Democrats on the lists of contributors in the 1830's, and he, like A. H. Everett, who became a Democrat in 1835, was looked upon as a traitor of sorts. The Whiggish character of the North American Review and the other reputable and well-established magazines like the American Quarterly and the New England Review was in a large measure responsible for the founding in 1837 of The Democratic Review, which Bryant, Whittier, Hawthorne, Thoreau, Melville, and Whitman, among many others, wrote for.[32] Indeed, it appears that virtually all of the literary artists of that time were Democrats, and there is ample evidence that the North American's Whiggishness alienated them.

Edward Everett's political attitude suggests something of the rigid self-righteousness in such matters that so often prevailed among the critics. In 1849 George Stillman Hillard asked Everett to use his political influence to

prevent the Whig administration of Zachary Taylor from removing Hawthorne from the Salem Custom House. In his letter of reply to Hillard, Everett, after agreeing to intercede in Hawthorne's behalf, reveals his private feelings about Hawthorne's political affiliation: "I will say to you, however, in confidence that I do not have much sympathy for men like Mr. Hawthorne, who think proper (for reasons best known to themselves) to give the weight of their name & influence to a party [the Democrats] to which they cannot in heart belong; thus depriving the conservative party, to which from all their associations & I will add principles they must belong, of the benefit of that circumstance."[33] Everett was simply unable to comprehend that Hawthorne could be intellectually honest in his political stance.

To what extent politics affected literary criticism it is hard to say. The critics, of course, did not use an author's politics as reason for praising or damning his works. Clearly, the reviews of Hawthorne in the North American were not influenced by his politics, nor is there any evidence that the overlooking of Melville was at all politically motivated. Nevertheless, the same world-view that determined a critic's political conservatism also shaped his notions of literary propriety. Despite a predominance of Whig reviewers, the North American Review generally

remained aloof from the political-literary squabbles carried on by the New York periodicals--namely, the Whiggish Knickerbocker Magazine and The Democratic Review.[34]

If the writers of the North American were slightly less than unanimous in their religious and political preferences, they all subscribed to the theory of progress, the notion that man was gradually improving himself and his lot. The belief in progress, as many Americans held it, included a beneficent Deity presiding over an enterprising and moral people who could hasten, if they were sensible enough, the gradual evolution toward a better life. This particular view of progress was one of the most powerful and universally held ideas in nineteenth-century America; and it was frequently reflected in the North American Review, as already noted. Adherents of the notion tended to look always for the good side of even the most dismaying developments. All problems appeared solvable. The evils of industrialization, while acknowledged, were but temporary flaws in a process that immeasurably benefitted man, suggested A. H. Everett in 1832.[35] Anything good was seen as the result of a long process of gradual improvement. Thomas Chase, reviewing Wordsworth in 1851,[36] remarks that in the greatness of Wordsworth's poetry "we gratefully recognize the fruit of eighteen centuries of Christianity, of six thousand years of human struggle and progress" (p. 474).

Chase then proceeds to clarify the extent of his trust in progress: "We believe in human progress; we believe that the good providence of God is leading the race of man by slow but constant steps to loftier heights of excellence, that the works of His hands may redound more and more to His glory. And we trace this progress in literature, as well as in every other department of human activity" (pp. 476-477).

The "race of man" that Chase mentioned did not necessarily include all mankind. For all its religious overtones, the devout faith in progress smacked a bit of racial superiority in its preoccupation with the welfare and achievements of Northern Europeans and Americans. A mildly racist outlook is implicit in much of the writing in the North American Review. An explicit expression of the racist sentiment that lay behind much of the writing in the Review appears in a Political Economy textbook written by Francis Bowen, editor of the Review from 1843 to 1853. A curious blending of racism and Christian piety comes through quite clearly in Bowen's response to the threat of overpopulation. In response to Malthus' frightening demographic predictions, Bowen serenely replies: "In those facts which appear so alarming to the Malthusians, I see only indications of a beneficent arrangement of Providence, by which it is ordained that the

barbarous races which now tenant the earth should waste away and finally disappear, while civilized men are not only to multiply, but to spread, till the farthest corners of the earth shall be given to them for a habitation."[37] Little comfort here for the American Indian.

There were minor differences, of course, in the particular concept of progress held by the writers of the North American, depending often on the subject being reviewed. Faith in a beneficent Deity and a preference for evolution instead of revolution were clearly the two essentials of this doctrine that formed the common denominator of their world-view. While the North American reviewers did not rule out the possibility of progress in other lands and for other peoples, they did regard their country as one that had been singularly endowed by the Creator with glorious future prospects. In a summary of American progress in the arts S. A. Eliot offers a typical example of the prevalent optimistic faith in progress, the sensitivity to foreign criticism, and the belief in the necessity--imposed by our geographic isolation--for self-reliance in American cultural development:

> Having witnessed within our own time wonderful progress in things both useful and ornamental, we feel a conviction that there will still be progress in other things,--in all things that are desirable and necessary to a people, especially to one so separated as we are from others. If we were

> immediately surrounded, as each nation of Europe is, by kindred nations advanced and advancing together, some in one branch of attainment and some in another, there would be a tolerable certainty of progress in all. As it is, we must, of necessity, find the impulse for every improvement within ourselves, and perhaps the rest of the world will have a little consideration for us on this ground, and will not laugh at us more than we can bear, because we do not quite come up to our own standard.[38]

Eliot's colleagues no doubt would have readily endorsed his conclusions.

The literary judgments of the North American Review also reflected the overwhelming faith in progress. Reviewers had little tolerance for literary emphasis upon the melancholy, pessimistic, and sordid side of life. Nor did they brook anti-social or rebellious themes, since the evolutionary aspect of the theory emphasized gradual, rather than abrupt or revolutionary change.

The spirit of nationalism, the buoyant Christianity, the belief in progress that animated the writers of the North American Review during the period from 1815 to 1860 prevailed as well in the country as a whole, and the characteristic mood produced by commitment to these principles was one of optimistic expectation. Such twentieth-century scholars as Vernon Parrington have pointed out the

romantic quality of this mood in the sense that the age democratically offered enticing prospects of imminent spiritual and material betterment to all who were sufficiently ambitious and able.[39] What had once been idealistic daydreams became possibilities; hence, the economics, politics, theology, and literature of the age clearly reflected this particular romantic impulse.

While Parrington's characterization of the age is certainly plausible enough, the application of the term "romantic" to literature raises awkward problems of definition. Literary romanticism, after all, is not exclusively synonymous with idealistic optimism. As applied to literature the term "Romanticism" refers to a widely disparate array of writing in various languages produced over a considerable period of time; hence, no brief definition of the term can be adequate. The task of defining Romanticism is further complicated by the necessity of taking into account the difference between the concept of Romanticism held by the nineteenth-century critics and that held by the twentieth-century scholars. The nineteenth-century critics evaluated Romantic works as they were published. Thus involved in the movement and lacking the broader perspective available to twentieth-century scholars, they were often unaware that they were dealing with Romanticism. The Romantic literature whose reception in the North American Review is being investigated in this paper is Romantic

literature as defined by modern scholars; that is to say, the concern here is with the critical reaction to literary works which by modern definition would be deemed Romantic, and the purpose of this analysis is to discern and explain the nineteenth-century critic's understanding of what is now known as Romantic literature.

One of the best modern definitions of Romanticism is that of Morse Peckham. In his essay "Toward a Theory of Romanticism,"[40] Peckham seeks a definition broad enough to encompass all Romantic works and usefully analytical enough to serve as a guide to the understanding of any particular work in that category. The Romantic movement in literature, Peckham explains, is one of the consequences of "the revolution in the European mind against thinking in terms of static mechanism to thinking in terms of dynamic organicism" (p. 14).

To understand Romanticism, then, one must first understand dynamic organicism, since it is the fundamental principle from which all Romantic doctrines follow. The difference between static mechanism and dynamic organicism as world-views can be seen in the cosmic metaphors representing each position. The pre-Romantic, viewing the world as a static mechanism used the metaphor of the clock, suggesting permanence, perfection, and uniformity. The

Romantic, viewing the world as a dynamic organicism, used the metaphor of the tree, suggesting change (growth), imperfection, and incompleteness.

The concept of dynamic organicism affected both the form and content of literature in many ways, only a few of which can be enumerated here. Probably the most significant change wrought by dynamic organicism on form in literature was the notion that form should grow naturally out of the literary subject. Each Romantic work thus constituted a generic law unto itself. As for the content, Peckham finds that the most universal quality of Romantic literature is its concern with process, especially as represented in a character's developing states of consciousness. Dynamic organicism itself is a process. Recognizing this, Peckham divides Romantic literature into the three categories of radical, positive, and negative Romanticism according to the nature of the concern with process. Radical Romanticism he describes as "dynamic organicism, manifested in literature in its fully developed form with all its main derivative ideas" (p. 14). Positive Romanticism refers to "men and ideas and works of art in which dynamic organicism appears, whether it be incomplete or fully developed" (p. 14). Negative Romanticism is "the expression of the attitudes, the feelings, and the ideas of a man who

has left static mechanism but has not yet arrived at a reintegration of his thought and art in terms of dynamic organicism" (p. 15). In the category of negative Romanticism Peckham places such works as Byron's Don Juan, in which the hero suffers unrelieved "guilt, despair, and cosmic and social alienation." Peckham's three categories are not mutually exclusive--a work could be classified as both radical and positive Romanticism--but they are clear and precise enough to be useful in a discussion of Romanticism.

A number of other characteristics, besides those already mentioned, distinguish Romanticism from the Neo-Classicism which it replaced, and these too stem from dynamic organicism. Literature, as the Romantics viewed it, was organically related to the society from which it sprung. As a society changed, so did its literature. If the literary artist, in keeping with this principle, was to produce a valid, dynamic literature he needed the freedom to choose and develop his subject as he saw fit. He could not be expected to avoid the traditionally taboo subjects, nor could he be expected to conform to classical models. Thus freed from long-standing restrictions, the artist became more completely responsible for his creation. He became, as it were, one with his art. In literature the

union of art and artist can often be seen in the author's identification with the literary hero, producing, at its extreme, a kind of psycho-analytical confession. The Romantic artist introspectively sought in the core of his individuality the universal siren strains that could evoke a sympathetic response from his readers. Here, of course, is a manifestation of the paradox of the simultaneously unique and universal,[41] one of the many paradoxes that characterize Romantic literature and philosophy.

The literary critics of the North American Review during the period from 1835 to 1860 had no such elaborate conception of Romanticism as that set forth by Peckham, but they were generally aware that a major change had occurred in European literature near the end of the eighteenth century, and they seem to have been familiar with the labels Classic and Romantic as used to distinguish the literature before and after the change, respectively. These critics held various conceptions of just what Romanticism in literature was, and their conceptions changed somewhat as they encountered more European Romantic literature. The variety and changeability of their views precludes the establishment of any one definitive attitude toward Romanticism among all the writers for the North American Review, but some generalizations are possible. A

look at the references to Romanticism in the North American Review prior to 1860 reveals that among the critics (1) the word "Romanticism" had a favorable connotation, mostly owing to the fact that the literary phenomenon which it denoted was regarded as a manifestation of the creative spirit of Aryan Christianity, and it was therefore welcomed as an invigorating influence upon European literature; (2) innovations in language and form, an energetically imaginative quality, and spirituality were most commonly seen as the distinguishing features of Romantic literature; (3) Germany was considered to be the birthplace of Romantic literature; (4) the term "Romanticism" was not generally applied to American writing; (5) it was the writing of French Romantics like Victor Hugo and George Sand that brought the movement into some disrepute, although the North American critics attributed the indelicacies of French writing to flaws in the national character of the French rather than to defects in the Romantic view; (6) after 1836 the relationship between Romanticism and social and political upheavals was generally recognized.

A brief survey of the recent scholarship concerning the attitudes of the North American Review toward Romanticism shows that the problem of definition is at the heart of the

confusing and seemingly contradictory conclusions of modern scholars. One of the earliest modern appraisals of the literary criticism in the North American Review can be found in the opening chapter of George E. DeMille's Literary Criticism in America (1929). DeMille, covering the first thirty-five years of the Review in thirty-one pages, concludes that the criticism in the North American shifted only gradually from eighteenth-century standards to the new Romantic standards and that this movement had very little momentum prior to 1831. In support of his assertion, he educes statements in the North American praising Pope as the greatest of poets and the heroic couplet as the greatest of meters. With only a few exceptions, DeMille claims, the original critics gave way to younger men in the 1830's, and it was they who wrote enthusiastically of Carlyle, Coleridge, and Hawthorne and ushered in the Romantic era in American criticism. In his necessarily undetailed chapter DeMille does not define Romanticism except by implication. A taste for Pope, by DeMille's reckoning, precludes an interest in Romantic doctrines, and Romanticism means, for the most part, an appreciation of some of the more prominent Romantics.

Writing in 1940, Harry Hayden Clark suggests that DeMille's estimate of the non-Romantic character of the writing in the first twenty years of the North American Review needs to be revised.[42] With a view toward showing the prevalence of essentially Romantic ideas among the critics, Clark abstracts 210 articles from the Review during the period 1815 to 1835. He claims that virtually all the Romantic concepts that appeared in Nature (1836) Emerson could have been introduced to in the pages of the North American Review, which, as his journals indicate, he regularly read. Although he does not involve himself in a discussion of Romanticism, Clark does succeed in showing the prevalence of Romantic ideas where they had been generally thought not to exist. Lacking in Clark's article, however, are clearly defined, mutually exclusive categories of Classic and Romantic. In their complexity the two categories, of course, defy absolute and simple definition, but one senses the implication in discussions like DeMille's and Clark's that the Classical and Romantic sensibilities are wholly incompatible. It is quite possible, after all, for a critic to enjoy both Pope and Wordsworth and to repudiate or ignore some Romantic doctrines while endorsing others. Allowing for these considerations, Clark's argument is more persuasive in that he amasses numerous examples of Romantic ideas. DeMille, on the other hand, besides

having less evidence, dismisses as irrelevant the favorable reviews of Scott and Wordsworth, and he ignores altogether the reception given the German Romantics.

By far the most comprehensive study of the criticism in the North American Review is Robert E. Streeter's unpublished dissertation which covers the period 1815 to 1865.[43] Streeter divides the period at 1835 and finds that prior to that date the predominant critical doctrines in the North American Review derived from English and Scottish association psychology as set forth principally by Archibald Alison in Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste (1790). According to association psychology a reader responded most fully to literature that partook of his country's geography and history. Streeter claims that the associationist doctrine, besides justifying partiality to native literature, also produced a climate of critical thought receptive to Romanticism. Thus, after 1835 the Romantic ideas of the Schlegels, Madame de Stael, and Coleridge held sway among the critics.

To support his contention that after 1835 the underlying critical principles in the North American Review were Romantic, Streeter isolates the six most frequently recurring Romantic ideas in the criticism. Three of these

ideas operated as critical principles of sorts--namely (1) the belief in "the existence of a hierarchy of ideal forms which could serve as the source and standard of beauty," (2) a Coleridgean concept of the Imagination, (3) the acceptance of organic unity as a "fundamental principle of art." The remaining three Romantic ideas, while not expressed as critical principles, pertained directly to the nature of art. The critics frequently debated and discussed these three subjects: (4) the fusion of "soul and body, thought and expression, content and form" in great art, (5) the balance between the "ideal and the material" in great art, (6) the purpose of criticism. Streeter finds ample instances of all six of these ideas in the North American Review from 1835 to 1865, and he concludes that with the exception of Francis Bowen and Cornelius Conway Felton the writers of the North American operated on Romantic principles.

Two weaknesses mar Streeter's otherwise trenchant and thoroughgoing analysis. While the quantity of Romantic ideas he finds in the North American is impressive, it appears that when he considers the Review to be Romantic, he does not take sufficiently into account the total portion of the magazine written by the various contributors. Emerson, for instance, wrote two articles for the North American in the period; Bowen and Felton wrote over one

hundred. But perhaps the greater weakness of Streeter's argument is that he fails to consider the treatment Romantic works received in the Review. It would seem that the ultimate test of the influence of Romantic ideas in a body of criticism is the overall reaction to Romantic literary productions, especially those whose Romantic quality and worth have been generally established with the passage of time. It is true, of course, that any number of non-literary influences could prejudice a critic's decision and that he might very well accept some Romantic works and reject others and still be essentially sympathetic to Romanticism. Nevertheless, the record of his final judgments should count for something.

Moreover, with the exception of the Coleridgean view of the imagination, which many of the critics would have dismissed as mystical nonsense, Streeter's six Romantic ideas in the abstract would have been generally accepted by the North American reviewers. These conceptions in themselves were inoffensive enough, after all. Certainly the critics' belief in progress would tend to dispose them favorably toward the organic in literature and make them amenable to attempts to improve literature by innovating. By no means nostalgic champions of the long ago, they stood ready to welcome the new; in fact, they cravingly anticipated the new in literature. But, as a matter of fact, these critics

rejected quite a few Romantic works because they challenged or even merely failed to reaffirm their world-view. It would seem, then, that any attempt to define the prevailing critical outlook must be based on an analysis of the reviewers' reaction to various kinds of Romantic literature. Such scrutiny of the pertinent reviews in the North American Review is now in order.

CHAPTER II

The Reviews and the Reviewers

In the <u>North American Review</u> prior to 1835 there were few references to Romanticism as a literary phenomenon, but when the new literature was mentioned it was invariably spoken of with optimistic approbation. In 1827 Edward Everett, who had recently been editor of the <u>Review</u> (1820-1824), attributed the literary application of the terms Classic and Romantic to the Schlegels and Madame de Staël.[1] The "genius of Romantic poetry," as Everett saw it, derived from "the peculiar character of the North, united with the spirituality of revealed religion," but the actual existence of the Classic and Romantic schools, he went on to say, is "a matter of doubt" (p. 137). Writing in 1834, Alexander Hill Everett, then editor of the <u>Review</u>, did not use the term "Romantic," but he obviously had Romantic literature in mind when he optimistically noted that "within our day another native school of learning has sprung up with a most luxuriant display of original vigor, and, having taken in the main a right direction, promises to pursue a long and successful career on both sides of the Atlantic."[2] Everett is referring to what he called--without naming individuals--a "new school of English writers" that have at last escaped the influence of seventeenth-century French classicism, which, as popularized by Dryden and Pope, has subverted English literature for nearly two centuries. A. H. Everett's attitude is particularly significant because it was he who wrote the first American review of <u>Sartor Resartus</u>.

Throughout his life, A. H. Everett was deeply interested in both politics and literature, and his writing for the North American, which he edited from 1830 to 1835, reflects these interests. Approximately one-third of the seventy-five articles that he wrote for the Review between 1818 and 1847 are literary reviews; the remainder are for the most part on political and social subjects. Shortly after his graduation from Harvard in 1806, Everett became one of the leading American authorities on Oriental literature. Next to strike his literary fancy were the Germans. He was willing in 1816 to help his younger brother Edward do a blank verse translation of Klopstock's Messias.[3] In 1823 he reviewed Henry Doering's Life and Writings of Schiller (Weimar, 1822) for the North American.[4] As for the contemporary English writers, Everett responded enthusiastically to Scott, Coleridge, Byron, and Carlyle. He was most interested, however, in American literature and actively encouraged its development. As a minister to Spain, he furthered the literary career of Washington Irving by securing a position for him in the American legation. It was primarily Everett's interest in American literature, in fact, that prompted him to take over the North American Review in 1830. As editor of the Review he encouraged the young Longfellow.

Everett's political career was as far-ranging as his literary interests. Over the course of his lifetime, he served in high diplomatic positions in Spain, Russia, the Netherlands, and China. At home, he served several terms in the Massachusetts State Legislature and ran unsuccessfully for Congress. Perhaps the greatest political stir he made, however, was his defection from the Whigs to the Jacksonian Democrats in 1835, an act that outraged the predominantly Whiggish Boston-Harvard community.[5]

In October 1835, Everett himself reviewed Carlyle's Sartor Resartus, and his review is easily the most enigmatic ever to appear in the North American.[6] In the playful spirit of Sartor, Everett at first seems to take the work quite literally as an English edition of a German professor's treatise on the "Philosophy of Clothes," but "after a careful survey of the whole ground," he declares, "our belief is, that . . . the whole account of the origin of the work before us . . . , is in plain English, a hum" (p. 456). As further evidence that the work is not what it claims to be, Everett translates the obviously contrived German names of the people and places mentioned in Sartor and notes their improbability. As to the pretense, that Sartor is a discussion of the "Philosophy of Clothes," Everett finally concludes that "though there is a good deal of remark

throughout the work in a half-serious, half-comic style upon dress, it seems to be in reality a treatise upon the great science of Things in General, which Teufelsdroeckh is supposed to have professed at the university of Nobody-knows-where" (p. 458).

Everett prefers the real subject of the work to the ostensible one, but he questions the morality of disguising a philosophical treatise as an "Essay on Dress." Younger readers, to whom "the subject of dress is one of intense and paramount importance" will invariably be misled and disappointed, he maintains.

Everett identifies Carlyle as the author--the early editions of Sartor were anonymous--and he praises Carlyle's articles in the British reviews, especially the essays on Goethe and Burns. Carlyle's literary virtues, as Everett sees them, are his unique style and his profundity. Everett's enthusiasm for Carlyle is wholehearted, and he obviously takes pride in introducing American readers to a great but little-known writer from whom so much could be expected: "We take pleasure," Everett announces, "in introducing to the American public a writer, whose name is yet in a great measure unknown among us, but who is destined, we think, to occupy a large space in the literary world" (p. 482). At the close of his review, Everett, with the improvement of

American letters in mind, invites Carlyle to come to the United States and ply his trade of "Things in General" at an American university.

The portion of Everett's review devoted to proving Sartor Resartus to be a literary hoax has baffled readers for years. In a letter to Emerson dated February 13, 1837, Carlyle said of Everett's article: "It was not at all an unfriendly review but had an opacity of matter-of-fact in it that filled one with amazement. Since the Irish Bishop who said that there were some things in Gulliver on which he for one would keep his belief suspended, nothing equal to it, on that side has come athwart me."[7]

What comes through clearly in Everett's review, however, is his enthusiastic approval of Sartor and Carlyle's work in general. It was the mood of whimsical fantasy in Sartor that no doubt inspired Everett to depart from the usual straight-forward earnestness of the North American and to write instead a tongue-in-cheek exposé. Moreover, his extensive and appreciative quoting--twenty pages--from Sartor and his outright praise of Carlyle's work unquestionably reveals his wholehearted endorsement of the early Carlyle. For all his appreciation, though, Everett does not provide much of a critical insight into Sartor Resartus,

and there is no suggestion that he had a very sophisticated understanding of Romantic doctrine. A much more perceptive review of Sartor, one that elicited a compliment from Carlyle himself, was that of Nathaniel L. Frothingham in the Christian Examiner.[8]

Although Everett's review falls short as critical analysis, it does reflect his cosmopolitan literary enthusiasm and it stands in the period as the last favorable notice of Carlyle in the North American Review. The North American reviewers after 1835 tended to be rather less than lukewarm toward Carlyle, and some of them resented what they saw as his baleful influence on such American writers as Emerson. As an exponent of Romanticism, Everett must be credited also with publishing two intelligent and appreciative reviews of Coleridge, one by Robert Cassie Watterston[9] and the other by George Barrell Cheever.[10] All in all, Everett, as editor of the Review, was clearly more favorably disposed toward Romantic literature than any of his three successors.

In 1836 when Alexander Everett resigned to run for Congress, John Gorham Palfrey, a Unitarian clergyman, became editor of the North American Review. Until 1839 Palfrey held the Dexter Professorship of Sacred Literature at Harvard, his alma mater; thus he perpetuated the traditional association of the magazine with Unitarianism and Harvard

College. Like Everett, Palfrey did not confine himself to one profession. Besides being an editor and a minister he functioned variously as politician, linguist, and scriptural scholar. His work in all these areas bears the stamp of his religious enthusiasm and intense patriotism. His biographer points out, for instance, that in Palfrey's most renowned work, A History of New England, he invariably sides with the ecclesiastical organization of early New England, and when writing of the struggle between England and the colonies he "could see little but tyranny on the one side and God-fearing patriotism on the other."[11] During Palfrey's editorship (1836-1842), literature was second only to history in space received in the Review. During Palfrey's editorship the North American carried reviews of a wide range of foreign and domestic literature, and it reflected a concern for the growth of American literature.

Palfrey himself more often reviewed historical works than literature. Of the nineteen articles that he contributed to the Review during his editorship only six are on literary subjects. But even when writing on other subjects he often reveals his literary attitudes, which, incidentally, reflect his ardent patriotism and stern religiosity. In a review of Harriet Martineau's Society in America,[12] for instance, Palfrey is obviously annoyed

by Miss Martineau's occasionally unflattering observations--one of which involved the North American Review[13] --and he attempts to impugn the accuracy of the Englishwoman's evaluation of American culture. To this end, he challenges Miss Martineau's assertion that in the United States Byron is unknown while Carlyle is quite popular. Palfrey refutes Miss Martineau by pointing out that Byron is the "one writer, more than all others, responsible for the freaks and follies and sins of our young people for the last twenty years" (p. 453). Palfrey explicitly objects to the misanthropy and immorality of Byron's poetry. Although he ventures no judgment of Carlyle, Palfrey implies that it is for the better that Sartor Resartus is not as popular here as Miss Martineau claims it is. At any rate, Palfrey obviously did not share his predecessor's enthusiasm for Carlyle, but he was not an anti-Carlylean either. Edward Hale relates that although all the Boston elders at the time "turned up their noses" at the affected Carlyle, Palfrey, out of a sense of editorial duty, read the French Revolution and, surprisingly, quite enjoyed it.[14] Just why he published no review of it is a mystery.

Of interest too is Palfrey's attitude toward Emerson. Prior to the "Divinity School Address" (July 1838), Palfrey looked upon the young Emerson with considerable favor. In 1837 he secured Emerson to write for the North American.

At that time, Palfrey told Nathan Hale[15] that he would have nothing to do with Emerson's speculative pieces (he had not published a review of Nature [1836]), but he was enthusiastic about Emerson's historical writing. Emerson's Concord Centennial Discourse (1835) is reviewed and highly praised by Benjamin B. Thatcher in the April 1836 number of the North American.[16] A year later, in a review of several addresses on New England history, Palfrey, with obvious approval, quotes Emerson's definition of the New England character--from the Centennial Discourse.

It seems to have been the "Divinity School Address" on July 15, 1838, that changed Palfrey's mind about Emerson. In a letter to James Russell Lowell on July 24, 1838, Edward Hale described Palfrey's reaction to Emerson's oration. "Dr. Palfrey appeared very much hurt about it," Hale claimed.[17] The fact that the issue of the North American for that very month carried Emerson's essay on Milton must have heightened Palfrey's embarrassment and regret. At any rate, Palfrey published no more articles by Emerson. The distress of Palfrey and other leading figures of the Harvard-Unitarian community no doubt accounts for the long period in which Emerson did no writing for the Review and was himself unfavorably reviewed in it. The North American under Palfrey did not carry a

review of Emerson's Essays, First Series (1841); and not until 1864 did Emerson again write for the Review.

The North American, under Palfrey, tended to be less receptive to Romantic literature than it had been under Alexander Everett. One of the first indications of this change in outlook can be seen in the 1836 review of Coleridge's Letters. Neither Watterston nor Cheever, the two most recent reviewers of Coleridge for the North American, was given the job. Instead, Palfrey published a mere two-page critical notice written by Cornelius Conway Felton.[18] In his article Felton acknowledges Coleridge's "brilliant imagination" and "acute discrimination," but he objects to the mystification and to the Coleridgean terminology, especially as the editor of the letters wields it. "This phraseology," Felton declares, "is bad enough in the hands of the great master; at best, it is but a vigorous affectation" (p. 263). Felton does find some merit in Coleridge's letters, however, in that they afford "some curious and amusing views of the ways and manners of the Initiated" (p. 264). But for the "Initiated," he does not have a particularly high regard. When he sums them up, his sense of intellectual superiority toward the Coleridgeans and his estrangement from them becomes clear. "How amazingly fond they all are of the child like;" Felton

observes, "what adepts in universal love, towards all who think exactly as they do. And what a charming vein of baby talk runs through their profoundly philosophical discourses on the nature of man" (p. 264).

Felton perceived that the disciples of Coleridge, Carlyle, and later, of Emerson constituted an unconventional coterie with which he was totally out of sympathy, and in the North American Review he often revealed his contempt for this group. In a review of a translation of Goethe's Faust published in Lowell, for instance, Felton mentions that a certain "popular transcendental lecturer" is most popular in Lowell; he then concludes that "there may be, after all, some hidden affinity between cotton-spinning and spinning transcendentalism; between carpet-weaving and weaving wild and shadowy speculations like those of the German muse."[19] On another occasion, in pointing out that Theodore Fay's literary productions have enduring merit, Felton observes that

> . . . we never threw aside his writings, disgusted by the fantastic barbarisms of speech which deform so many popular works of the day, or by those moral paradoxes, which are as offensive to the judgment and principles of sober-minded men, as they are fascinating to the perverted feelings and crude conceptions of the small-brained and long-haired young gentlemen, who set up, with the most entertaining self-complacency, and the most oracular unmeaningness of language, for the arbiters of taste, philosophy, and poetry.[20]

Felton's assessment of the transcendentalists sounds an ironic note. Like most of the writers for the North American Review in the period, Felton, unwittingly perhaps, sets himself up as an "arbiter of taste, philosophy, and poetry." His use of the editorial "we" and his undaunted certainty that he spoke for the "sober-minded" betray an essentially authoritarian approach to criticism, an approach, incidentally, that drew a fair share of rebuke from contemporary authors. Felton's attitude is particularly significant because he functioned as an unofficial assistant editor under Palfrey and Bowen and did a large amount of the literary reviewing. Between 1836 and 1851 he wrote forty-five articles and numerous critical notices. Over half of these are on literary subjects.

A classical scholar, Felton held the Eliot Professorship of Greek at Harvard from 1834 to 1860, when he became president of the college. His own literary output consisted primarily of textbooks on classical languages and translations of classical literature. His classical bearing is reflected, too, in his literary criticism. For such neo-classicists as Pope, he showed a decided preference, and for the Romantics, whom he so often reviewed, he had a clear aversion.

Felton did not review Emerson in the North American until 1850, but he assessed Essays, First Series for the Christian Examiner,[21] and this review provides a fuller understanding of Felton's attitude toward his friend Emerson. After citing the great praise and vast following that Emerson has acquired, Felton refers to Emerson as a man of "extravagant, erratic genius," whose greatest literary asset is his poetical style. "Some of his sentences," says Felton, "breathe the most exquisite music, of which language is capable" (p. 255). Emerson's style, though, is too often marred by what Felton calls "a studied quaintness of language." In summing up Emerson as a writer, Felton lists irreverence as well as affectation as his most prominent faults: "from the praises, which the author's genius would otherwise deserve, large deductions must be made, on the score of oddity, whim, and affectation; and particularly on the score of great levity of opinion, and rashness of speculation on the gravest subjects" (p. 262). Felton never spoke as harshly of Emerson as he did of the Transcendentalists in general.

One of the most significant writers to be reviewed in the North American during Palfrey's editorship was Nathaniel Hawthorne. When the first volume of Hawthorne's Twice Told Tales appeared in 1837, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow greeted it in the North American Review with

this rapturous apostrophe "Live ever, sweet, sweet book."[22] He then proceeded to set forth his own views of poetry. The poet, claims Longfellow, should have "a universal sympathy with Nature" and he should see poetry in everything, even in the prosaic. It is precisely these qualities that Longfellow finds and praises in Hawthorne--a poet who could perceive that the New England legends had as much poetic charm as those of the Rhine and the Black Forest. Longfellow also commends Hawthorne for the clarity of his prose, and then, in a somewhat impressionistic vein, he describes Hawthorne's effect on the reader: "A calm, thoughtful face seems to be looking at you from every page; with now a pleasant smile and now a shade of sadness stealing over its features. Sometimes, though not often, it glares wildly at you with a strange and painful expression, as, in the German romance, the bronze knocker of the Archivarius Lindhorst makes up faces at the Student Anselmus" (p. 62). Here, Longfellow, who had been a classmate of Hawthorne's at Bowdoin, reveals his familiarity with, and appreciation of, German Romantic literature. In an attempt to demonstrate the same magical literary power in Hawthorne, Longfellow devotes more than half the review to quotations from the Tales.

It would be a mistake to dismiss Longfellow's review because of his occasional outbursts of almost effete exuberance. All of his pronouncements, even his most

ecstatic, have the ring of intelligent conviction, and occasionally he reveals an awareness of certain Romantic doctrines--that of sympathy, for instance. What is more, if we remember the prevailing scarcity of native literary talent, and if we consider that this was actually Longfellow's introduction to the mature Hawthorne, we can readily understand his zealous approbation.[23] Like Alexander Everett, however, Longfellow, for the most part, substituted praise and lengthy excerpts for perceptive critical analysis. Despite his extensive familiarity with foreign literatures, Professor Longfellow seldom displayed in his criticism a keen understanding of the dynamics of Romantic literature, though he obviously appreciated much of it.

Longfellow's critical method and attitudes differed from those of most of his contemporaries who wrote for the North American Review. In the first place, his critical verdicts were not delivered with the pontifical certitude that was customary in the Review. As for his literary tastes and opinions, he had not the same antipathy for the Transcendentalists that Felton exhibited, and unlike Francis Bowen, he enjoyed Emerson's poetry. In the Review, Bowen ridiculed Emerson's Poems (1846), as we shall presently see, while Longfellow wrote in his journal that the collection was "truly, a rare volume; with many

exquisite poems in it."[24] On the much-discussed question of a national literature, he disagreed with anti-English critics like Bowen and Felton who, in the interest of literary independence, seemed anxious to deny America's literary inheritance from England. "A national literature," Longfellow claimed, "is the expression of national character and thought; and as our character and modes of thought do not differ essentially from those of England our literature cannot."[25] As it turned out, however, Longfellow's views were not prominently asserted in the Review during the period. After his piece on Twice Told Tales, he wrote no other articles on contemporary literature for the North American, and after signing an exclusive contract with Graham's Magazine in 1844 he ceased writing for the Review altogether.[26]

Hawthorne's next collection of tales, Grandfather's Chair, received a favorable brief critical notice in 1841.[27] The following year, Volume Two of Twice Told Tales received a three-page critical notice.[28] The anonymous critic--perhaps Palfrey or Felton--refers to Longfellow's review of Volume One, and his observations up to a point bear a remarkable similarity to Longfellow's. Hawthorne's "creative originality," his deft use of language, his use of New England folk sources, and his "power of finding the elements of the picturesque, the romantic and even the

supernatural, in the everyday, common-place life" (p. 497) are all commended. The reviewer, however, does see this limitation in Hawthorne: "His range is not very extensive, nor has he any great versatility of mind" (p. 498). It is obvious too that the critic does not share Longfellow's enthusiasm for German literature. Alluding no doubt to the American writers who have come under Carlyle's influence, the critic observes that Hawthorne "gives us no poor copies of poor originals in English magazines and souvenirs. He has caught nothing of the intensity of the French or the extravagance of the German, school of writers of fiction" (p. 497).

The first review of James Russell Lowell's poetry appears in the April 1841 issue of the _North American_, but George Stillman Hillard's review of Lowell's _A Year's Life_[29] tells perhaps as much about Hillard's literary attitudes as it tells about Lowell's poetry. Hillard's pronouncements on literary matters have the same resounding finality as the inevitable series of tonic chords ending a Beethoven symphony. He explains, for instance, the public's rejection of Byron in favor of Wordsworth: "They could no longer listen with any patience to the prolonged whine of the dyspeptic scholar, who imagined that his heart was broken when he was really suffering for want of

fresh air and exercise. A natural reaction took place. The eyes of men turned to the milder and purer light of Wordsworth and his followers" (p. 453).

Hillard again seems to have an unquestionably accurate insight into the arcana of public tastes when he declares that, despite the fact that Lowell is a talented and original writer in the Wordsworthian vein, his volume of poetry will be unpopular because of "its very strong infusion of personality," that is, its revelation of intimate passions.

Convinced that Lowell shows considerable promise as a poet, Hillard proceeds to detail his literary faults. Besides Lowell's "versified confessions" Hillard also objects to "daintiness and prettiness of expression," the attempt "to combine poetry and philosophy," and the "lack of finish" in Lowell's poems. As a personal friend of Lowell's, Hillard seems concerned lest the young poet should be lured into the Transcendental camp. The weaknesses in Lowell's poetry are, to Hillard, characteristic of the Transcendentalists. Thus, he ends his review with some remedial suggestions for the poet. In a lofty and paternalistic vein he recommends that Lowell study "those poets who are at the head of that class to which he himself does not belong, such as Pope, Gray, and Rogers, whose paramount excellence consists in the elaborate finish of their style, and the care with which every line has been

wrought and polished into perfection" (p. 466).

As a Harvard graduate and a Unitarian, Hillard is typical in background and outlook of most of the contributors to the North American during this period. A lawyer by profession, Hillard also devoted considerable time to a public-spirited support of religion and culture. In 1833 he helped George Ripley publish the Christian Register, a Unitarian weekly. He ran successfully for the Massachusetts state House of Representatives as a Whig in 1835. Like so many of his contemporaries, Hillard was clearly moved by a sense of public duty, a sort of *noblesse oblige*, which seems to have been based on a benevolent dogmatism (no doubt a product of the cosmological certainty of pre-Darwinian Christianity). Also inherent in Hillard's outlook is a marked Anglo-Saxon provincialism. On the whole, he and his friends believed implicitly in Anglo-Saxon superiority, and they saw themselves as members of an intellectual elite. Thus, their pronouncements, literary and otherwise, sound the tone of an assured conviction that all right-thinkers would, of course, agree on the matter. Hillard, along with Longfellow, Cornelius Conway Felton, Charles Sumner, and Henry Cleveland, comprised an exclusive group of eminent Bostonians who called themselves the "Five of Clubs," but were dubbed the "Mutual Admiration Society" by

outsiders. Writing of this group, Edward Everett Hale observed that of the five, only Longfellow "knew that there were worlds outside of London and Edinburgh, Boston and Cambridge, and their environs."[30] Indeed, Longfellow's criticism contrasts markedly with that of Hillard and Felton, in that it reflects his willingness to allow the writer greater thematic and stylistic freedom. Considering Longfellow's belief in the poetic significance of the individual as expressed in his review of Twice Told Tales, it seems clear that he would have been more tolerant of the "strong infusion of personality" in Lowell's poetry that Hillard assumed would alienate the public.

Most of Hillard's twenty-three articles for the North American are on biographical or legal subjects, but occasionally he wrote on literature. Unlike Longfellow, Hillard was not himself a poet, and except for his solid general education he seems to have had no particular qualifications as a literary critic. In his literary criticism he places a strong emphasis upon style, and he seems to feel that the mechanical perfection of the best eighteenth-century poetry represents the apex of poetic achievement. He can by no means be written-off as a neo-classicist, however, since he was favorably disposed toward some Romantic doctrines. In an 1831 review of Catherine Sedgwick's Clarence,[31] he almost sounds like a Transcendentalist as he commends "the fine philosophy of Wordsworth,"

a philosophy which, as Hillard sees it, "regards the fair forms of the outward world as the instruments of a spiritual influence upon the mind of man, as the varied stops through which the myriad tones of a universal harmony are breathed" (p. 77).

A look at the references to Romanticism in the North American during Palfrey's editorship (1836-1842) makes it clear that the critics were more aware of literary Romanticism than the reviewers during A. H. Everett's editorship (1830-1835) had been. But along with the greater awareness of the emerging Romanticism, an awareness still far short of sophisticated comprehension, came a slight diminution of the earlier optimistic acceptance, as some qualities of the new literature began to disturb the critics.

As they became more familiar with European Romantic literature, the critics grew increasingly aware that the new freedom from conventional (classical) restrictions often produced disturbingly chaotic works. In 1837 Mrs. Elizabeth Fries Lummis Ellet lauds the contemporary English school of poetry because of its "romantic spirit," but the wild extravagances of French poetry since 1830 she deplores, and she suggests, that "If any term could be invented expressive of the widest degree of license, it would be more applicable than romantic, to their productions;

as these new authors disdain utterly the limits, prescribed by nature, morality, and good taste, which legitimately control the excursive genius of the true romantic."[32] Thus Mrs. Ellet finds no fault with Romanticism per se but rather with the misuse of poetic license. Her article is also significant in that it reveals that the use of Romanticism as a literary term was by then fairly common, and it is one of the first reviews in which the social and political antecedents of Romanticism are considered.

In July 1838 Antonio Gallenga, the Italian scholar, reviewed three contemporary Italian Romantic poets, Tomasso Grossi, Pietro Giannone, and Giovani Berchet, and pointed out that while these three failed to measure up to the standard set by Goethe, Schiller, and Byron, they nevertheless were doing quite well, considering the political harassment then endured by Italian writers.[33] Like Edward Everett eleven years earlier, Antonio Gallenga saw Romanticism as a product of the Northern intellect. His comments on Romanticism are as unrestrained and ebullient as the literary phenomena he attempts to describe:

> Romanticism [Gallenga rhapsodizes], that word, so vaguely defined, and so strangely interpreted; that universal reformer, extending from the frame of an epic poem, to the head-dress of a girl, a substitute, in Europe, for all endearing adjectives; a seducing enchanter, surrounded with fairies and genii, haunting lonely towers and silent graves,

> crowned with holly and cypress, with mail on his breast, a cowl on his head, a red cross on his mantle; mounted on a spotted horse, with a damsel en croupe; a hawk perched on his gauntlet, and a harp of gold slung across his shoulder; this creation of the Northern fancy, received in Italy with eager hospitality, is about to usurp there an undisputed sway over letters and arts, as soon as the consciousness of political existence shall set the wings of Italian genius at liberty (p. 214).

As an Italian, Gallenga holds no special admiration for the "Northern fancy," and he is obviously making a satirical point with his overdone description. His view of Romanticism, unlike that of the Everetts, is distinctly medieval. It seems that Gallenga had in mind the medieval tales of chivalrous love and adventure rather than the works of Goethe and Carlyle, which were characterized by dynamic organicism.

One of the most prolific and outspoken writers for the North American, Francis Bowen, reveals in a review of George Sand's novels a conception of Romanticism that was typical among the more conservative critics, like the editor of the North American Review at the time, John G. Palfrey.[34] His commentary reveals by implication his understanding of Romanticism as well as his personal philosophy, especially his religiosity and faith in progress. Early in his article Bowen notes with seeming approval the existence of a Romantic school of writers: "After continuing for centuries

in a cold and pedantic imitation of classical models, a Romantic school has suddenly risen up, and is now working with all the vigor and activity, which usually accompany or produce great revolutions in literary opinions" (pp. 104-105). He then voices some reservations about the subjects of the new writing and its lack of verisimilitude: "What is deformed, horrible, and grotesque, is now introduced not merely as an element in art, but to the exclusion of what is calm, beautiful, and pure. Violence is now done . . . to all the laws of probability, consistency, and homogeneousness, which form the essence of the creative and imitative process" (p. 105). Sand's unconventional views of marriage, society, politics, and religion also disturb Bowen, and he feels that the society that produces such shockingly irreverent writers and reads their works must be corrupt. He then reveals his own solid commitment to the conventional Christian view of the sacredness of these matters: "Government and laws, marriage and other institutions of society, all of the refinements of civilized life, are no toys to be pulled in pieces or thrown away at the suggestion of a crack-brained theorist, a declaimer about universal liberty and equality, or an enthusiastic admirer of savage simplicity. They are the gifts of Providence to a later generation, the slowly matured

inventions of ages for the comfort and support of an otherwise weak, brutish, poor, and solitary being" (p. 111). Not only does Sand violate Bowen's notions of propriety, but she also takes too pessimistic a view of man and society for the critic, who clearly subscribes to the theory of progress; hence, he dismisses two of Sand's more irreverent and anti-social novels (Leila and Spiridion) with the haughty suggestion that: "A long wail of discontent and anger with the actual condition and opinions of the civilized portion of our race strikes harshly and gloomily upon the ear; and as we believe it proceeds from a mind incurably diseased, we are willing to let it die away without remark or censure" (p. 135).

Although Bowen apologizes for his subject and dutifully inveighs against Sand's anti-social tendencies, he does have a sharp enough critical eye to perceive the Romantic qualities in her writing. He compares Sand to Rousseau and sees in both of them: "a similar vein of egotism . . . a disposition to make a confidant of the whole world, and to call for its sympathy by a free disclosure of individual passions and sufferings, of wearied affections and buried hopes, of both external and inward causes of unhappiness peculiar to themselves" (p. 108).

He also notes Sand's "admiration of German models" whose influence "leads to an affected mysticism and inflation of style." Bowen later sums up the features of Romanticism that he finds objectionable and hopes that American literature does not come under the sway of these harmful influences:

> A false estimate of the comparative value of various feelings and actions, an improper standard of excellence in point of conduct, having regard only to a romantic and impracticable generosity and a distructive vehemence of passion, is at the bottom of the pernicious influence, which writers of this class, the school of over-heated romance, constantly exert. May our own literature of fiction never be visited with a similar spirit, or undergo a crisis like that of the "Storm and Pressure" period in the history of German letters, the vigor and freshness of which form no compensation for its corrupting stimulus and debasing tendency (p. 130)!

As Bowen understood it, Romanticism was a revolution in letters that freed the writer from the necessity of conforming to classical models, and he detected the resulting unconventionalities of style. He perceived also in Sand's egocentric preoccupation with her private passions the Romantic "vein of egotism." Although he complained of Sand's "affected mysticism" he did not elaborate upon the spiritual quality of Romanticism--no doubt because this aspect annoyed him. Thus, while Bowen condemned the more rebellious and shocking works of George Sand and the French Romantics in general, he did not lay their defects to

Romanticism. He blamed instead the inferior and mean French culture and the writers' abuse of poetic license.

Of the Romantic works not reviewed in the North American during Palfrey's editorship probably the most significant are Carlyle's French Revolution (1837) and Heroes and Hero Worship (1841).[35] For reasons already mentioned Emerson's Nature (1836) and Essays, First Series (1841) were similarly overlooked. Less significant was the failure to notice Poe's Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque (1840), since Poe's first collection of tales made no great stir in the literary world.

Francis Bowen, a graduate with honors from Harvard and a Unitarian, replaced Palfrey as editor of the North American in 1843. One of the most splenetic of the literary critics for the Review in the mid nineteenth century, he could be much more strident than Hillard, whom he resembled in educational background and attitude. In virtually all his academic concerns Bowen stood opposed to what can now clearly be seen as the mainstream of nineteenth century ideas. In philosophy his major interest was to work out an intellectual position compatible with traditional Christianity, and he therefore opposed the philosophical ideas of Kant and Fichte and supported Berkeley. It is on philosophical grounds too that he opposed Darwin's theory of evolution. As a political economist he opposed

Adam Smith on free trade, and Malthus on population.

Bowen's career as a teacher and writer reveals the broad range of his interests. In 1835 he served as a tutor in intellectual philosophy and political economy at Harvard. He taught mathematics for two years at Exeter before taking over the North American. In 1851 he was denied the Maclean professorship of history at Harvard because of his part in the Kossuth controversy,[36] and in 1853 he became Alvord Professor of natural religion, moral philosophy and civil polity at Harvard. His voluminous bibliography also is remarkable for its variety of subjects. Cushing credits Bowen with forty-three brief "Critical Notices" and 110 major articles in the North American on such diversified subjects as literature (American and European), philosophy, theology, biography, history, politics, and economics. His fourteen books are on similarly diverse subjects. The Dictionary of American Biography remarks that Bowen "spread his energy over too many fields to attain supremacy in any of them."[37] If Bowen's failure to specialize did cut short his rise to eminence, one would expect that his catholicity of interests coupled with his scholarly background would have bred in him a kind of cosmopolitan tolerance of the new literature. But time after time in the pages of the North American he refused even to consider the validity of

the Romantics' world-view, and he generally disapproved of their stylistic innovations. Bowen's inflexibility in this regard, like Hillard's, seems to have been a product of his aristocratic Christian orientation.

As editor, Bowen, who seems to have been a prodigious reader, did much of the literary reviewing, not only of the American Romantics, but of the Continental as well. He had a taste for the contemporary French novelists, and in the North American he reviewed not only George Sand, but also Alexander Dumas and Paul de Kock. Although fascinated by these novelists, he also found them offensive to his sense of literary propriety. In his review of Paul de Kock, Bowen states his position on the question of evil and unpleasantness in literature, and he reveals one of the key tenets of his conception of the role of literature when he says: "It is a noble characteristic of the taste and conscience of man, that they require in art a closer adherence to the principles of the beautiful, the just, and the right, than we can reasonably expect to be exemplified in nature and life."[38] Thus, he expected literature to be affirmative, and optimistic--purer than life. Not an easy critic to please, Bowen knew enough about the fundamentals of literary technique to avoid praising meretricious sentimentality. He damned works, however, not on literary grounds but in direct proportion to their opposition to

his world-view. As rigidly dogmatic in this respect as Hillard and Felton, he was even more caustic on occasion.

Bowen reviews Emerson's Poems (1847), and this article, which also covers eight other new American poets, is a fairly representative example of his critical technique.[39] Bowen is primarily interested in Emerson and Channing. He begins with this estimate of Emerson: "He is a chartered libertine, who has long exercised his prerogative of writing enigmas both in prose and verse, sometimes with meaning in them, and sometimes without,--more frequently without" (p. 406).

Emerson's prose essays, however, if they are "always enigmatical and frequently absurd in doctrine and sentiment," are redeemed, in Bowen's opinion, by "quaint and pithy apothegms, dry and humorous satire, studied oddities of expression, which make any old thought appear almost as good as a new one, and frequent felicities of poetical and picturesque diction" (p. 407).

But Bowen has no patience with many of Emerson's ideas. He thinks them "startling and offensive opinions, drawn mostly from systems of metaphysics that were long ago exploded and forgotten." And he also observes in Emerson this disturbing duality: "Poet and mystic, humorist and

heretic, the writer seemed, on the one side, to aim at a revival of Heraclitus and Plotinus, and on the other, to be an imitator of Rabelais and Sterne" (p. 407). Only in what he must have intended to be flights of extravagant and jocular exaggeration did Bowen come close to summing-up Emerson.

Emerson's poetry, unredeemed by stylistic charm, leaves Bowen even colder. It "puts at defiance all the laws of rhythm, metre, grammar and common sense" (p. 406) and is "the most prosaic and unintelligible stuff that it has ever been our fortune to encounter" (p. 407). Bowen then quotes from "The Sphinx," after admitting that its riddles are beyond him, and makes this observation: "It matters not what portion is extracted, for the poem may be read backwards quite as intelligibly as forwards, and no mortal can trace the slightest connection between the verses" (p. 407).

Bowen goes on in this jaunty vein. After quoting an apostrophe from "Mithridates," he asks, "Is the man sane who can deliberately commit to print this fantastic nonsense?" He does concede that some of the poems have an occasional worthy line, but "these are like a few costly spices flung into a tub full of dirty and greasy water; they are polluted by the medium in which they float, and one cannot pick them out without soiling his fingers" (p. 413).

6

Bowen finds Channing even "more childish and insipid" than Emerson, and he devotes so much space to these two poets only because of their popularity "in certain quarters." One of Emerson's admirers is Margaret Fuller, and Bowen quotes from her essay, "American Literature," in which she places Emerson at the head of the list of contemporary American poets. He disagrees, of course, with Miss Fuller and can only conclude that the admirers of Emerson's poetry are guilty of "perverted taste."

An interesting contrast to Bowen's reaction to Romanticism is that of Edwin Percy Whipple, an ex-bank clerk whose formal education ended when he graduated from high school.[40] As a critic, Whipple was well-known and respected not only in Boston, but throughout the nation during the 1840's. Rufus Griswold included him in Prose Writers of America (1847) and compared his style with Milton's and Addison's. Poe, Hawthorne, and Emerson praised him, and when Emerson could not keep a Lyceum engagement, he sent Whipple in his stead. Whipple also belonged to the various literary clubs in Boston during the period. With Emerson and Lowell in 1849 he helped organize the short-lived Town and Country Club. In 1847 he was one of the original members of the Saturday Club, a group that included Emerson, Lowell, Holmes, and Longfellow.

In October 1843, Whipple's first contribution to the North American, a review of the Critical and Miscellaneous Writings of Thomas Noon Talfourd appeared.[41] More interesting, however, is his second article for the North American, a review of the second edition of Rufus Griswold's Poets and Poetry of America.[42] Here Whipple comments on the state of contemporary American literature. Because he knows that truly consummate literary genius occurs rarely and that a distinctive national literature develops slowly, Whipple is not unduly disappointed by the rather meager achievement of American poetry. There are very few of Griswold's poets that Whipple cannot abide; these he does not indicate by name. Many like Charles Sprague, Richard Henry Dana, and James Percival, he takes great delight in, while others in Griswold's anthology, like Whittier, he sees as having great potentiality. But Whipple is anything but complacent. He is both anxious and optimistic about the development of a worthy national literature, one that will do justice to this land and its peoples. He thus sets forth some of the conditions the new literature should fulfill. "If we have a literature," Whipple asserts, "it should be a national literature; no feeble or sonorous echo of Germany or England, but essentially American in its tone and object" (p. 37). Whipple feels that America should

have a poetry that provides much more than mere diversion. The demands he makes of American poetry indicate not only his literary attitudes, but his patriotism, and cheerful Christian optimism as well:

> We want a poetry which shall speak in clear, loud tones to the people; a poetry which shall make us more in love with our native land, by converting its ennobling scenery into the images of lofty thoughts; which shall give visible form and life to the abstract ideas of our written constitutions; which shall confer upon virtue all the strength of principle and all the energy of passion; which shall disentangle freedom from cant and senseless hyperbole, and render it a thing of such loveliness and grandeur as to justify all self-sacrifice; which shall make us love man by the new consecrations it sheds on his life and destiny; which shall force through the thin partitions of conventionalism and expediency; vindicate the majesty of reason; give new power to the voice of conscience, and new vitality to human affection; soften and elevate passion; guide enthusiasm in a right direction; and speak out in the high language of men to a nation of men. (p. 39).

Whipple did none of the reviewing of the American Romantics for the North American. It seems clear, however, that he would have been far more receptive to the Transcendentalists than Bowen and Felton were. In a review of Wordsworth in 1844, he makes probably the friendliest reference to the transcendentalist view to appear in the North American during Bowen's ten-year editorship.[43] "It is certain," Whipple claims, "that, during the period when poetry was most artificial and didactic, the current philosophy was far from being spiritual" (p. 356). With

the advent of a "spiritual philosophy" came a corresponding change in the nature of the poetry. "The spirit of transcendental speculation," says Whipple, "deeply infects the poetry of Wordsworth, Shelley, Coleridge, Keats, and Tennyson" (p. 356). This same transcendental impulse, in Whipple's view, inspires the best American poetry.

Unlike Bowen, Whipple displays a rather sophisticated comprehension of the sources of the Romantic impulse and Romantic doctrine. He attributes the revolution in literature to "the impact of the French Revolution" and the "tendency in the highest minds toward spiritualism . . . vaguely called the 'transcendental philosophy'." In summing up contemporary poetry Whipple hits upon several key Romantic principles:

> . . . the poetry of the present age is distinguished by what may be called its philosophical as well as its imaginative character. It grasps at the solution of the dark problems of man's existence and destiny. It grapples with the doubts and fears which perplex the understanding. It watches the movements of the soul, intent on fixing and giving shape to the most fleeting shades of thought and emotion. It is even familiar with the dark and tangled paths of metaphysics. Nothing is too humble for its love, nothing too lofty for its aspirations (p. 358).

The extent of Whipple's transcendental view can be seen in some of his writing for other journals during the period. In a July 1845 review of Griswold's <u>Poets and Poetry of England in the Nineteenth Century</u> for the <u>American</u>

Review, the Whig counterpart of the Democratic Review, Whipple reveals the curious combination of his spiritualism, religiosity, and literary enthusiasm. "The code of practical atheism," remarks Whipple, "which condemns poetry as fantastical, strikes at the very root of morals and religion; and those prudent worldlings who adopt it must have a very dim insight into the ethical significance of those words which represent the world as 'living in a vain show.' Now, poetry is the protest of genius against the unreality of actual life. It convicts convention of being false to the nature of things; and it does so by perceiving what is real and permanent in man and the universe."[44]

Perhaps more than any other contributor to the North American during Bowen's editorship, Whipple displayed a keen critical awareness and understanding of contemporary literary trends--and a willingness to tolerate them. These qualities, which account for his superiority to Bowen as a critic, stem ultimately from his conception of the role and basic purpose of literature. Bowen, on the one hand, continually implies that literature should constitute a pleasant source of inspiration, entertainment, and enlightenment, but it should in no wise produce disagreeable emotions, deal with distasteful subjects, or challenge the

premises upon which society is based. In short, literature to Bowen is ornamental, not fundamental, and tolerating an unamiable literature is every bit as preposterous as putting up with a grotesque knick-knack. Whipple, conversely, sees literature as having a vital social function. The philosophy of modern poetry, Whipple asserts, "is not a dead formula, but a living faith, by which the value of institutions is to be tested, and in obedience to which all things must be ruled."[45] With such a view, Whipple does not proscribe literary subject matter as drastically as Bowen, especially in the social-political realm. Speaking again of modern poetry, Whipple concludes that "It is, as it were, the champion of humanity, declaring the infinite worth of the individual soul, and, both in anathemas and appeals, striking at all social and political despotisms" (p. 358).

Whipple's obvious commitment to an optimistic version of Romantic individualism largely determined his own approach to criticism. Making no distinction between the artist and his art, he saw each work of literature, in true Romantic fashion, as the expression of the author's whole and unique being. He had little patience, therefore, with formal critical systems, which used certain ideal models as a basis for the comparative evaluation of new works. Instead, Whipple sought, in his criticism, to judge

the moral state of the author, and he based this judgment upon an objective analysis of the author's works.

In evaluating the character of an author through his works, Whipple recognized the validity of only the brighter, more optimistic side of human experience. He was, of course, more astute than to accept blatantly sentimental optimism, but he nevertheless invariably rejected any literature tinged by gloomy misanthropy and discontent, or any that was preoccupied with the darker side of life. These qualities in a literary work were, to Whipple, evidence of the author's diseased mind.

Thus, while he could recognize and appreciate Byron's genius and poetic power, he nevertheless regretted "that a poet possessing such wide influence over the heart should too often have exercised it in cultivating and honoring its base and moody passions; should have robed sin in beauty and conferred dignity on vice . . . should have shown such brilliant audacity in assaults on the dearest interests of society; and, by the force of his example and the splendor of his mind, should be able to perpetuate his errors and his vices through many generations to come."[46] These unpleasant qualities in Byron's writing were, to Whipple, evidence of the author's diseased mind, and in summing up Byron he pointed out that "the faults of his life blaze out in his verse, and glitter on almost every page of his correspondence" (p. 86).

Whipple did not review Carlyle or Hawthorne for the North American Review, but in essays on these authors published elsewhere his aversion for the melancholic and the misanthropic influenced his judgment. In a brief essay on Carlyle's Letters of Cromwell, published as an appendix to Essays and Reviews (1850), Whipple takes issue with Carlyle's version of Cromwell, and he asserts that Carlyle is himself obsessed with the perverse. "In his contempt for what he is pleased to call the 'rose colored' sentimentality of those who love peace, and shrink with horror from rapine and murder," says Whipple, "he hardly seems aware that, under the influence of a morbid sentimentality of another kind, he himself has come forward to whitewash Oliver Cromwell."[47] In a review of Hawthorne's Marble Faun for the Atlantic Monthly in 1860, Whipple found in Hawthorne's mind "an unpleasant something, perhaps a ghastly occult perception of deformity and sin in what appeared outwardly fair and good; so that the reader felt a secret dissatisfaction with the disposition which directed the genius, even in the homage he awarded to the genius itself."[48] Whipple could, however, approve and enjoy what was affirmative and optimistic in Carlyle and Hawthorne.

Thus, Bowen, the testy conservative, and Whipple, the mild-mannered liberal, represent the extremes of critical attitudes and the range of comprehension of the Romantic movement to be found in the North American Review during the period. But even more illuminating than the differences between these two critics are the similarities. For all his critical sensitivity and tolerant disposition, Whipple had essentially the same world-view as Bowen; that is, each subscribed to a benign version of Christianity and each had an unshakable belief in progress. These two convictions formed the core of each man's outlook and served as the underlying premises for whatever conclusions he drew.

The difference, therefore, between the two critics is one of degree, not of kind; one of temperament, not of philosophy. Whipple's optimistic view of man's achievements and prospects did not lead him into the narrow racism that Bowen fell into, and this is the sort of distinction that the terms liberal and conservative denote when applied to the two critics. Moreover, Bowen was editor of the North American when Whipple first began to write for it. He is, in fact, generally given credit for the addition of Whipple to the staff of the North American, and nineteen of Whipple's twenty-three essays for the Review were contributed during Bowen's ten-year editorship. It would seem, therefore, that Whipple's literary judgments had Bowen's tacit approval.[50]

The definitions of Romanticism ventured in the North American Review during Bowen's editorship were rather few and brief. Each critic's conception of the new literature varied according to his knowledge, sensitivity, and temperament. What can be said is that the critics knew of the literary revolution, but they varied considerably in their awareness of its scope and implications. Of all the critics, Whipple was clearly the most knowledgeable and sympathetic when it came to evaluating Romantic literature.

It was not Whipple, however, who was assigned the task of reviewing Emerson's Representative Men in 1850. Instead, Bowen entrusted the task to C. C. Felton, a holdover from Palfrey's day who continued to do much of the literary reviewing for Bowen.[51] The review is hardly favorable--Felton seems at this time to have the same attitude toward Emerson that he revealed nine years earlier in the Christian Examiner--yet there comes through a distinct impression that Felton had been quite taken by Emerson's personal charm. A gentler critic than Bowen, Felton seems almost to regret having to announce that Emerson's verse is whimsical--destined to be short lived--and that "much of his prose, too, the product of imitation, unconscious perhaps, of vicious foreign models, can scarcely be expected to survive the charm which hangs about his person and lingers in the magic tones of his voice" (p. 520).

Felton sees Emerson as a great writer, if somewhat overrated by his followers, but superior to Carlyle, at any rate, whom he should know better than to copy. The two particularly offensive strains in Emerson's writing--namely, his "air of indifference to all positive opinions" and his "impartiality towards all religious systems"--are derived, according to Felton, from German Transcendentalism and consequently can be seen as the unfortunate effects of Emerson's attempt to ape Carlyle, his literary hero and model. These influences account for the defects that Felton finds in Representative Men. He is especially abashed by Emerson's sacrilegious equating of Christ and Socrates, and he is also disappointed that in the work "there is no method, no unity of effect." Despite these faults, however, Felton finds praiseworthy qualities in Emerson and claims that "there hovers over much of his writing a peculiar and original charm, drawn from no source but the delicate and beautiful mind of the author himself" (p. 521).

Another of Felton's significant articles during Bowen's editorship is his April 1844 review of Lowell's second volume of poetry.[52] Felton gets underway by speaking, with olympian condescension, of the literary climate of the mid 1840's. "American literature," Felton maintains, "is, in many respects, under very unfortunate influences. Many of our writers are men of imperfect knowledge,--men whose attainments in letters are, comparatively speaking, contemptible. Their range of thoughts is narrow, and their

thoughts themselves are feeble. Their conceptions are indistinct; their imagery wan and faded; their expressions tame and commonplace, or tawdry and affected" (p. 284).

It becomes obvious that Felton has the Transcendentalists in mind as he proceeds to fix responsibility for the sad state of American letters and finds that Bronson Alcott's literary follies can be traced to the Germans--namely, the writing of Jean Paul Richter--whom Carlyle was so unwise as to imitate. Felton briefly describes the process: "The study of German became an epidemic about the time that Carlyle broke out; the two disorders aggravated each other, and ran through all the stages incident to literary affectation, until they assumed their worst form and common sense breathed its last, as the Orphic Sayings came,--those most unmeaning and witless effusions" (pp. 284-285).

Although Felton does not regard Lowell as one of the Transcendentalists, he does see in his promising ex-student the same dangerous tendencies in that direction that Hillard had detected three years earlier. He notes that some of Lowell's poems are "tinged somewhat with the vague speculations which pass current in some circles for philosophy" (p. 286). He is also disturbed that Lowell keeps positive religious views "far in the background," and in Lowell's "tone" he sees a certain radical tendency. But he does

refer to Lowell as a "young and gifted poet" with an excellent "poetical style." Like Hillard, Felton ends with so many potentially disastrous literary temptations.

Felton reveals his paternalistic concern for Lowell as he closes his review with this combination of wishes, advice, and prediction in behalf of the young poet:

> That he will soar above the spirit of coteries; that he will reject the bad taste of cultivating singularities in thought and expression, and descend from the clouds of vague philosophy and Utopian reforms; that he will brace his mind with strengthening knowledge in science, history, and social life; and that he will thus create a noble sphere for the exercise of his fine powers, and give additional lustre to a name already crowned with the honors of professional, literary, and mercantile eminence; is what we not only hope, but in the faith of achievements already performed confidently predict and believe (p. 299).

In the same month that Felton reviewed his poetry, Lowell contributed his first article to the North American, a review of Fredrika Bremer's novels.[53] Before 1850, he contributed four more articles, reviews of Bulwer-Lytton's New Timon (1847), Disraeli's Tancred (1847), Browning's Poetry (1848), and Longfellow's Kavanaugh (1849). For three years after 1850, however, Lowell did not write for the Review, because he fell out with Bowen over the latter's stand on the Hungarian question. A member of the Boston-Harvard community--having graduated from the college in

1840--Lowell succeeded Longfellow as Smith Professor of Modern Languages there in 1855, and he followed Andrew P. Peabody as editor of the North American (with Charles Eliot Norton) in 1863.

As a critic, Lowell was free from many of the besetting weaknesses that marred the writing of so many of his fellow contributors to the North American in the 1840's. His sparkling and witty prose seems almost out of place in the North American. Bowen, in fact, once called Lowell's articles for the Review "too brilliant."[54] Lowell's criticism, however, is marked by a historical awareness even more striking than his style. Lowell escaped the prevailing nationalism. Thus, on the question of a national literature, he agreed with Longfellow and did not share the common chauvinistic consternation about our not having produced any great men of letters. Almost the whole of his 1849 review of Longfellow's Kavanaugh Lowell devotes to the question of a national literature, and he points out that the true literary genius occurs only once in several centuries; he notes too that Shakespeare, who was born just a generation before the early American colonists, must be reckoned one of our literary ancestors.[55] His historical perspective came into play also in his 1847 review of The New Timon when he pointed out the futility of a modern

poet's imitating Pope as Bulwer-Lytton had done.[56] Lowell no doubt remembered Hillard's suggestion that he do the same.

By 1844 Lowell was over the earlier flirtation with Transcendentalism, which led him to contribute several sonnets to the Dial in 1841. His enthusiasm for Carlyle had waned considerably, and although friendly with Emerson, he was by no means a disciple of the older poet. To the Transcendentalists, however, he no doubt would have been more friendly than Bowen and Felton, but he did not get a chance to review any American authors except Longfellow.

It was not one of the regular writers for the North American who reviewed The Scarlet Letter in 1850. Mrs. Anne Wales Abbot, a woman now virtually unknown, assesses Hawthorne's masterpiece in the Review.[57] After acknowledging Hawthorne's "racy and pungent" style, his originality, and his genial feeling, she reveals her distaste for the subject of the novel: "One cannot but wonder, by the way, that the master of such a wizard power over language as Mr. Hawthorne manifests should not choose a less revolting subject than this of the Scarlet Letter, to which fine writing seems as inappropriate as fine embroidery" (p. 147).

As repugnant as the idea of adultery might be to a Christian lady, it was not only the subject of The Scarlet Letter that distressed Mrs. Abbot. The whole world of that

novel was quite out of keeping with the world which she knew, or rather, the world as she was wont to see it. Hawthorne was playing some rather nasty tricks on his readers. In this novel, the perplexed Mrs. Abbot notes, "devils and angels are alike beautiful." Likewise the paradoxical notions "that revenge may exist without any overt act of vengeance" and that one who eschews vengeance might "be more diabolical in his very forbearance" (p. 143) than a cold-blooded avenger are preposterously at variance with Mrs. Abbot's moral view. And except for Pearl ("the only genuine and consistent mortal in the book" [p. 142]), the characters are disturbingly unreal to the reviewer. The reader's initial pity for Hester lasts only as long as there is some "hope for her soul." When Hester's humility becomes pride "a vague unreality steals by degrees over all her most humanizing traits" and she ultimately disappoints the reader, who was "looking to behold a Christian" (p. 140) --more of Hawthorne's devious trickery. Dimmesdale is "but a changeling, an imp in grave apparel," and Chillingworth "a pure abstraction at last, a sort of mythical fury" (p. 142).

Thus, Hawthorne has turned the world upside down, and Mrs. Abbot is neither imaginative enough nor supple enough to stand on her head, nor is she willing, like Emerson in <u>Nature</u>, to bend over and look at the world through her legs.

An unshakable moral certitude gives her philosophical statements the ring of undebatable finality, as witness this pronouncement on the significance of suffering: "Mere suffering, aimless and without effect for purification or blessing to the soul, we do not find in God's moral world" (p. 141).

Despite her serious reservations about the morality of The Scarlet Letter, however, Mrs. Abbot's criticism is neither sarcastic nor harsh--owing, no doubt, to the restraining influences of Christian charity and her respect for Hawthorne's by then considerable literary reputation. Mrs. Abbot wrote only one other article for the North American, a review of some minor lady novelists in 1851. She seems to have shared the moralistic viewpoint of Felton and Bowen and their circle.

Neither Carlyle nor the American Romantics got a warm reception in the North American Review during Bowen's editorship. Except for Mrs. Abbot's review of Hawthorne, all of the significant articles on Romantic literature were by Bowen and Felton. As the editor, Bowen was of course responsible for seeing to it that the younger critics, like Lowell and Whipple, were not given a chance to evaluate the Transcendentalists. He is accountable too for the significant omissions, of which that of Melville is most

prominent. His name was not mentioned in the North American Review as Typee (1846), Omoo (1847), Mardi (1848) and even Moby-Dick (1851) went unnoticed. The only other major American magazine that overlooked Moby-Dick was the Ladies Repository.[58] Among some of the other notable unreviewed works were Emerson's Essays, Second Series (1844), as well as Carlyle's Life of John Sterling (1851). Thoreau's A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers (1849) was likewise overlooked.[59] While the book had very little immediate impact on the literary world, Bowen could not have helped knowing about it.

Andrew Preston Peabody took over the North American Review in 1853 when Bowen became professor of civil polity at Harvard. A man of prodigious energies, Peabody until 1860 also served as pastor of South Parish Unitarian church in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Although much more theologically conservative than the average Unitarian of his day, he was not at all a dour moralist. Instead, he maintained a pleasant, charitable, and optimistic outlook. A cheerful religiosity was his most prominent quality. At Harvard, where he later served as Plummer Professor of Christian Morals, he was fondly known as the "College Saint."[60] Peabody's sweet gentility is reflected in the tone of the Review during his editorship.

With the change in editors in 1853 came a change in the group who wrote most of the literary criticism. Although Bowen did not do as many of the major literary reviews, he continued to write for the North American after Peabody took over, but, for various reasons, a number of the other writers from the 1840's did not contribute as frequently. Felton, who spent a great deal of time in Europe during the 1850's, wrote only four reviews. Whipple wrote three, none of them on literature. Hillard wrote one, and Lowell none.

Peabody, of course, did a large share of the reviewing himself. A voluminous writer, he contributed eighty articles to the North American Review, thirty-three of them between 1852 and 1861. And even more abundant was his output of books and pamphlets. After his name, the Harvard library catalogue lists 190 titles, on such subjects as theology, travel, literature, and biography.[61] The quality of his prose, however, does not match the quantity. His literary criticism, especially, is undistinguished. Although he was responsive to the positive and cheerful aspects of Romantic literature, he too often was guided by his blissful religiosity and his steadfast faith in progress rather than by literary standards. Hence, he rejected out of hand any work that smacked of irreverence, misanthropy, or anti-social attitudes.

In the first issue of the Review for which he was responsible, Peabody reviewed Hawthorne's House of Seven Gables and Blithedale Romance.[62] This review is the lengthiest treatment of Hawthorne in the North American to date, and the first four pages of it are given over to an evaluation of Hawthorne's previous literary record. The essence of Hawthorne's genius, Peabody finds, lies in his magical ability to make the commonplace incident or object seem "grand, pathetic, or grotesque," and Hawthorne uses this unique talent to philosophize. "With him," Peabody observes, "a tale takes the place of an apophthegm; an allegory, of a homily; a romance, of an ethical treatise" (p. 231). Peabody notices two weaknesses in Hawthorne's writing: inept plots and unrealistic dialogue. He declares them minor flaws, however, especially the dialogue, which is, after all, "true to fact and feeling."

Although he seems tolerant enough and more able to deal with Hawthorne on strictly literary grounds than Mrs. Abbot had been, Peabody too is disturbed--for reasons of dubious critical validity--by The Scarlet Letter. In it, Peabody observes, Hawthorne has

> . . . unwittingly defamed the fathers of New England, by locating his pictures of gross impurity and sacrilegious vice where no shadow of reproach, and no breath but of immaculate fame, had ever rested before.

> He thus has violated one of the most sacred canons of literary creation. A writer, who borrows nothing from history, may allow himself an unlimited range in the painting of character; but he who selects a well-known place and epoch for his fiction, is bound to adjust his fiction to the analogy of fact, and especially to refrain from outraging the memory of the dead for the entertainment of the living (pp. 232-233).

It could be demonstrated, of course, that "gross impurity" and "sacrilegious vice" had existed in seventeenth century Boston, just as they have existed--in some measure --in all places and all times, but Peabody's "sacred canon of literary creation" is itself neither sacred nor canonical. He implies that Hawthorne erred by not choosing some completely fictitious land--a Brobdingnag or a Laputa--or, at least, an actual geographical setting in which the seven deadly sins would be more at home. Peabody is moved by an exaggerated sense of the moral superiority of his New England ancestors, an understandable inclination, but a hindrance to critical perspicacity, nevertheless.

When Peabody gets to the Blithedale Romance, he notes that the characters are, appropriately enough, all abnormal, since in our well-endowed nation "the Socialist might complain, with some color of reason, that the only materials for his experiments were insoluble precipitates from the crystallization of domestic life" (p. 237).

Peabody is out of sympathy with the very notion of social reform; hence, he is pleased with Hawthorne's delineation of Hollingsworth as a fanatic who crushes those who do not cooperate in his schemes. He likes Zenobia even better, but he is distressed by her suicide, because it is ghastly, unnecessary, and not plausible. And it is essentially his strong distaste for socialism that leads him to rank The Blithedale Romance below The Scarlet Letter and The House of Seven Gables. He launches into a two-page discussion of the evils of collectivization--the greatest of which is "homelessness"--and a blatantly sentimental defense of domesticity. "There are chords of sentiment in every heart," says Peabody, "which can respond only to the word HOME" (p. 245).

To Thoreau's Walden, Peabody devoted a brief critical notice in October 1854.[63] So brief is the review that it can easily be quoted in its entirety: "The economical details and calculations in this book are more curious than useful; for the author's life in the woods was on too narrow a scale to find imitators. But in describing his hermitage and his forest life, he says so many pithy and brilliant things, and offers so many piquant, and, we may add, so many just, comments on society as it is, that his book is well worth the reading, both for its actual contents and its suggestive capacity" (p. 536).

Peabody's observation that Thoreau's account is not a very practical guide to outdoor living indicates that to some extent he probably missed the point of the book--much as Everett pretended to miss the point of Sartor Resartus. But he obviously did enjoy Walden, and he endorsed Thoreau's world-view, as he understood it. The meager review that he gave to Thoreau's masterpiece, however, indicates that he by no means considered it to be a really significant work.

In 1856 Peabody reviews Emerson's English Traits, and his criticism again reveals his moralistic outlook and a patriotic dislike of the British.[64] He points out that Emerson's philosophy ultimately "neutralizes moral distinctions, eliminates duty and accountability, obliterates religion, and excludes the conception of a personal and self-conscious deity" (p. 505). Peabody does concede, however, that Emerson's "indifference" is "propitious to merely aesthetic observation and impression," and he recognizes and admires the merits of Emerson's techniques even while decrying their tendency toward irreverence. "Mr. Emerson," Peabody explains, "threw open his own broad, rich, delicately organized, and generously cultured intellect, with an Argus-eyed passiveness, with a receptivity which no emotion or affection weakened or distorted, to take an exact impress of what he heard and saw" (p. 505).

But Emerson is too much of an Anglophile for Peabody's taste. No doubt moved by a haunting intimation of America's cultural inferiority, Peabody admonishes Emerson for not balancing his account by mentioning the "pauperism, ignorance, and crime, aristocratic pretension and plebian sycophancy, sinecure laziness, and under-paid labor" (p. 505) that are so common in England.

In January 1856 Peabody published a three-page review of Whitman's Leaves of Grass written by Edward Everett Hale,[65] a nephew of Alexander and Edward Everett, who later that year became Pastor of South Congregational Church in Boston. In his review--one of the most enthusiastic early notices of Whitman's masterpiece--Hale sees Whitman as "an American,--one of the roughs,--no sentimentalist,--no stander above men and women, or apart from them,--no more modest than immodest" (p. 275). Hale especially likes Whitman's Preface. He declares that Whitman's "analysis of the genius of the United States" is superior to many "more pretentious studies of it" (p. 275). As for the poetry, Hale finds it "refreshing," and he notes Whitman's successful use of "natural language." After quoting several of Whitman's poems, Hale tempers his praise with a slight reservation about the indelicacy of a few passages. Although there is nothing in the book "more

indelicate than are some passages in Homer," Hale observes, "it is a pity that a book where everything else is natural should go out of the way to avoid being prudish" (p. 277).

Hale contributed other critical articles to the North American during Peabody's editorship, including reviews of Tennyson's Maud and Longfellow's Hiawatha. Although he was clearly on the side of the Romantics, his literary criticism is not as interesting as his commentary upon the age in which he lived. His reviews are not keenly analytical, and are generally filled out with lengthy excerpts. As a younger member of the Harvard-Unitarian community, however, he developed a sensitive awareness of the shifts in thought taking place in his time. As an older man looking back at the Harvard of 1839, he declared, "Like all college boys at their graduation, I was sternly old-school; thought Mr. Emerson half crazy; disliked abolition; doubted as to total abstinence, and in general, followed the advice of my Cambridge teachers, who were from the President down to janitor, all a hundred years behind their time."[66]

Hale's youthful exposure to the Bostonian conservatism seems to have effectively immunized him from many of the prevailing aesthetic ills, especially the tendency to overemphasize good taste and decorum. Of the nine members

of the Saturday Club in 1857, for instance, only Emerson recognized Whitman's greatness. Whipple's jest that Whitman "had every leaf but the fig leaf"[67] no doubt reflected the opinion of the rest of the group, which included Lowell, Holmes, Longfellow, and John Lathrop Motely.

A frequent contributor to the North American during Peabody's editorship was Henry Theodore Tuckerman. Between 1854 and 1860 he contributed fifteen reviews, six of them on literature, the remainder on biography and travel. Tuckerman's sympathetic understanding of Romanticism is best revealed in his review of Evart and George Duyckinck's Cyclopaedia of American Literature.[68] He refers to German literature of the eighteenth century as "that extraordinary flowering of genius," and he notes the generally beneficial influence of Goethe, Schiller, and Richter--through the agency of Carlyle--upon American writers, especially Emerson. While he finds much to praise in Emerson, Tuckerman voices some of the customary objections to the American poet-philosopher. His itemization of Emerson's faults, however, lacks Bowen's sting, and he does not emphasize Emerson's irreverence as much as Peabody did. After commending Emerson for his "charm," "aphoristic eloquence" and "style," Tuckerman observes that "while

cordially admitting these merits, we must acknowledge that a habit of vagrant speculation, a love of saying things to astonish, a studied peculiarity of expression, and certain odd graces of style, evince of themselves rather premeditated eccentricity than deep convictions" (pp. 343-344). Tuckerman also praises Hawthorne, calling him "the only writer who has bravely tried the traditions and primitive character of New England in the crucible of analytical imagination" (p. 346).

During the late 1850's Charles Carroll Everett, a first cousin of Edward and Alexander Everett, began writing for the Review. Easily the most Romantic of the writers for the Review, Everett had studied in German universities, where he became a confirmed disciple of Hegelian thought. From 1857 to 1859 he was a student at Harvard Divinity School, and in 1869, after ten years as pastor of a Unitarian Church in Bangor, Maine, he became Bussey Professor of Theology at Harvard. Despite his religious orientation, however, the predominating influence of his German education kept him from being a merely moralistic critic in the manner of Peabody.

In reviews of Ruskin, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, and Tennyson, Everett applied Hegel's epochal view of aesthetic development to the individual artist.[69] As Hegel saw it,

aesthetic development could be divided into three epochs --symbolic, classic, and romantic--on the basis of the spiritual quality of the art of each period. In the symbolic period, spirit was subordinate and obscured by the material. In the classic period, the spiritual and the real were in balanced fusion. In the romantic period, the spiritual elements predominated. Everett's most concise statement of his concept of Hegel's epochal view occurs in his article on Elizabeth Browning:

> It is interesting to see the processes of history repeated in the individual, as to a certain extent they must be. The embryonic man passes through all the forms of lower life to attain to the higher. To our childhood the sun rose and sank, and the stars revolved about the seeming plane of the world, as they did in the ancients. Thus the development of the individual artist exhibits very often the three periods by which art attained to its present position. At first, when he awakes to spiritual truths they loom about him, vast and shadowy. His mind cannot completely grasp them. It has itself no fixed standpoint from which to survey them. All is vague and unsettled. His life and the structure of his works will partake of this same character. They will be to a degree formless, and, so far as they seek to represent the higher spiritual truths, symbolical. This is the wild ferment that is seen, for instance, in the Robbers of Schiller, where we meet gigantic shadows instead of men. We find the same in the view of life exhibited in the Sorrows of Werther. This period, however, passes; the poet obtains a clearer view of truth, and consequently a more perfect command over the expression of it. The rudeness of the material yields to his labor, and answers to the beauty of his thought. The era thus reached is that corresponding to the one in which the classic art of the Greeks flourished. It would be easy to show, for instance, how the Iphigenia of Goethe differs from the Grecian drama; it would be no less easy to show

> that it resembles it more nearly than most of his other writings. When the artist has acquired this perfect command of material with which he has to work, if his intellectual and spiritual development continue, this latter begins to influence his production more and more. The difficulties that he had met in the matter of outward form being subdued, this retires more and more into the background. He demands simply a medium for the communication of his thought, and no longer requires that this should reflect its beauty. The Faust of Goethe furnishes a fine example of the last-named class of works, in which the principle of modern or romantic art is first fully exhibited.[70]

Everett saw the romantic period, Hegel's third stage, as the triumphant culmination of the aesthetic development of the race and the individual artist. Thus, "Aurora Leigh," one of Elizabeth Browning's later poems, represented "her whole past life, with its main griefs and disappointments, with its inspiration and its failures, and with its final crown of love and joy" (p. 431). Likewise, Everett saw his own age as the romantic period, and he frequently expressed his fondness for the German Romantics who had ushered in the new era. Everett did not review the American Romantics for the North American, but he incidentally revealed his admiration for Margaret Fuller and Emerson. In his article on Browning he refers to Margaret Fuller as a "genius," and in his Ruskin article he quotes Emerson's "Each and All"--to demonstrate the evanescence of nature--and calls it a "beautiful poem." Whatever the shortcomings of a critical method based on Hegelian aesthetics, Everett's

use of this technique made his reviews readable and interesting. If his attempt to fit an author into the Hegelian scheme was too rigidly doctrinaire, it nevertheless was an analytical method. In using it Everett avoided the moralistic approach and the taboos against misanthropy and anti-social themes.

Another exponent of German literature and philosophy who began to contribute to the North American under Peabody was Frederick Henry Hedge, a Unitarian minister, who became well grounded in Kant, Fichte, and Schelling during a stay in Germany as a young man. Hedge is best known today as one of the founders, with Emerson and George Ripley, of the American Transcendental movement. He did not write for the Review during the heyday of Transcendentalism, a period when his theological position, like Emerson's, was much too heretical for the conservative Unitarians who controlled the North American. Thus, his appearance in the journal in 1856 indicates that the once heated controversy between the liberal and conservative Unitarians had cooled considerably, and this change is reflected in the literary criticism of the North American, since those who had been identified with Transcendentalism were no longer excluded.

Hedge contributed essays on Margaret Fuller and Goethe to the Review in 1856. He has high praise for Margaret Fuller, who had been his close friend.[71] Although she lacked the "concentration and singleness of purpose" required to produce a masterpiece, she nevertheless turned out a number of excellent brief critical essays, especially those on Goethe, Hedge maintains. In a review of G. H. Lewes' Life and Works of Goethe,[72] Hedge predictably reveals his great admiration for the German poet, but, more than that, his comments indicate that he was not one of the moralistic critics. Even such an ardent admirer of Goethe as Longfellow had certain reservations about the morality of the German poet. Hedge mentions Geothe's reputation as a "selfish and heartless monster," but he predicts that "the time must come when the greatest poet of his age will be judged no longer by court gossip and the misrepresentations of party spite, but by his works. And when so judged he will assuredly--even as a moral nature--be esteemed 'very highly for his work's sake'" (p. 568).

The appearance of Charles Everett and Frederick Hedge in the North American Review represents a major departure from previous editorial policies that can be seen also in a number of other literary reviews that Peabody published.

Not only were there new reviewers, but there were new subjects and attitudes as well. In 1853, Arthur Hugh Clough, an English poet who was very fond of Emerson, reviews Matthew Arnold's first two volumes of poetry, Empedocles on Etna, and A Strayed Reveller.[73] Clough finds Arnold's poetry unnecessarily obscure, but he sees in Arnold a great poet in the making. In a laudatory article on Victor Hugo,[74] Ainsworth Rand Spofford, a librarian from Cincinnati, challenges the notion that Byron and Shelley were guilty of bad taste in "their wide departure, both in subject and style, from the classic models." Spofford claims that "no greater service has in modern times been rendered to art than the widening of the domain of poetry by these very writers" (p. 338). In October 1856 a Mrs. E. Vale Smith wrote the first review of Poe to appear in the North American.[75] From Mrs. Smith, however, Poe gets only recognition, not acceptance. "Rather than remember all, we would forget all that he has written" (p. 455), Mrs. Smith concludes. In April 1859 Osmond Tiffany reviews Carlyle's Life of Frederick the Great,[76] and he regrets that the "Carlylese" style will force students interested in Frederick to read digests of Carlyle's account in periodicals. Tiffany's review is such a digest. He enjoys the Life of Frederick despite Carlyle's stylistic idiosyncrasies, however. Tiffany thanks Carlyle for his

"great work" and commends him for his "careful research, profound philosophy, picturesque and vivid description, and inexhaustible wit" (p. 547).

In April 1860 Charles Cord Smith reviews Hawthorne's Marble Faun.[77] The critical notice, scarcely more than a page long, yields little of interest. Smith refers the reader to Peabody's article on Hawthorne in the January 1853 number of the Review for background information; then he proceeds to examine The Marble Faun. For mainly stylistic reasons he finds it superior to Hawthorne's previous novels, and he also finds its tone more "healthful." On the negative side, he notes that the plot is "too intricate" and that the book leaves "an impression of incompleteness." He does not, of course, go into any great detail on the novel's merits or faults. It seems, however, that so far as Hawthorne is concerned, Smith is of the same mind as Mrs. Abbot and Peabody, and his critical approach is essentially the same as theirs.

On the whole Peabody, as editor of the North American Review, gave the Romantics a kinder reception and more extensive coverage than Bowen or Palfrey had given them. There were, however, a few noteworthy works that went unreviewed. Neither Melville's Piazza Tales (1856) nor his

The Confidence Man (1857) were reviewed. His name again went unmentioned in the Review. The only other significant work to go unnoticed was Emerson's The Conduct of Life (1860).

CHAPTER III

Conclusions

Summing up the overall attitude toward Romanticism expressed in the North American Review during the period is complicated by the number of critics to be taken into consideration and by the fact that Romantic literature transcends national boundaries and includes a wide variety of literary styles and themes. It is possible, nevertheless, to make a few qualified generalizations on the subject, in that the critics were in many respects of one mind, and none of them deviated much from the position of the editor, who not only made the assignments but also had the right to refuse to print what was widely at variance with his own opinions. Moreover, for all its diversity, Romantic literature does have an identifiable common essence.

The critics were most nearly unanimous in their religious outlook. Virtually all of them were devout Unitarians; many were clergymen. And their religiosity accounts for the key principle of their criticism; that is, literature should not contain anything contrary to established religion and conventional morality. Although the critics did not insist upon a didactic literature, they did demand that religion be treated with reverential respect, and they were quick to condemn any work that

explicitly or implicitly treated religion as less than the most necessary, worthwhile, and unassailable institution. Likewise, any work that failed to affirm conventional morality was by virtue of that fact bad literature. The religious and moral standards were, of course, relative--what was irreverent to one critic might have been innocuous to another. The question of morality elicited a variety of responses. Anne Wales Abbot, for instance, in objecting to the subject of The Scarlet Letter, is merely prudish. Frederick Hedge, on the other hand, applies a much more profound version of the moral standard to Goethe when he says that, properly understood, Goethe's seemingly pernicious works are indeed moral. All too often, however, the critics were more prudish than profound.

The optimistic quality of the critics' religious convictions accounted for their insistence that literature present an affirmative and cheerful account of the human condition. Misanthropy, in their estimation, vitiated literature by rendering it untrue to life. Such an outlook obviously coincided with the prevailing belief in progress.

The writers of the North American were homogeneous in other ways that affected their literary criticism. Nearly all of them were professional men--ministers, professors, and lawyers--who shared common social and

educational backgrounds. They conceived of themselves as a social, intellectual, and cultural elite. Indeed, they did constitute such an aristocracy, and they had a paternalistic concern for the welfare--as they understood it--of society as a whole. Their solicitude amounted to a fixed determination to maintain the status quo. Hence, they insisted that literature contain nothing that reflected unfavorably upon the prevailing social and economic order. As a corollary of this anti-radical principle, they preferred literature that emphasized man's social involvement and responsibility rather than that which focused upon his unique individuality, as Romantic literature frequently did.

In the realm of aesthetic sensibility, the critics were not as much of one mind. They were in accord, however, in condemning idiosyncratic and obscure styles, and they had little patience with mysticism, a label they applied to writing that to them was not immediately comprehensible. These strictures too were relative. The application of them depended upon the critic's sensitivity and perception, and over the years the influence of these taboos diminished. By the time of Peabody's editorship, most of the critics were much more tolerant. Despite the conservatism of the older critics, however, they could hardly be called Neo-Classicists. A few of them--namely,

Felton, Hillard, and Bowen--admired the polished perfection of the poetry of Pope and other eighteenth century poets. But even these critics had tired somewhat of couplets in iambic pentameter, and, while they often deplored the imperfection of much contemporary poetry, they did not insist on a strict adherence to conventional poetic forms. As long as an author's work remained intelligible, the critics were willing to grant him much more liberty with form than with content. All the critics, in fact, advocated originality in literature, originality, that is, within the limits of their literary canons.

Thus, the predominating critical attitudes did not rule out Romanticism per se. Dynamic organicism, the central principle of Romanticism, was not necessarily incompatible with the standards applied by the critics, most of whom thought of Romanticism as an essentially sound literary mode that had been on occasion abused. They considered those Romantic works of which they did not approve to be examples of excessive or "superheated" Romanticism, and they did not refer to the American Transcendentalists as Romantics. Hence, the term Romantic maintained a more or less honorific connotation with them, even though they held much Romantic literature in disrepute.

With their optimistic Christianity, belief in progress, and cultural pride, the critics found the concept of Romanticism to be compatible, since it represented to them the cultural flowering of Aryan Christianity.

For the most part, however, not many Romantic authors fared well in the North American Review. With the exception of the much-admired Walter Scott and Wordsworth, virtually all of the important Romantics violated one or more of the prevailing critical doctrines. Hawthorne, the most favored of the American Romantics, was taken to task for his subject matter and his sometimes gloomy outlook. Emerson, on the whole, was too irreverent, affected, and obscure. Byron was seen as the most pernicious writer of all, although the critics generally acknowledged his literary talent. Carlyle's style was mainly responsible for alienating the critics. The German and French Romantics were maligned for their irreverence and radicalism, less often for their style.

Individual differences among the critics and the influx of new critics during Peabody's editorship necessitate some qualifications of the foregoing conclusions, however. Alexander Everett, a maverick in many respects, did appreciate Carlyle. Edwin Whipple, a critic who lacked the standard aristocratic background and Harvard

education, was much more understanding of Byron than any of the other critics had been. A number of the younger men who wrote the literary criticism during Peabody's editorship were more tolerant of styles and mystical content, and they did not have such superficial notions of the morality of the works that they appraised. Edward Hale, who at an earlier age had been very conscious of the conservatism of his elders, could approve of Whitman's Leaves of Grass, and he regarded the indelicate expressions not as major flaws but as merely minor blemishes in Whitman's masterpiece. Certainly, Frederick Hedge and Charles Everett, both avid students of German literature and philosophy, had nothing against what earlier critics would have called "mystical" writing. As for Peabody himself, if he could not be enthusiastic about Emerson, he did write a favorable review of Thoreau's Walden, though its extreme brevity suggested that he did not think the work very important. Between 1853 and 1860, then, the Review was more favorably disposed toward Romantic literature than it had been since Alexander Everett relinquished the editorship in 1836.

The response of the writers of the North American to Romanticism points up an intriguing paradox. While the critics seemed to have the highest possible regard for

literature, they did not believe in literary art for its own sake. Rather they made literature subservient to their self-esteem and their philosophical outlook. They craved a national literature, not so much because it would offer a profound and objective insight into themselves, but primarily because it would give them a cultural identity and make Europe, especially the British, take notice. They expected literature to reaffirm their world-view, but worthwhile literature has always challenged man's illusions. So it is that many of the works that are revered in later ages are resented in their own time--when the illusions are indispensable, as they so often were to the writers of the North American.

Notes

Chapter I

[1]Frank Luther Mott, A History of American Magazines, II (Cambridge, 1938), 220-221. In acknowledging the various sources of historical data on the North American Review, I cite the most conveniently detailed account in each instance.

[2]Herbert Baxter Adams, Life and Writings of Jared Sparks, I (Boston, 1893), 287.

[3]Unless otherwise noted, my source of historical information on American magazines other than the North American Review is Mott's History, Vols. I and II.

[4]Prescott made these comments on the Review in a letter to Gardiner dated October 4, 1837. The portion of the letter bearing on the Review appears in George Ticknor's Life of William Hickling Prescott (Boston, 1864), p. 238n.

[5]Adams, I, 233.

[6]Quoted from the Edinburgh Review by Algernon Tassin (The Magazine in America [New York, 1916], p. 37).

[7]Adams, I, 285.

[8]Before 1868 articles in the North American were unsigned. To identify the authors I used William Cushing's Index to the North American Review, 1815-1877 (Cambridge, 1878).

[9]Census figures in this paper are from Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957, compiled by the U. S. Bureau of the Census (Washington, D. C., 1960).

[10]These figures are based on national averages for the period in various industries and trades as estimated by Carroll D. Wright in The Industrial Revolution in the United States (New York, 1897), pp. 215-228.

[11]The state of the fine arts during the period is described by Harvey Wish in Society and Thought in Early America (New York, 1950), pp. 470-478.

[12]"Boston Academy of Music," NAR, XLIII (July 1836), 53.

[13]"The Present and Future of American Art," NAR, LXXXIII (July 1856), 84-96.

[14]Second and subsequent references to specific pages of articles in the North American Review will be cited in the text.

[15]Frank Luther Mott describes the inception of "cheap publishing" in Golden Multitudes (New York, 1947), pp. 76-79.

[16]Mott, History, I, 581.

[17]NAR, LIX (July 1844), 33.

[18]Stanley M. Vogel, German Literary Influences on the American Transcendentalists (New Haven, 1955), p. 15.

[19]Orie W. Long, Literary Pioneers (Cambridge, 1935), p. 238n.

[20]Long, pp. 127-130.

[21]Vogel, p. 19.

[22]"Representative Men," NAR, LXX (April 1850), 521.

[23]"Lyell's Second Visit to America," NAR, LXIX (October 1849), 338. In 1863 Lyell drew an even more pained response from the American geologist, C. H. Hitchcock ("Antiquity of Man," NAR, XCVII [October 1863], 451-483), "Lyell is one of those philosophers who are determined to devise theories for the explanation of every phenomenon in the mental and physical world without reference to the creating and controlling hand of the Deity" (473-474), Hitchcock lamented.

[24]"Hugh Miller and Popular Science," NAR, LXXIII (October 1851), 448-473.

[25]All biographical information, unless otherwise indicated, is taken from the Dictionary of American Biography (New York, 1928-1936).

[26]Thomas Cuming Hall takes special note of the significance of Unitarianism and claims that "the intellectual life, not only of New England but of the whole northern part of the United States, was from the year 1800 completely under the sway of Unitarian religious movement in as far as any religious teaching commanded common assent." ("The Religious Background of American Culture [New York, 1930], p. 213).

[27]While the population doubled, membership in the Methodist church almost trebled, going from 655,000 in 1835 to 1,661,000 in 1860 (Historical Statistics of the United States, p. 229).

28"The Progress of Society," NAR, XXXVI (April 1833), 419.

29"The Colonization Society," NAR, XVIII (January 1824), 40-90.

30"The Possible Amelioration of Slavery," NAR, LXXVII (October 1853), 466-493.

31"Nathaniel Hawthorne," NAR, LXXVI (January 1853), 227-248.

32Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. briefly discusses the political character of the major magazines of the time in his essay "Jacksonian Democracy and Literature" (The Age of Jackson [Boston, 1946], pp. 369-390).

33Quoted by B. Bernard Cohen ("Edward Everett and Hawthorne's Removal from the Salem Custom House," AL, XXVII [1955], 246).

34The political-literary disputes, which centered in New York, are dealt with by John Stafford in The Literary Criticism of Young America (Berkeley, 1952) and by Perry Miller in The Raven and the Whale (New York, 1956).

35"The Effects of Machinery," NAR, XXXIV (January 1832), 220-246.

36"The Life and Poetry of Wordsworth," NAR, LXXIII (October 1851), 473-495.

37Quoted by Arthur A. Ekirch, Jr. in The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860 (New York, 1944), pp. 86-87.

38"The Present and Future of American Art," NAR, LXXXIII (July 1856), 95-96.

39In Main Currents of American Thought (New York, 1927), Parrington titles the volume dealing with the period 1800-1860 The Romantic Revolution in America.

40PMLA, LXVI (March 1951), 5-23.

41Arthur O. Lovejoy discusses the philosophical development of this paradox in "Romanticism and the Principle of Plenitude" (Chapter X in The Great Chain of Being [Cambridge, 1957], pp. 288-314).

[42]"Literary Criticism in the North American Review, 1815-1835," Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, XXXII (1940), 299-350.

[43]"Critical Ideas in the North American Review, 1815-1865" (Northwestern University, 1943). Streeter published the conclusions of the first portion of his study ("Association Psychology and Literary Nationalism in the North American Review," AL, XVII /1945/, 243-254).

Chapter II

[1]"Phi Beta Kappa Orations," NAR, XXIV (January 1827), 129-141.

[2]"Early Literature of Modern Europe," NAR, XXXVIII (January 1834), 176.

[3]The translation was Edward's idea. Alexander agreed, but the project was never undertaken. Edward's letters to Alexander, in which he proposes the scheme, have been published by Orie W. Long in Literary Pioneers, pp. 66-67.

[4]"Life and Writings of Schiller," NAR, XVI (April 1823), 397-425. Everett's essays for the North American Review and other magazines were collected and published in two volumes by his nephew, Edward Everett Hale, under the title Critical and Miscellaneous Essays (1845-1846).

[5]In the Massachusetts gubernatorial contest in 1839, Alexander supported Marcus Morton, his brother's Democratic opponent, and his endorsement made the crucial difference in Morton's famous one-vote victory. The episode is described by Paul R. Frothingham in Edward Everett: Orator and Statesman (Boston, 1925), pp. 154-155.

[6]"Thomas Carlyle," NAR, XLI (October 1835), 454-482. Everett reviewed the 1834 London printing from Fraser's Magazine. Only fifty-eight copies were issued (Charles F. Harrold, ed., Sartor Resartus /New York, 1937/, p. lxiii). The first American edition of Sartor appeared in 1836.

[7]The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson, ed. C. E. Norton (Boston, 1883), I, 112.

[8]"Sartor Resartus," Christian Examiner, XXI (September 1836), 74-84. Of Frothingham's conception of the Clothes-Philosopher, Carlyle said, "I did verily detect more similitude to what I myself meant to be, than in any or all the other criticisms I have yet seen written of me" (in a letter to Emerson /June 1, 1837/, Correspondence, I, 125). Frothingham wrote three reviews for the NA. They appeared in 1823, 1841, and 1847.

[9]"Coleridge's Poems," NAR, XXXIX (October 1834), 437-458.

[10]"Coleridge," NAR, XL (April 1835), 299-351.

[11]DAB, XIV, 170.

[12]NAR, LXV (October 1837), 418-460.

[13]She claimed that the Review "has sunk at home and abroad, less from want of talent than of principle" and that "if it has any principle whatever at present, it is to praise every book it mentions, and to fall in as dexterously as possible with popular prejudices." (Society in America /London, 1837/, II, 308; quoted in Mott's History, II, 239).

[14]Edward Everett Hale, James Russell Lowell and His Friends (Boston, 1899), p. 61. Palfrey read Carlyle's History on a trip to Louisiana to free forty slaves he had recently inherited. Hale reports that "before he /Palfrey/ came to Cincinnati, he had forgotten the eccentricities and was as eager as the youngest of us to praise the historian" (p. 61).

[15]Hale, p. 61. (Boston, 1898).

[16]"History of Concord," NAR, XLII (April 1836), 448-467.

[17]Quoted by Leon Howard in Victorian Knight-Errant (Berkeley, 1952), p. 64.

[18]"Coleridge's Letters," NAR, XLIII (July 1836), 263-264.

[19]"Hayward's Translation of Faust," NAR, LI (July 1840), 250.

[20]"Fay's Countess Ida," NAR, LI (October 1840), 434.

[21]"Emerson's Essays," Christian Examiner, XXX (May 1841), 253-262. The Christian Examiner is indexed in William F. Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, 1802-1881, 2 vols.

[22]"Hawthorne's Twice Told Tales," NAR, XLV (July 1837), 59-73.

[23]The review was actually Hawthorne's idea. He wrote to Longfellow in March 1837: "The agent of the American Stationers' Company will send you a copy of a book entitled Twice Told Tales, of which, as a classmate, I venture to request your acceptance." (quoted in Life of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, ed., Samuel Longfellow, /Boston, 1886/, I, 250. After reading the review, Hawthorne again wrote to Longfellow: "Whether or no the public will agree to the praise which you bestow upon me, there are at least five persons who think you the most sagacious critic on earth; viz., my mother and two sisters, my old maiden aunt, and finally,--the sturdiest believer of the whole five,--my own self (Life, I, 255).

[24]From the journal entry for December 26, 1846 (Life, II, 69), which was but a day after publication of the volume. Longfellow received his copy from Emerson.

[25]Life, II, 20.

[26]Life, II, 19.

[27](Anonymous) "Hawthorne's Grandfather's Chair," NAR, LII (January 1841), 260-261. This article and the 1842 review of the Second Edition of Twice Told Tales remain anonymous because Palfrey, in 1878, was "too inform" to give Cushing any information (reported by Cushing, p. iii).

[28](Anonymous) "Hawthorne's Twice Told Tales," NAR, LIV (April 1842), 496-499.

[29]"Lowell's Poems," NAR, LII (April 1841), 452-466.

[30]Hale, pp. 61-62.

[31]"Clarence," NAR, XXXII (January 1831), 73-95.

[32]"Modern French Poetry," NAR, XLIV (April 1837), 363.

[33]"Romantic Poetry in Italy," NAR, XLVII (July 1838), 206-236.

[34]"Works of George Sand," NAR, LIII (July 1841), 103-139.

[35]In a review of Chateaubriand's Sketches of English Literature (NAR, XLIX /October 1839/, 317-348), the historian, William Hickling Prescott, refers to Carlyle's French Revolution as a "harlequin compound" in which "the author flounders on, amid a sort of 'crude consistence,' half prose, half poetry, like Milton's devil working his way through chaos" (p. 342).

[36]Bowen's opposition to the popular Hungarian patriot was put forth in a Review article ("The War of Races in Hungary," NAR, LXX [January 1850], 78-136).

[37]DAB, II, 504.

[38]"Paul de Kock's Novels," NAR, LVI (April 1843), 285.

[39]"Nine New Poets," NAR, LXIV (April 1847), 402-434.

[40]The fullest account of Whipple's critical method and reputation is Denham Sutcliffe's article, "Our Young American Macaulay," New England Quarterly, XIX (March 1946), 3-18.

[41]"Talfourd's Miscellaneous Writing," NAR, LVII (October 1843), 333-352. Whipple's literary essays for American magazines in the 1840's were published in two volumes in 1850 under the title Essays and Reviews.

[42]"Griswold's Poets and Poetry of America," NAR, LVIII (January 1844), 1-39.

[43]"Wordsworth's Poetical Works," NAR, LIX (October 1844), 352-384.

[44]"English Poets of the Nineteenth Century," reprinted in Essays and Reviews, I, 300.

[45]"Wordsworth's Poetical Works," NAR, LIX (October 1844), 358.

[46]"Characteristics of Lord Byron," NAR, LX (January 1845), 86.

[47]"Thomas Carlyle as a Politician," Essays and Reviews, II, 389.

[48]"Nathaniel Hawthorne," Atlantic Monthly, V (May 1860), 616. Hawthorne approved of Whipple's article. He called it "really keen and profound" and declared, "I agree with almost all Whipple says." (quoted by Sutcliffe, p. 15).

[49]"Characteristics of Lord Byron," NAR, LX (January 1845), 86.

[50]"Mr. Whipple may now fairly be called the most popular essayist in this country," declared Bowen in his laudatory review of Whipple's Lectures on Literature and Life (NAR, LXX [January 1850], 153).

[51]"Emerson's Representative Men," NAR, LXX (April 1850), 520-524.

[52]"Lowell's Poems," NAR, LVIII (April 1844), 283-299.

[53]"The Writings of Miss Bremer," NAR, LVIII (April 1844), 480-508.

[54]Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Old Cambridge (New York, 1899), p. 53.

[55]"Nationality in Literature," NAR, LXIX (July 1849), 196-215.

[56]"The New Timon," NAR, LXIV (April 1847), 460-483.

[57]"Hawthorne's Scarlet Letter," NAR, LXXI (July 1850), 135-148.

[58]Hugh W. Hetherington, "Early Reviews of Moby-Dick," in Moby-Dick Centennial Essays, ed. Tyrus Hillway and Luther S. Mansfield (Dallas, 1953), p. 113.

[59]The only mention of Thoreau in the North American during Bowen's editorship is Felton's observation, in a review of Herbert's Translations from Aeschylus (NAR, LXIX /October 1849/, 407-421), that Thoreau, who had translated Prometheus Fettered for the Dial, is "a scholar of talent, but of such pertinacious oddity in literary matters that his writings will never probably do him any justice" (p. 414).

[60]Francis G. Peabody, Reminiscences of Present-Day Saints (Boston, 1927), p. 29.

[61]Francis G. Peabody, p. 37.

[62]"Nathaniel Hawthorne," NAR, LXXVI (January 1853), 227-248.

[63]"Thoreau's Walden," NAR, LXXIX (October 1854), 536.

[64]"Recent Books on England," NAR, LXXXIII (October 1856), 503-521.

[65]"Whitman's Leaves of Grass," NAR, LXXXII (January 1856), 275-277.

[66]Edward E. Hale, Jr., The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale (Boston, 1917), I, 123.

[67]Recorded by Emerson in his Journal for April 1856 (Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1820-1876, ed. Edward W. Emerson and Waldo E. Forbes /Boston and New York, 1909-1914/, IX, 33).

68"American Literature," NAR, LXXXII (April 1856), 319-349.

69Robert Streeter points out in his dissertation ("Critical Ideas in the North American Review, 1815-1865," p. 287) that Hegel's aesthetic doctrine was the one most favored in the North American Review. None of the other critics applied it as extensively as Everett did, however.

70"Elizabeth Barrett Browning," NAR, LXXXV (October 1857), 437-438.

71"Madame Ossolis' At Home and Abroad," NAR, LXXXIII (July 1856), 261-264.

72"Lewes' Life and Works of Goethe," NAR, LXXXII (April 1856), 564-568.

73"Recent English Poetry," NAR, LXXVII (July 1853), 1-30.

74"Genius and Writings of Victor Hugo," NAR, LXXXI (October 1855), 324-346.

75"Edgar Allan Poe," NAR, LXXXIII (October 1856), 427-455. I could locate no biographical data on Mrs. Smith. A modern Poe scholar, Sidney P. Moss, thinks the name is a pseudonym (Poe's Literary Battles /Durham, North Carolina, 1963/, p. 127n), but this is doubtful. Cushing credits one other article to the same Mrs. Smith, and Mott points out (History, II, 243) that a number of the writers for the North American in the 1850's are now unknown.

76"Carlyle's Life of Frederick the Great," NAR, LXXXVIII (April 1859), 503-547.

77"Hawthorne's Marble Faun," NAR, XC (April 1860), 557-558.

List of Works Consulted

Adams, Herbert B. The Life and Writings of Jared Sparks. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1893.

Carlyle, Thomas. Sartor Resartus, ed. Charles F. Harrold. New York, 1937.

Clark, Harry Hayden. "Literary Criticism in the North American Review, 1815-1835," Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, XXXII (1940), 299-350.

Cohen, B. Bernard. "Edward Everett and Hawthorne's Removal from the Salem Custom House." AL, XXVII (1955), 245-249.

Cushing, William. Index to the North American Review, 1815-1877. Cambridge, 1878.

DeMille, George E. Literary Criticism in America. New York, 1931.

Dictionary of American Biography. 20 vols. New York, 1928-1936.

Ekirch, Arthur Alphonse. The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860. New York, 1944.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1820-1876, ed. Edward Waldo Emerson and Waldo Emerson Forbes. 10 vols. Boston and New York, 1909-1914.

Everett, Alexander Hill. Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, ed. E. E. Hale. 2 vols. Boston, 1845-1846.

Felton, Cornelius Conway. "Emerson's Essays," Christian Examiner, XXX (May 1841), 253-262.

Frothingham, Nathaniel L. "Sartor Resartus," Christian Examiner, XXI (September 1836), 74-84.

Frothingham, Paul R. Edward Everett. Boston, 1925.

Hale, Edward Everett. James Russell Lowell and His Friends. Boston, 1899.

Hale, Edward E., Jr. The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale. 2 vols. Boston, 1917.

Hall, Thomas C. The Religious Background of American Culture. New York, 1930.

Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. Old Cambridge. New York, 1899.

Hillway, Tyrus and Luther S. Mansfield, eds. Moby-Dick Centennial Essays. Dallas, 1953.

Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957. Washington, 1960. (Compiled by the U. S. Bureau of the Census)

Howard, Leon. Victorian Knight Errant: The Early Literary Career of James Russell Lowell. Berkeley, 1952.

Long, Orie W. Literary Pioneers. Cambridge, 1955.

Longfellow, Samuel, ed. Life of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. 2 vols. Boston, 1886.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. The Great Chain of Being. Cambridge, 1957.

Miller, Perry. The Raven and the Whale. New York, 1956.

Moss, Sidney P. Poe's Literary Battles. Durham, North Carolina, 1963.

Mott, Frank Luther. Golden Multitudes. New York, 1947.

_____. A History of American Magazines. Vols. I and II. Cambridge, 1938.

North American Review. Vols. 1-97. 1815-1863.

Norton, Charles Eliot, ed. Correspondence Between Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1834-1872. 2 vols. Boston, 1883.

Parrington, Vernon Louis. Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920. 3 vols. New York, 1927.

Peabody, Francis G. Reminiscences of Present-Day Saints. Boston, 1927.

Peckham, Morse. "Toward a Theory of Romanticism," PMLA, LXVI (March 1951), 5-23.

Poole, William F. Index to Periodical Literature, 1802-1881. 2 vols. Boston, 1891.

Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. The Age of Jackson. Boston, 1946.

Stafford, John. Literary Criticism of Young America. Berkeley, 1952.

Streeter, Robert E. "Association Psychology and Literary Nationalism in the North American Review," AL, XVII (1945), 243-254.

_____. "Critical Ideas in the North American Review, 1815-1865." Northwestern University, 1943. (Unpublished dissertation)

Sutcliffe, Denham. "'Our Young American Macaulay,' Edwin Percy Whipple, 1819-1886." NEQ, XIX (March 1946), 3-18.

Tassin, Algernon. The Magazine in America. New York, 1916.

Ticknor, George. Life of William Hickling Prescott. Boston, 1864.

Vogel, Stanley M. German Literary Influences on the American Transcendentalists. New Haven, 1955.

Whipple, Edwin P. Essays and Reviews. 2 vols. Boston, 1850.

_____. "Nathaniel Hawthorne," Atlantic Monthly, V (May 1860), 614-622.

Wish, Harvey. Society and Thought in Early America. New York, 1950.

Wright, Carroll D. The Industrial Revolution in the United States. New York, 1897.

Vita

James Andrew Rhody, the son of Kenneth C. and Rose M. (Zern) Rhody, was born in Patton, Pennsylvania on September 16, 1932. He attended the Patton public schools, and in 1950 he graduated from Patton High School. In 1955, after serving two years in the army, he enrolled in Saint Francis College at Loretto, Pennsylvania, from which institution he received a bachelor of arts degree, with a major in English, in 1959. In September 1959 he became a graduate assistant in English at Lehigh University, and as such he taught freshman composition and took graduate courses in English until May 1961. In September 1961 he became an instructor in English at the State University of New York at Brockport, and he has maintained that rank and position to the present (May 1965).