CHAPTER XX

The Study of Literature in the Graduate School

For at least a generation, now, Americans of literary interests have felt ill at ease either within or without our universities. Young men have gone to graduate school in search of a doctorate, generally in English, with the hope of receiving a serious literary education. Some have dropped out; others have become bitter but resigned; others have complied but been distracted from their proper direction and only belatedly have sought to give themselves that literary discipline they had missed.

What is the matter with our "higher study" of literature? Are we offered no wider choice than between the "historical method" (not the same as literary history) and dilettantism? Is the situation peculiarly American?

There is an obvious gain in perspective if, before addressing ourselves specifically and practically to the familiar local situation, we review briefly the comparable situations, between the two World Wars, in England, France, Germany, and Russia.[1]

In England, the mass-production of Ph.D.'s is not a danger, for the universities are still comparatively few, and manage with small staffs.[2] Mere antiquarianism, however, is flourishing. An influential professor has been heard to say that the future of literary scholarship is in "bibliography," i.e., the type of textual criticism cultivated by W. W. Greg and Dover Wilson. But far more influential and prominent is a "genteel" tradition which approves the writing of irresponsible, whimsical, impressionistic essays. In leading positions there are still men contemptuous of all theory and system, of everything modern and contemporary, men best exemplified perhaps by the late President of Magdalen, Dr. George Gordon. Though the education of a student of English in the British universities may be more literary than in most American universities, one cannot say that it gives critical training, not to speak of anything like a systematic theory. In Eng-

land, little academic publication avoids the extremes of pure antiquarianism on the one hand and pure literary essay-writing on the other. There are, to be sure, some precursors of change, men like Geoffrey Tillotson, a student of the history of English poetry, who, though his theory be far too relativistic, is genuinely occupied with poetics, or F. R. Leavis, editor of *Scrutiny*, who, as leader of a critical group, has fought vigorously against academic gentility, or Leavis' able associate, L. C. Knights. The British universities have the considerable advantage of drawing on students who come from cultivated families, and who have received sound training in the classical languages. But the suspicion of theory and the prevailing gentility combine to preclude a high standard of critical scholarship. A reform is overdue.

At the end of the nineteenth century, Germany was the center and norm of exact research and "scientific method." [3] Between the two wars, reaction went to amazing lengths: from facts and facts alone, one is tempted to say, the Germans swung to fancies, speculations, and dogma. The Germans it was who reacted against what American humanists are still likely to think of as "German scholarship." Among them there were, of course, temperate, distinguished thinkers, like Dilthey and Unger, who defined problems of method and clarified epistemological issues. But, especially in its later developments, German literary scholarship has produced grandiose theories and pretentious verbalisms which neither arise from nor apply themselves to concrete works of art. Even before the Nazis, German theorizers concentrated on the German "*Geist*" and its permutations. The chief writers have scarcely been critically analyzed, save perhaps in terms of their political thought; and, indeed, outside of nationalistic and racialist criteria (sometimes disguised, like "organicity"), German literary scholarship is highly relativistic. Studies in "comparative literature," in some respects active, are dominated by the same reference to the norms of German *Kultur* and German *Geist*. Though the Nazi rule has passed, those twelve years must have left their deep impress even on men not technically identified with the "movement." Its racial theory, its pathological sense of superiority to the rest of the world, and its centrally political outlook have pervaded German literary

scholarship, necessitating its present reconstruction almost from the bottom.

In France, the tradition of critical scholarship has been very strong; and French literary scholarship, on the whole, has been in less danger of losing the sense of its true vocation than has literary scholarship elsewhere. But in France there has been a tendency toward mass-production. The enormous *thèse* has encouraged sheer wordiness, rhetoric, or the indiscriminate display of materials; and, when the work is devoted to a foreign author, it has included word-for-word translations. After the first World War, it would appear that France wanted to vie with German organized scholarship: one thinks of the elaborate and overelaborate editions of French classics like Rabelais or the "integral" literary history of Daniel Mornet, who advocates the study of minor and even "minimal" authors.[4] Hence a critic like Valéry Larbaud proposes that scholars be forbidden to write books and be limited to printing of their treasured *fiches*, their "notes and queries." [5] The French have produced little systematic literary theory and have, on the whole, avoided methodological discussion. In part, however, these very lacks testify not only to distaste for Teutonic extremes but to the general soundness of the French tradition. The French universities can still take for granted a certain humanistic training imparted by the *lycées*—a training which, though rather limited in scope and taste, includes grammar, rhetoric, and explication of texts. But in France, as elsewhere, the disjunction between scholarship and criticism widens.

In Russia, just after the first World War, the Formalists, originally a group of linguists, did much to clarify the methodology of literary study and produced some excellent analyses of poetry and prose.[6] Their resolution to study literature as literature was admirable; but it is impossible to endorse their avoidance of the critical problem. Through their stress on evolution, on "historical poetics," they arrived at a new relativism, according to which works of literature are to be judged solely by how far they modify existing poetic convention, succeed in changing the course of literature.

Now, Formalism as a movement has been suppressed. Most of its proponents have shifted their writing to historical novels and biographies. Literary scholarship is officially dominated by

the Marxist view. It is, however, possible—witness the new Soviet Academy Histories of Russian, French, English and American Literature—to combine professions of Marxist faith (attested by frequent citations of Marx and Lenin) not only with conventional historical scholarship but also with observations formalistic in origins and methods. On the whole, Soviet literary scholarship is less purely antiquarian than its American equivalent, as it is also far less theoretical and cloudy than the German; but it suffers from its narrow conception of social utility and is not centrally or primarily "literary."

One cannot yet anticipate the way in which European literary scholarship will be reconstituted. But it seems probable that, in any case, leadership has passed to the United States. Here the material bases have been unimpaired; here it has been possible to assemble European scholars of methodological and speculative concerns as well as learning; and here there is a native, independent critical movement beginning to make itself academically felt. Here there is a chance—though one which we can miss or misuse—to reconstitute literary scholarship on more critical lines: to give merely antiquarian learning its proper subsidiary position, to break down nationalistic and linguistic provincialisms, to bring scholarship into active relations with contemporary literature, to give scholarship theoretical and critical awareness.

The present status of American scholarship in literature has been frequently and often unfavorably characterized.[7] The common objections rehearse the triviality, futility, remoteness from life and literature of much academic publication; the chiefly quantitative standards; the exaltation of the hitherto unknown and unpublished, whatever its intrinsic worth; the complacent pleasure in mere factual accuracy. Academics are, of course, inclined to dismiss such strictures as either perfectionist or hostile—made by those *extra muros*. They defend current production variously, sometimes on the conviction that any kind of industry is preferable to undisguised laziness, or to merely polite pursuits like gardening, golf playing, cocktails, and *The New Yorker*. They can maintain—and frequently with some truth—that what appears trivial to the layman may, to the contextually aware specialist, seem significant. They may assert that the fear of erudite accumulations ("masses of knowledge") is excessive—or vain.

Such defenses, we think, avoid the real issue. The crisis of the profession is not due to scholarship or to such unavoidable technicalities of a profession as invite the ridicule of the outsider. Rather, we have to do with a special situation, that of the literary scholar; and we believe it remediable from within the profession.

There are, indubitably, some hopeful signs. Within the last twenty-five years, those who feel the need of reform have grown to be a vocal minority. At Chicago, the whole graduate program has been boldly reoriented from the historical to the critical; at Iowa, under Norman Foerster, the School of Letters developed a comprehensive and flexible critical doctorate; almost everywhere there have been some changes in an analogous direction. These new interests at the universities find expression and stimulation in the new groups which have, at the Modern Language Association conventions, been organized as "Special Topics." Now, as critical alternative to the organization by historical periods, we have sections studying Poetics and General Aesthetics, Literature and Society, Literature and the Fine Arts. The same felt need for the articulation of theory and method prompted the establishment of the English Institute, which has already held six annual meetings.

In the world of professional magazines, similar changes are observable. The "learned journals," including the *PMLA*, have increasingly admitted articles (theory, literary criticism, studies of contemporary writers like Joyce, Proust, and T. S. Eliot) which, before, would either have been rejected or never received. Some recently established journals, notably the *Journal of the History of Ideas* and the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, have set new standards of intellectual precision and stylistic care. But our magazines of "literary scholarship" include also, and centrally, the critical or critical and creative quarterlies—the late *Criterion* and *Southern Review*, the current *Scrutiny*, *Sewanee Review*, *Kenyon Review*, *Partisan Review*, and *Accent*.

Of the obvious forces which work for the preservation of the existing order, the chief is undoubtedly inertia. Others are of an institutional nature. American universities have become enormous enterprises requiring huge staffs of English and Modern Language teachers. The necessary classification and grading of such teachers can most easily be done by giving them a stand-

ardized education with standardized degrees, and by measuring their subsequent achievement in terms of pages contributed to "learned journals"; and it is manifestly difficult to replace this system by something less mechanical.

Further, the overexpansion of the university has led to a corresponding overproduction of teachers of English. Like history, literature is too often taught by men without specific vocation, by those who might as well have become businessmen, lawyers, or preachers. The teacher of literature should himself be a literary man, as professors of philosophy are, still, expected to be philosophers, not merely historians of philosophy. Whether a practicing poet or novelist or a critic or theorist, he should be a man who has experienced, and who values, literature as an art. In the traditional sense, he should be an "apologist" for literature. Currently, other disciplines—e.g., sociology, psychiatry—press their claims, extend the application of their principles. The professor of literature must be conversant with the relations between literary theory, philosophy, psychology. He must be able to give some reasoned account, to representatives of other disciplines, of the nature and value of literature. The eminent French critic, Albert Thibaudet, has suggested that, just as there are chairs of philosophy, so there should be chairs of "literature," for inquiries which belong to the general theory of literature. The suggestion is good. But we Americans should do more: we should seek to make our professors of English into professors of Literature.

The reply from the "old guard" will of course be that no individual can be an "authority" on English literature, let alone on "literature." Distinction in literary scholarship is possible only through sharp limitation of the data—in effect, a limitation in time and space (one period, one nation, one author). The standard English departments must still have an accredited specialist in Chaucer, in Shakespeare, and in Milton, and for each period of fifty or a hundred years.

As the publications of scholarship increase, it becomes more and more difficult to be, without sacrifice of perspective, a technical Shakespeare scholar. E. E. Stoll is one of our few Shakespeareans who is also a man of letters. The most comprehensive

recent critic of Shakespeare, the late Granville-Barker, was a dramatist and dramatic producer, not a professor.

But prevailing conceptions of what constitutes distinction in a department we believe to be unsoundly narrow and superficial. Universities should appoint to their vacant chairs only men of general intellectual and literary distinction, the best they can find. There is no need to follow a Miltonist with a Miltonist. Nor is it necessary that Milton be taught by a Miltonist, i.e., someone who has published books and articles on Milton. It is the present presumption that a man teaches only after he has published a book or article on the author to whom the course is devoted. We might better argue, however, that he should teach the course only till he has published his book. After his view has been developed and committed to print, it is a waste of time to have it repeated and diluted in lectures.

A professor of literature should be able, with proper *ad hoc* preparation, to teach and to write on any author or period within his linguistic compass: W. P. Ker, H. J. C. Grierson, and Mario Praz are examples of such versatile distinction. Research of a "factual" sort is not necessary to the production of sound criticism. But, what the teacher-critic does need, of course, is the grasp his training in the methods of literary scholarship should give him—the ability to judge the general reliability of published research, the ability to analyze the assumptions and logic of other literary scholars, the ability to analyze a poem, novel, or play.

Instead of staffing a department in terms of "Shakespeare men" and "Wordsworth men," we should, better, invoke types of mind and method. Have we someone adept at exegesis and practical criticism? Have we a literary theorist? Have we a man of strong philosophical interests and training who can analyze the interrelations of literature and philosophy in the "history of ideas"? Have we a poet? Have we a teacher who has active social and political interests without ceasing to be a literary man? Have we a "Catholic intellectual"? Have we a man versed in modern psychology and psychiatry? Have we men who are adequately sympathetic representatives of the chief literary kinds—drama, the novel, poetry?

Unavoidably, if our departments alter their conceptions of

English professors, older men, within a given university and elsewhere, will complain that standards have been lowered or given up. All such laments, it is important to see, are not statements of fact but judgments of value. If, in 1930, Kittredge had retired and T. S. Eliot had been appointed in his stead, most Harvard Ph.D.'s would probably have said that Harvard standards had declined. They would obviously have changed. When our standards for professors grow more literary, we shall surrender some things once thought imperative while we shall also make new exactions.

To pass from appointment and promotion to their correlative and, in large measure, prerequisite—the training of future teachers of literature: we urge far-reaching reform in the training of candidates for the Ph.D.[8] In general, two ways are open. The first would involve a sharper distinction between the teacher and the scholar. Smaller and humbler institutions—perhaps most colleges—would abandon their present pretensions to "scholarly research." The doctorate—or at any rate the Ph.D.—would really represent what it has professed to represent. Its holders would be specialists with easy access to the largest libraries, who, freed from elementary teaching, would devote themselves to their own studies and the training of their successors.

The new "higher" Ph.D. would correspond rather to a French *docteur ès lettres* or the *Habilitation* of a German *Privatdozent*. In addition, there would be a "teaching" degree, frankly utilitarian, which would be focused on what would be useful in future college teaching, and might require courses in Education or possibly "practice teaching." Though it would meet some of the criticisms of the present situation, this solution would not be satisfactory, but, probably, even aggravate the divorce between learning and literature. The "high" Ph.D. would tend to become an even more technical and antiquarian degree; the teaching degree would tend to become purely vocational, illiberal.

The other and opposite way, which is also the democratic way, seems much the sounder. It would reform the Ph.D. in the direction of making its holder not a specialist in a period but a professional man of letters, a man who, in addition to English and American literature, knows literary theory, the modes of scholarship and criticism, who, without recourse to impressionism

and "appreciation," can analyze and discuss books with his classes. Such a program of graduate study could be inaugurated gradually. Feasible means present themselves.

In the linguistic requirements, radical change should be made. The usual perfunctory attainments in the medieval stages of modern languages and in Latin are, we think, of little direct value to the student of modern literatures. This is, of course, not to disparage really substantial attainments in the classical languages, nor to question the importance of Old French or Old Norse as well as Latin for the student specializing in medieval literature and civilizations. Nor, of course, do we doubt the value of a science of linguistics which has its own rationale and problems and should train scholars by its own methods. But the new type of Ph.D. would profit most, it seems to us, from a real conversance with one or two modern languages. The present examinations in French and German frequently test the candidates' ability to read some paper in *Englische Studien* or *Anglia* or some passage in Taine or Legouis-Cazamian—the ability, that is, to read academic or critical prose concerning English literature. The assumption, surely deplorable, is that French and German, for the man of letters as for the chemist or physicist, are tool subjects, vehicles of scientific communication.

At present our linguistic requirements are too easy, too uniform, and not adequately literary. Our student of literature should know French or German or Italian or even Spanish or Russian so well that he can read poetry and fiction in one or two of those tongues with literary understanding. If he knows Racine and Baudelaire, or Goethe and Rilke—which, of course, implies that he is able to study other French and German poets—his understanding of English poetry will be measurably increased (in terms not of "sources" and "influences" but of comparison and contrast) and he will come into direct relation with modern movements of literature, which neither can nor should be understood in terms of a single language. Thus it would be possible to lower those boundaries between national literatures which have obstructed the synoptic view of literary history, to approximate, at least, the ideal of "general literature."

Our present graduate curriculum offers two kinds of courses—

those in periods and those in great authors, both (in practice) illustrations of a loosely conceived literary history; and there is a tendency to think of compulsory courses in the chief periods and authors. Both the course theory of education and the exclusive rule of the "historical method" should be challenged. A graduate school exists to induct literarily serious students into an acquaintance with the aims and methods of literary study and to provide critical supervision of their reading and writing. Such a conception includes both "scholarship" and "criticism" (as Americans commonly use these terms) and refuses to distinguish in its methods of study between literature before the twentieth century and "contemporary literature."

For curricular requirements, we should plan "types" of courses. One would be a course in a period, which need not be restricted to a single literature: "The Age of Reason," or "The Romantic Movement" should survey at least France, Germany, England, and America. A course in a single author provides—should indeed necessitate—close reading and exegesis; but the authors thus selected need not be always the same, nor only the three or four masters, nor always authors from the remote past. There should be a genre course, which need not be so broad as "The English Novel" but should certainly not turn into a series of isolated analyses. There should be a course in literary theory. There should be a seminar studying specific approaches to literature—the biographical, the sociological, the ideological; studying the relations between literature and the fine arts, between literature and philosophy.

The doctoral thesis should be conceived of as flexibly as we conceive of professional literary distinction. As the most individual part of a man's professional training, it should give the reader—not merely the official departmental "reader"—a real sample of its author's intellectual quality. It should certainly not be assigned by the sponsoring professor as a subdivision of some topic upon which he is professionally engaged; it should, rather, be proposed by the candidate and ratified as suitable and intellectually profitable by the advisor. Length and documentation —or degree of documentation—should be flexible. Every topic has its own logic and its own length. Mere industry and endurance are not intellectual virtues; and the *fiches*—the three-by-five cards—should not, even though pasted together, constitute a book.

Should the thesis be printed, and if so, when and how? It, or some representative part of it, should be published rather soon after the awarding of the degree. It does not seem desirable that ten or fifteen years should go to a working over of the thesis, which may then become the author's sole publication. Apprenticeship should not be prolonged into middle age. If a man has no capacity for independent study and writing, he should not be spared that self-knowledge.

The success or failure of the doctoral candidate should depend much more evenly than is now the case on both thesis and general examination. The latter (both written and oral, and in time nearer to three days than to three hours) should be passed before active work on the thesis is begun. The general examination should be critical (i.e., exegetical and evaluative) as well as factual and historical. At some schools, it may be strategic to set separate papers, one historical and the other critical; but such a separation would be false were it taken to imply some real disjunction between history—literary history—and criticism. The final oral should either be abandoned or limited to a discussion of the thesis. As a general examination, it comes too late in the student's career. It is usually so badly planned that it tests only the knowledge of isolated bits of information.[9]

In some European universities, every candidate for the Ph.D., whether in Latin or in Chemistry, has to pass a two-hour oral examination in philosophy—the history of European philosophy and theory (psychology, logic, epistemology, perhaps). The intent is thoroughly sound. The learned specialist should also be a comprehensive, "educated man." And he should also know something concerning the "philosophy" of his own subject, see its place, historically and theoretically, in the whole structure of human knowledge, thought, and civilization. For literary men, this would, of course, mean aesthetics, with its subdivision, poetics. Sometimes (e.g., at Berlin under Dessoir and at Princeton under Bowman) all prospective Ph.D.'s have been required to attend a course of philosophical lectures especially addressed to them. A course would seem less useful, however, than individually guided reading upon which the candidate should be orally

examined by members of the philosophy department. What is needed, in any case, is not another ritual gesture toward the hypothetic unity of human knowledge but, at our highest level of education, some actual discipline for all in the unification of knowledge—in logic, epistemology, or semiotics. The shocking inability of one scholar to communicate, at any respectable level of abstraction, with another scholar; the inability of a specialist to state either to himself, or to a specialist in another discipline, the assumptions and sanctions of his researches: these are recognized symptoms of a culture's disruption. Though the world will not be put together again by semiotics or even philosophy, a modest degree of intellectual communication between scientists, social scientists, and humanists can do much to hold together what remains.

These recommendations for the reform of the English doctorate can be applied with slight modifications to the degree in the other modern literatures. Even Latin and Greek may be revitalized by reducing their stress on antiquarianism and the pursuit of microscopic philological learning. A student of French literature (or German or Spanish) would also profit from a sharp reduction in the requirements of medieval languages and linguistics and a strong stress on literary theory and criticism. He should elect as a second subject English literature, needed to help him understand and to teach his European literature. It is an anomalous situation that many teachers of French, German, and Spanish are almost totally ignorant of the literature in their own, or at least their students', native tongue. The combination of French and English, German and English, Spanish and English might be trusted to break down the cultural provincialism and even the cultural Francophilia, Germanophilia, or Hispanophilia of many of our teachers of French, German, and Spanish.[10]

Our proposals for reform may also suggest that there is the possibility of a revival, at least in the larger institutions, of Comparative Literature, which should become simply a Department of General or International Literature, or simply of Literature. The dangers of dilettantism, of mere sentimental expansionism, are here acute. Professionals in the established literatures have frequently felt that such studies offer an easy escape from the rigors of their linguistic, philological, and historical training. But there is nothing wrong in this if the escape from petty antiquarianism be compensated for by a rigorous training in literary theory and criticism. Proper safeguards against dilettantism can be introduced, among them, high initial language requirements. One literature should be the area of concentration; and within it almost as much could be demanded as from the student of the one literature. Why should it not be possible to combine the study of French and German or English and French? In the Romance Language departments, it is possible and even necessary to study French and Spanish or French and Italian or even all three major Romance literatures.

Departments of Comparative Literature should be also concerned to encourage studies in the classical tradition as continued in the modern literatures, a topic surely deserving of systematic cultivation. The Department of Comparative Literature could also easily become the special protector of studies in literary theory, studies which are not and cannot be confined to a single linguistic medium. A History of Criticism not concerned with, at least, Aristotle, the Italians of the Renaissance, and the French of the seventeenth century is hardly worthy of the name; yet it can be labeled English only if we extend the English Department to take all literature for its province. The Department of Comparative Literature may adopt as a special task the needed training of teachers prepared to direct the Great Books, Humanities, and Literature Core courses now given in many American institutions and now usually taught by teachers grossly unprepared for their task.[11] Thus the department may become the center for the reform which should, however, be carried out primarily within the departments of English and the other Modern Languages, the reform which, briefly, demands a Ph.D. in literature rather than in English, French, or German Philology.

It has been objected to such a program as ours that it asks for a reform of *homo Americanus*, that it ignores his preoccupation with the job, his ideal of efficiency, his belief in teaching anybody and everybody, his inborn positivism.[12] This objection we do not grant. While we all hope for a change in man, and in the American specifically, the scheme proposed is not Utopian nor does it contradict fundamental American traditions. It is the older, the

existing, program which is "unrealistic," since it lacks integration with contemporary life and literature, and does not prepare for the teaching in the college classroom which the literary doctor is to undertake.

We do not ask for reorientation according to some vague and tenuous idealism. If we reject some of the preconceptions of nineteenth-century scientism—its atomism, its excessive determinism, its skeptical relativism—we are thereby in agreement with well-nigh all of the physical and social sciences, for with them today, revolutionary concepts such as patterns, fields, and *Gestalt* have superseded the old concepts of atomism, and with them determinism is no longer a generally accepted dogma. A turn toward the study of theory and criticism is neither "idealistic" nor un-American.

The education of the recent past was conspicuous for its provincial reduction of all serious values to the scientific and its consequent reduction of the humanities to the status of pseudosciences or irresponsible eclecticisms. We need not longer maintain this nineteenth-century epistemology or accept the dismissal of the arts as no longer deserving of serious attention. But we professors of literature must not hope to persist in our old, easy ways, our personal compoundings of pedantry and dilettantism. Literary study within our universities—our teaching and our writing—must become purposively literary. It must turn away from the delightful details of "research" and direct itself toward the large, unsolved problems of literary history and literary theory. It must receive stimulation and direction from modern criticism and contemporary literature—from participation in literature as a living institution.

Notes

CHAPTER I

Literature and Literary Study

1. Advocated in Stephen Potter's *The Muse in Chains*, London, 1937.
2. Ferdinand Brunetière, *L'Évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature*, Paris, 1890; J. A. Symonds, *Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama*, London, 1884, and "On the Application of Evolutionary Principles to Art and Literature," *Essays Speculative and Suggestive*, London, 1890, Vol. I, pp. 42-84; John Matthew Manly, "Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species," *Modern Philology*, IV (1907), pp. 577-95.
3. I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, London, 1924, pp. 120, 251.
4. Wilhelm Dilthey, *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften*, Berlin, 1883.
5. Wilhelm Windelband, *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft*, Strassburg, 1894. Reprinted in *Präludien*, 4th ed., Tübingen, 1907, Vol. II, pp. 136-60.
6. Heinrich Rickert, *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, Tübingen, 1913; also *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft*, Tübingen, 1921.
7. A. D. Xénopol, *Les Principes fondamentaux de l'histoire*, Paris, 1894; second ed., under title *La Théorie de l'histoire*, Paris, 1908; Benedetto Croce, *History: Its Theory and Practice*, New York, 1921, and *History as the Story of Liberty*, New York, 1940.
8. Fuller discussions of these problems in Maurice Mandelbaum, *The Problem of Historical Knowledge*, New York, 1938; Raymond Aron, *La Philosophie critique de l'histoire*, Paris, 1938.
9. Louis Cazamian, *L'Évolution psychologique de la littérature en Angleterre*, Paris, 1920, and the second half of E. Legouis and L. Cazamian, *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, Paris, 1924 (English translation by H. D. Irvine and W. D. MacInnes, 2 vols., London, 1926-7).
10. *Cf.* W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., "The Structure of the 'Concrete Universal' in Literature," *PMLA*, LXII (1947), pp. 262-80 (reprinted

CHAPTER XX

The Study of Literature in the Graduate School

1. *Cf.* bibliography, Section II, 1.
2. *Cf.* bibliography, Section II, 2.
3. *Cf.* bibliography, Section II, 3.
4. *Cf.*, e.g., Daniel Mornet, "Comment étudier les écrivains ou les ouvrages de troisième ou quatrième ordre," *Romanic Review*, XXXVIII (1937), pp. 204-16.
5. *Cf.* bibliography, Section II, 3.
6. *Cf.* bibliography, Section II, 4.
7. *Cf.* bibliography, Section III.
8. *Cf.* bibliography, Section IV.
9. S. L. and L. C. Pressey and Elinor J. Barnes, "The Final Ordeal," *Journal of Higher Education*, III (1932), pp. 261-64.
10. For good comments on this situation, *cf.* Christian Gauss, "More Humane Letters," *PMLA*, LX (1945), pp. 1306-12; and Leo Spitzer, "Deutsche Literaturforschung in Amerika," *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht*, XXXVIII (1946), pp. 475-80.
11. *Cf.* detailed recommendations in Norman Foerster, "The Teacher of Great Literature," *Journal of General Education*, I (1947), pp. 107-13.
12. *Cf.* Leo Spitzer, "A New Program for the Teaching of Literary History," *American Journal of Philology*, LXIII (1942), pp. 308-19.

Bibliography

CHAPTER I

Literature and Literary Study

GENERAL DISCUSSIONS OF LITERARY THEORY AND METHODS OF LITERARY STUDY

Baldensperger, Fernand, *La Littérature: création, succès, durée*, Paris, 1913; new ed., Paris, 1919

Croce, Benedetto, *La Critica letteraria: Questioni teoriche*, Rome, 1894; reprinted in *Primi Saggi* (Second ed., Bari, 1927), pp. 77-199

Cysarz, Herbert, *Literaturgeschichte als Geisteswissenschaft*, Halle, 1926

Daiches, David, *A Study of Literature*, Ithaca, 1948

Dragomirescou, Michel, *La Science de la littérature*, 4 vols., Paris, 1928-9

Eckhoff, Lorentz, *Den Nye Litteraturforskning: Syntetisk Metode*, Oslo, 1930

Elster, Ernst, *Prinzipien der Literaturwissenschaft*, 2 vols., Halle, 1897 and 1911

Ermatinger, Emil (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Literaturwissenschaft*, Berlin, 1930

Foerster, Norman; McGalliard, John C.; Wellek, René; Warren, Austin; Schramm, Wilbur Lang, *Literary Scholarship: its Aims and Methods*, Chapel Hill, 1941

Greenlaw, Edwin, *The Province of Literary History*, Baltimore, 1931

Guérard, Albert L., *A Preface to World Literature*, New York, 1940

Hyman, Stanley Edgar, *The Armed Vision. A Study in the Methods of Modern Literary Criticism*, New York, 1948

Hytier, Jean, *Les Arts de littérature*, Paris, 1945

Kridl, Manfred, *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackiem*, Wilno, 1936

Lacombe, Paul, *Introduction à l'histoire littéraire*, Paris, 1898

Lanson, Gustave, "Histoire littéraire," *De la méthode dans les sciences*, Deuxième série (Paris, 1911), pp. 221-64

———, *Méthodes de l'histoire littéraire*, Paris, 1925

Morize, André, *Problems and Methods of Literary History*, Boston, 1922

Moulton, R. G., *The Modern Study of Literature*, Chicago, 1915

Oppel, Horst, *Die Literaturwissenschaft in der Gegenwart: Methodologie und Wissenschaftslehre*, Stuttgart, 1939