Occasions when R.S. Crane devotes a whole article to criticize individual literary works are not many. Swift's Gulliver's Travels, Fielding's Tom Jones, Jane Austen's Persuasion and Hemingway's two short stories, The Killers and The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber have been individually treated by him. We may also mention two other of his articles, "Notes on the Organization of Locke's Essays" and "Montesquieu and British Thought: Gibbon, Adam Smith, Burke", where Crane's chief concern is with some particular authors and their works. In all other books and essays Crane is the critic of critics. To express it in a different language, Crane, in most of his books and articles, is mainly concerned with some fundamental critical problems and he tries to suggest possible solutions to those problems. Scattered remarks on individual literary works are of course used in all these essays and books to illustrate his point and substantiate his views. But if we are to find Crane as a practising critic, if we want to judge his act of criticizing individual works in the light of his own critical theory we must turn our attention to those few articles in particular.

However, Crane's treatments of all these authors and
their works are not equally elaborate and complete. For, as we all know, Crane examines only the element of plot in Tom Jones, and in his article on Gulliver's Travels his chief concern is only with the fourth book of that novel. But in his treatment of the two other authors, Jane Austen and Hemingway, Crane is more comprehensive and complete. In my present chapter I shall try to examine Crane's observation on these four authors, and to show what Crane thinks about the function of a literary critic. I leave out of my account the two other articles ("Notes on the Organization of Locke's Essays" and "Montesquieu and British Thought: Gibbon, Adam Smith, Burke") because I have already considered them in a previous chapter.

I

Crane's essay "Houyhnhnms, Yahoos, and the History of ideas" may be divided into two parts. In the first part Crane sums up most of the available criticism of the fourth voyage of Gulliver's Travels, and criticizes one misapplication of the history of ideas in some of the 20th century critics' interpretation of this part of Gulliver's Travels. Crane's view on the proper method of criticizing a literary work becomes evident in what he says in this part of his essay. In the other part Crane's own interpretation about what Swift actually intended to do in the final travel of Gulliver has been recorded. Crane here seeks to establish how Swift in
the fourth voyage of *Gulliver's Travels* intended to disprove a popular tradition in the history of ideas.

It is needless to mention that the fourth voyage of *Gulliver's Travels* created a turmoil in the world of literary criticism, the source of which was nothing but Swift's peculiarly vexing presentation of the man-like Yahoos as the most filthy, degraded and 'unteachable of brutes', and his treatment of the horse-like Houyhnhnms as 'wholly governed by reason'. The charge of a whole-hearted misanthropy on the part of the author, which finds its expression through Gulliver, is no longer in vogue now. It has rather been widely accepted as Miss Kathleen M. Williams has pointed out, that the fourth voyage is the culmination of "Swift's lifelong attack on the pride of man, especially the pride which convinces him that he can live by the light of unaided reason". But even though the charge of misanthropy has been discarded on the ground that it was due only to a rash judgment of Swift's intention in the fourth voyage, a few other misconceptions are still in vogue. Crane in the opening part of his essay criticizes one such view of some of the 20th century critics, which intends to explain Swift's intention in the fourth voyage on the basis of a hypothesis drawn from the history of ideas.

The hypothesis which these critics have drawn is that Swift has designed the fourth voyage to represent the traditional and orthodox concept of human nature - the concept that there is an inseparable mixture of good and evil in man. They quite naturally tend to explain the two species of animals - the Houyhnhnms and the Yahoos - as allegorical abstractions of good and evil. Swift, they say, might have in view the two extreme opinions about human nature - one was the sentimental optimism of the Earl of Shaftesbury, a contemporary to Swift, and the other was the sheer pessimism of Hobbes and Mandeville, neither of which was a proper estimation of human nature. Swift intended to disprove these two extremist opinions and to uphold the orthodox view that man possesses a nature neither unmixedly good, nor totally bad but an amalgamation of the two. That is why we find him satirizing both the Yahoos and the Houyhnhnms.

Such an interpretation of Swift's intention in the fourth voyage may appear somewhat convincing at first sight, and the critics who exalt it have drawn arguments in favour of their hypothesis from what they find in the text, in Swift's religious belief and also in the general trends of the age. But Crane opposes to this line of interpretation on the ground that it violates the basic condition of hypothesis making. Crane admits it to be true that several possible hypotheses may be framed as primary tools of interpretation of a literary work. It is also true that some
positive evidences can be sought out in support of each of the hypotheses. But the critic's task is to find out and establish the correct one from a number of possible ones. And when there remains the scope of only one hypothesis, out of many, to be correct, mere positive evidences are not enough. The critic must try all possible hypotheses, not by accumulating arguments in favour of them but by pointing out the weaknesses, and endeavouring to discard them, if possible, one by one. Thus the most appropriate one, which cannot be discarded in this method, will emerge\(^2\). Only this process will enable the critic to establish his own hypothesis as fact.

But the hypothesis of the allegory of good and evil, Crane observes, when tested in this way can hardly establish itself as fact. The limitation of this popular method of criticism lies in its failure to see other possible interpretations which may also appear to suit the design of the fourth voyage. These critics took it for granted that this part of the travel was meant to reflect a conflict of the three fundamentally different ideas about man's nature - the orthodox classical christian dualism, the doctrine of the rationalists and benevolists, and that of the materialists

and cynics. And then, turning away their attention from all other possibilities, they have engaged themselves only to gather some confirmatory evidences, judiciously avoiding those which do not fit their hypothesis. What these critics have thus done is only a misapplication of the history of ideas in literary interpretation. Their method being faulty and incomplete, they have ultimately affirmed the false as true.

However, in the second part of his essay Crane has given his own interpretation of Swift's intention in the fourth book of *Gulliver's Travels*. Crane observes that the logicians of antiquity as well as of our own days have been attributing the gift of rationality on man alone in the animal world. In all the definitions of man which they have given from time to time the assumed superiority of man has always been emphasized. Swift, as Crane has tried to establish, designed the fourth voyage with those age-old definitions of man in his mind. As a satirist he desired to disprove what those definitions have emphasized and thus to give a tremendous shock to his readers' pride over the superiority of man. Swift's famous letters to Pope are there in support of Crane's hypothesis. Swift declared that he had "got materials towards a treatise proving the falsity of that definition animal rational", and that his chief aim was "to vex the world rather than divert it". This intention might direct
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Swift to reverse the animal world of Houyhnhnm-land and to attribute rationality to the horse-like Houyhnhnms and brutish behaviour to the man-like Yahoos. This reversal was perhaps the most effective means of vexing the world of intellectuals by giving a shock to their complacence of superiority.

Some historical evidences are also there in support of Crane's hypothesis. In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the old fashioned logical treatises were taught in the universities of England. The "Isagoge" of Porphyry was a popular one among them. Porphyry defined men with the help of some binary divisions, popularly known as Porphyrian tree. At the lowest branch of the tree Porphyry divided 'Animal Corporeal Feeling Substance' into 'Rational' and 'Irrational'. Man is the only rational creature; all others go under the other division. And Porphyry mentioned 'the horse' as a concrete example of the irrational variety. Swift, during his days at Trinity College, must have his acquaintance with Porphyry's treatise. His selection of the 'Houyhnhnms', and no other animal, as opposed to the man-like Yahoos was due to the influence of Porphyrian logic.

Crane has also mentioned an anonymous poem, "The Logician Refuted", in which the poet refused to accept the definition of man as 'animale rationale', and challenged the logicians to prove it, if they could. The publication of the poem, sometime after Gulliver's Travels is surely an evidence
of the fact that the matter haunted intellectuals of the time. It was then quite natural for Swift to take it up and to give it a fine satirical twist.

Crane has thus pointed out what tradition of the history of ideas was actually there in Swift's designing of the fourth voyage. His arguments are convincing enough. One may, however, say that Crane has not connected the earlier parts of the Travels with the final one. And unless Crane's hypothesis suits the whole design of the book we cannot accept it as fact. But we may, I think, easily have a meaningful explanation of the fourth book quite in tune with the earlier ones in Crane's way of thinking. In the first part of the Travels Swift's satire is directed against human pettiness, in the second part against physical grossness, and in the third it is against various institutions and glamorous programmes of man. These three books may be found to have been arranged in an ascending order of importance and seriousness. All these are meant to create the ground for the final shock in the last part.

II

In "The Concept of Plot and the Plot of Tom Jones" Crane speaks of a new approach to the concept of plot and examines, as a concrete example, the plot of Tom Jones. The new approach Crane speaks of is the formalistic approach.
As a formalist Crane gives superiority to 'form' over 'content'. In his concept 'form' is the synthesizing factor that gives 'power' and a particular combination to the 'content' or the material aspects of a literary work. It is, for him, the first principle of artistic construction, and should, therefore, be the first principle of a criticism of the textual properties of a work.

However, Crane examines briefly, before he expresses his own concept of a plot, the nature and critical adequacy of the conception of plot that underlies most of the observations of the critics of the past. And he finds that the definition of plot, as the past critics understood it, is an extremely limited one. In their concept plot is only one of the various elements of a novel such as character, thought and diction. It is, they considered, "the material continuity of the story considered in relation to the general pleasure we take in any fiction when our curiosity about the impending events is aroused, sustained, and then satisfied to a degree or in a manner we could not anticipate". Crane also observes that the greatness and goodness of a plot in this sense depend on the variety of incidents it includes, on how the story evokes suspense and surprise, and also on the success the novelist achieves in executing the resolution at the end as a natural outcome of the happenings at
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4 Crane, R.S., "The Concept of Plot and the Plot of Tom Jones" Critics and Criticism, ed. by R.S.Crane (The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p.64.
the beginning and at the middle of the novel. The inevitable result of such a narrow definition of plot is that a loose external relation between the plot and other aspects of a novel is only considered. And it is, Crane observes, due to such a narrow definition of plot that most of the critical estimates, say, of the plot of Tom Jones, have finally turned into some enthusiastic general appreciations.

Crane believes that such a restricted definition of plot can hardly do justice to the analysis of the plot of a novel. He, therefore, elaborates his own idea of the plot of a novel. In his concept "the plot of any novel or drama is the particular temporal synthesis effected by the writer of the elements of action, character and thought that constitute the matter of his invention". The elements of action, character, and thought are taken as causal ingredients, and the structure of a plot, as Crane believes, differs widely as the one or the other of these ingredients is employed as the synthesizing principle. We may thus have plots of action, plots of character, and plots of thought. Most of the classical plots generally are plots of action. This may be the reason, Crane rightly observes, why the elements of incidents receive so much importance in the traditional idea of a plot. Critics have actually reduced the concept of the plot to the single element of action, neglecting the two other equally important

5 Ibid., p.66.
aspects of character and thought. However, in Crane's concept all the three elements are synthesized in the plot of a novel or a drama. But these three elements constitute what Crane calls the material aspects of a plot, not the form of it. The formal aspect of a plot is the 'power' which every synthesis of the material aspects (action, character and thought) is necessarily endowed with to affect our emotions and opinions in a particular way. The series of actions, events and thoughts of a novel or a drama arouses in us, when we go through it, certain expectations about what is going to happen. In short, we become emotionally involved with whatever happens in the work, and we respond in the particular way in which the plot (or the 'power' of its form) affects us. What Crane suggests here is that the material aspects of action, character, and thought are designed in a particular way or given a definite artistic shape by means of the form of the plot. And the form of a plot is the final end of the artist - his original intention to affect our emotions and reasons or to make us respond in a particular way. All the outward and inward aspects of a novel or a drama are exploited to achieve this definite end. That is why Crane says that "the plot, considered formally, of any imitative work is, in relation to the work as a whole, not simply a means - a 'framework' or 'mere mechanism' - but rather the final end which everything in the work, if that is to be felt as a whole, must be made, directly or indirectly, to serve". Obviously then, the form of a plot.

6 Ibid., p.68.
in the particular sense in which Crane uses the term, must be the first principle of a critic to examine effectively any novel or drama he likes to, because unless and until he discovers the formal end of the plot which is the guiding principle of the work and to which all other aspects of the particular work must conform, he can hardly be expected to analyse anything successfully.

In this way Crane elaborates his idea of the plot of a novel or a drama. He then applies this idea to analyse the plot of *Tom Jones*. His is a formalistic analysis, and therefore, he seeks first to discover the particular form that gives unity to the plot of *Tom Jones*. And for the purpose of discovering this form (which is also the first principle of the artist) a critic must look beyond the material system of happenings that constitutes the external aspects of the plot, and must consider at least three important aspects. (i) One must consider the moral character of the hero that allows us to expect either for a good or a bad fortune for him at the end. (ii) One must also judge the nature of events which take place in the life of the hero, and in consequence of which we expect, whether temporarily or permanently, either a painful or a pleasurable result. (iii) A third important aspect is our idea of the hero's responsibility for whatever happens to him and whatever he does in the novel. Crane emphasizes these three aspects because he thinks that the form of a plot is "a function of the particular correlation among these three
variables which the completed work calculated to establish, consistently and progressively, in our minds". And after considering all these aspects in *Tom Jones* Crane discovers that the novel has a 'pervasively comic form'. He supports his idea about this form of the novel with concrete examples from what the text of the novel actually shows.

The happenings of the novel, Crane admits, generate enough suffering for the hero and the heroine of the novel, Tom and Sophia. We sometimes involve ourselves into the distresses of Tom and wish him to come out of his troubles. All these have a seemingly serious nature. But their sufferings never appear so serious as to arouse the tragic emotions of pity and fear. Crane's impression is that the comic form of the novel prevents the suffering of the hero and the heroine from becoming the dominant emotion in the complication of *Tom Jones*. It prevents even our indignation for the villain from becoming too acute. Fielding has, Crane observes, achieved an attenuation of the serious feelings of pity, fear and indignation - an attenuation which is a necessary condition for comic pleasure - chiefly by two things.

The first thing that Fielding does for this purpose is to endow with certain obvious comic traits those characters in the novel who threaten serious consequences for the hero and the heroine. Blifil is, of course, too selfish to strike

us as ridiculous. But some other characters like Allworthy, Lady Bellaston, Lord Fellamar and the Westerns obviously show some comic strain. And when, Crane observes, the agents of harm are ridiculous persons, we do not generally accept their power of causing harm as well as the matters that follow as a result of their workings so seriously as they appear. The second important thing is that the successive incidents of the novel, as they lead us to the climatic situations, on the one hand increases the suffering of Tom, but on the other hand they make an attentive reader aware of the fact that since nothing irreparable has taken place so far, no such incident is likely to happen in the life of the hero. Such an awareness also reduces the seriousness of actions.

These two things have given a sense of security to the comic pleasure of the novel. Crane has also showed, and convincingly, that the mistaken acts which Tom has committed excite our amusement. Thus the major incidents and characters have been exploited by the novelist for a comic effect. Of course the comic pleasure here is not an unmixed one. It is rather a mixed type of comedy in which all the previous semi-serious happenings end in the happy denouement with a pure rejoicing smile. This, Crane thinks, is the essential form of the novel.

So the primary task of a critic investigating into the novel is, in Crane's opinion, to find out the "extent to
which Fielding's handling of the constituent parts of the novel is calculated to sustain and maximize this special pleasure which is its form. Both the merits and demerits of the novel may thus be pointed out. Crane also analyses the novel in this particular way and finds that the novel is not, since no work of art is perhaps perfect, without its faults. We are, for example, not prepared to accept the sudden change in the character of Tom when he borrows money from Lady Bellaston at his very first meeting with her. Similarly the authorial intrusion is often without sufficient artistic justification.

But in spite of some such defects of the novel Crane's impression is that "there are not many novels of comparable length in which the various parts are conceived and developed with a shrewder eye to what is required for a maximum realization of the form." The first thing that Crane mentions in support of what he says is Fielding's skillful handling of the various incidents which directly arise out of Tom's mistakes. Crane shows that Fielding has followed more or less the same pattern for all of them, and the pattern he uses enhances the comic pleasure of the novel. Similarly Fielding's creation of the characters of the novel
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is quite in tune with the comic form of its plot. Crane also shows how Fielding has even made a full use of the various devices of the mode of narration to help the comic plot form of the novel.

Thus Crane mentions some of the things which must be considered in an analysis of the plot of Tom Jones, taken as the first principle of artistic construction. And he suggests that an adequate analysis of the plot of Tom Jones in this method will require an examination of how all the major and minor aspects of the novel — characters, dialogues, diction, images and symbols, and even the passages of extra-dramatic thought which define the moral quality of the world — function to hold our responses restricted to the comic form of the novel. Thus this mode of criticism enables us to expose how all the parts of a literary work contribute to achieve the formal end of the artist.

It is, however, a fact that every critical method has its characteristic limitations. Naturally, the formal approach to the plot of a novel, which Crane propounds, may also have some faults. But Crane's greatness lies in the fact that unlike most other critics he is not blind to the defects of his own theory. He is well aware of the limitations of this approach. He, therefore, clearly suggests that this method, even when it can adequately exhibit how the material parts of a work contribute to the achievement of the expected
effect, can hardly do justice to the analysis of how the various parts in a work develop themselves. Crane is also aware of the fact that this method is applicable more to evaluate the performance of a writer - his success or failure in constructing individual works of art - than to make a comparative judgment of the literary greatness and seriousness of a work. We will need a method other than the criticism of form to remark, for example, on the general qualities of intelligence and feeling, reflected in Tom Jones. Another characteristic fault of this method is that it isolates a work of art as a finished product from the rest of its species. Thus, the method can hardly provide us with a means to judge the place or the relative greatness of a literary work in the history of that type of writings. Crane clearly says that "we have obviously to go beyond formal criticism if we would assess Fielding's originality as a writer of comic romance, or account for that peculiarly eighteenth century flavour in Tom Jones which causes us to reflect that, unique and unrepresentative as Fielding's novel is when considered as a whole, it could yet have been written at no other time".10

However, this inadequacy of the formal criticism does not affect its positive qualities. What is actually required for the best result is that this method should be supplemented by some other criticisms - the criticism of quality and
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also some sorts of historical inquiries. But the theory must be valued as the only effective method that can adequately analyse, in terms of causes and effects rather than analogies, the values and characteristics of a literary work as an artistic construction with a special power to affect us in a particular way. Crane suggests one more point, though he does not elaborate it. His suggestion is that the investigation into the historical origins of a work, as well as the criticism of qualities become more specific and reliable when they are controlled by the criticism of form. There is surely sense in what Crane suggests here. Any criticism - whether historical or psychological - must be supported by what the literary text as the only concrete object bears testimony to. A criticism of form can almost faultlessly exhibit what the artist tries to achieve in a given work of art. Naturally, when all other criticisms are based on the criticism of form, they may give us more accurate information about their investigations. To add one more point, the idea of 'form' which Crane expresses here is expressed more elaborately toward the end of his book *The Languages of Criticism and the Structure of Poetry*. In that book Crane applies his idea of form in the analysis of the structure of poetry. It proves that Crane's idea of 'form' is basically the same. It is constituted as a theory applicable perhaps to all types of literary works of true artistic value.
III

Crane's consideration of Jane Austen's Persuasion, as has already been said, is more comprehensive and elaborate than that of either Swift or Fielding. The essential story of Persuasion, Crane observes, is the story of "a broken engagement finally restored, and with even deeper happiness for the heroine and hero, Anne Elliot and Captain Frederick Wentworth, than they had felt when the engagement was entered into eight years and a half before". The story is a simple one and Jane Austen has presented it simply by means of a large number of characters and a series of often disconnected events. Apparently, for a simple story that Jane Austen tells in Persuasion such a huge number of characters and events seem superfluous. Crane, therefore, frames his critical questions from this point. He tries to investigate what all the minor characters and series of events do in relation to the main story of the novel. He also tries to find out Jane Austen's artistic problems and their solutions from the artists' point of view.

Persuasion, as Crane understands it, is a love story of a different character. It is a love story indeed, and a simple one in the sense that there is hardly any external obstacle working as a bar to the delayed union of the lovers. It is more than an ordinary love story, primarily because a

love story of common character depends for its appeal and emotional strength chiefly on our general sympathy with young lovers. But Jane Austen has conceived her novel in a bit different way in order to evoke a different kind of response at the climax. In support of his belief Crane mentions the paragraph in which the narrator (Jane Austen) informs us how Anne and Wentworth exchanged their feelings and pleasures immediately after Charles had taken leave of them. Crane believes that the response of the readers at this point of the novel is more than mere sympathy with the lovers. We, the readers, share the 'rational' and 'rapturous' happiness of Anne and Wentworth. It is the happiness "not simply of lovers but of moral individualists" a happiness which can be achieved only by persons of superior minds and characters, and to which, consequently, when we are convinced that this is indeed the case, we tend to respond in a more complex way than to the merely 'sentimental' resolutions of ordinary love tales.

In order to evoke such a response Jane Austen had to mould her materials differently. Crane observes that she might begin her story at the very beginning when Anne and Wentworth were first engaged. She might even contrive her narrative in a way that we were allowed to enter into the
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thoughts of Wentworth also. But in either case she might not be able to arouse the desired response. That is why Austen follows neither of these forms. She makes Anne the centre of her narrative, and "except in the opening exposition and in a relatively few scattered passages later on we are given no more of the events and of the thoughts of the other characters than Anne herself can know through direct observation and listening to conversations or through not always correct inference from what she sees or hears". The narrative follows her wherever she goes.

This very design of the novel, Crane shows, necessitates the inclusion of a large number of characters and events. The ultimate union of Anne and Wentworth, as already mentioned, is something more than a union of two lovers - it is the union of two good minds, two moral individuals. That is why the happiness is greater than what might have been when they first met. But if readers are to share this feeling of greater happiness, they must be convinced of the moral and constant characters of the hero and the heroine. But the design of the novel is such that the hero and the heroine are not given the scope of a joint response until at the end. Naturally, the novelist had to expose their minds through their interactions with other characters and responses to various activities and events in their day-to-day lives. Hence, Austen

14 Ibid., p.289.
had to introduce a large number of minor characters and events. If they are removed, it would be wellnigh impossible to have the desired effect. In short, it is the form of the novel that determines the materials.

After examining the novelist's intention, and its relation to the design of the novel, Crane tries to judge the artistic problems of the novelist and the manner in which she solves them. The development of the plot of *Persuasion* is the development or changes in the mental world of Anne and Wentworth. So Jane Austen had to face the problem of invention and treatment in order to unfold the minds of the hero and the heroine and to make the reunion convincing. She had to invent such incidents, or 'occasions' as Crane calls them, which would successfully give expression to the gradual development of the plot, and at the same time had to give variety and probability to those incidents. Any conscious reader, who goes through the novel, must admit that Jane Austen has successfully solved these problems.

A number of critics have brought the charge against the novelist of *Persuasion* of using a series of coincidences which, according to them, hardly suit the practice of a good artist. Crane comes forward to vindicate Jane Austen's practice. Crane admits that Austen has taken help of coincidences to make possible the meeting between Anne and Wentworth. But the fact is that the artistic quality of the novel is not hampered even a bit by them. The force of the novel does
not allow us to consider them as coincidences. Even if we, for the sake of criticism, admit that they are coincidences, we must also admit that Jane Austen had no alternative before her. The mental conditions of the hero and the heroine are such that they cannot invite one another, and naturally their meeting is possible only by chances and coincidences.

Crane also observes that a novel like Persuasion depends for its success on the readers' whole-hearted attachment to the heroine, Anne, as an individual, because the more we feel for her the more we understand what happens. We gradually become eager to find her happy, and when we find that our expectation is fulfilled at last we enjoy boundless pleasure. So Jane Austen's problem was to build Anne's character in that way. And Crane shows that the novelist has followed three principal devices for the desired result.

First, Jane Austen handles quite skillfully Anne's unspoken thought in the narrator's discourse. In some short passages the narrator expresses the suppressed mental suffering of the heroine. These analytical passages are quite functional; they help to draw the readers' sympathy for Anne. Second, the novelist tries to invent such happenings and conversations that "define and vivify for us her (Anne's) positive traits of personality and character: her serious principles, her superior standards, her sound judgments of people, her ability to look at herself and others (including Wentworth) objectively". The more we know such good account, the more we understand what happens.

15 Ibid., p.296.
qualities of the heroine the more we become emotionally attached to her. A third main device followed by Austen is to juxtapose Anne with other characters of the novel, which also enable us to recognise her goodness as well as greatness. Anne feels her emotional proximity to the characters like Admiral and Mrs. Croft and the Hervilles, who impress us as pleasant, warm-hearted, self-reliant and unpretentious. This likeness of feeling and opinion makes Anne impressive to the readers. Thus Jane Austen solves the problem of building Anne's character.

In the creation of the character of Wentworth also Jane Austen has achieved enormous success. Crane considers Wentworth as one of the greatest heroes of Jane Austen. Austen had to make him superior in nature so that Anne finds some renewed attraction for him. And the novelist has established her hero's superiority in various artistic ways, without any direct comment. Various activities and incidents in the novel throw light on the goodness of Wentworth's character. Besides, when we contrast Wentworth with other characters like Walter Elliot, Charles Musgrove and Mrs. Elliot, we can easily discern his superiority. Again, Wentworth's closest friends are those whom Anne regards to be the warm-hearted and ideal people. It is also another proof of Wentworth's warm-heartedness and sincerity. Thus the problem of building the character of Wentworth is also solved.

It is in this way that Crane criticizes the novel. There
is no conflict between theory and practice in Crane; he follows what he says. He examines and explains the textual and artistic problems without imposing any dogmatic principle. His criticism is, again, positive in nature. Unlike most other critics who burden their criticisms with what the artist has failed to achieve, Crane shows us convincingly what Jane Austen as an artist has achieved and how. His observations are thus more helpful for a better understanding of the text.

Crane's essay on *Persuasion* is also interesting for the reason that here he emerges as a moral critic. Apart from the consideration of the plot structure and the principles evolved from within, Crane spent a good deal of energy in highlighting the moral thrust of the novel by pointing out, time and again, the moral quality of the love between Anne and Wentworth. The union after the restoration of the relationship is qualitatively better than the possible union in the beginning of their relationship, because both the characters have known each other better during the intervening period and each appreciates the moral qualities of the other. By the end of the novel, Crane suggests, their love is touched by mutual admiration in addition to attraction which they felt at the outset for each other.

IV

Crane has written two articles on two different stories
of Hemingway. It is interesting to note that both the articles are in the form of letters written as responses to the observations of a friend and an ex-student. In his article on "The Killers" Crane concentrates his attention on the "technical question of how the characters, actions, and speeches of the boys in the lunch room are related to the situation involving the Killers and Ole Andreson". With regard to this consideration Crane divides the characters of "The Killers" into two groups - one belonging to the 'subject' of the story and the other to the 'treatment'. His distinction between 'subject' and 'treatment', Crane admits, is in the sense of what Henry James in his preface to The Portrait of a Lady says about that distinction. The subject proper of "The Killers" is comprised of just three characters - Ole Andreson and the two killers, Al and Max. All the remaining characters, according to Crane, are related to the subject only indirectly. They belong intimately to the 'treatment' because they are used as "devices of disclosure and commentary which enable Hemingway to bring his essential 'subject' before us with a maximum of concentration and dramatic liveliness and a minimum of ambiguity as to its desired emotional effect". Crane tries to prove this point with sufficient examples and illustrations from the text.
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Firstly, the essence of the story is constituted of the fact that the killers, Al and Max, are bent on murdering Ole, and they are going to succeed simply because Ole, in spite of being aware of it, decides to do nothing to escape. The happenings in the lunch room and the activities of Nick and his friends by no means affect or change this essence of the story and its expected development.

Secondly, the peculiar moral and emotional response arising out of the action of the story is, Crane suggests, due to the horrifying quality of the killers and also to Ole's passive submission to his fate. Our emotional response to the story is what George and Nick, respectively, say: "It's a hell of a thing", and "It's an awful thing".

The boys in the lunch room have no contribution in creating that response; their activities only clarify for the readers the desired response. The artist, Crane suggests, could invent any other situation as well to give expression to his essential subject and to create the same emotional response. In support of his idea Crane mentions Hemingway's deliberate vagueness about Ole's offence. Al and Max, we are informed in the text, are going to kill Ole only to oblige a friend. And Ole informs us that he has got in wrong. But the exact nature of his offence is kept secret. This is, Crane says, part of Hemingway's design to "shift the main emphasis

---

of the story away from causes and antecedents to the final situation resulting from these ... the horrifying quality of the two killers and their completely impersonal relation to Old, and the even more 'awful' quality of Ole's passive acquiescence in his fate" 19.

In this way Crane shows that the boys in the lunch room have almost nothing to do either as constituents of action or as agents to produce the ultimate effect. But at the same time Crane admits that their artistic function in the story is enormous. He divides the story into four scenes and shows how George, Nick and Sam are made to function in the action of the story. In the first scene the two killers are the centre of attention, but here Hemingway has utilized George to the full for the purpose of giving us all the necessary information. The second brief scene is the preparatory part of our meeting Ole Andresen. Here Nick's willingness to go to Ole as a messenger makes a smooth development of the plot possible. It does not, however, change or modify the plot.

The third scene is again like the first one a scene of disclosure, and Nick's role here is almost the same as the role of George in the first scene. Nick's message had nothing new for Ole, and neither Nick nor his message brings about any change in the imminent action of the story. The final scene, by means of the reactions of George and Nick, suggests the

possible reaction of the readers. The function they serve here is more or less the function of a chorus. Thus Crane shows that the second group of characters is part of Hemingway's artistic treatment.

Crane also opposes the view of Brooks and Warren, who consider Nick Adams to be the central character of the story. The story, according to them, is the development of Nick from adolescence to manhood by means of the shocking experiences he passes through. Crane rejects this theory on two grounds. His first point is that there is no development from adolescence to manhood in the character of Nick. He simply passes from ignorance to knowledge. Crane's second objection is that the character of Nick impresses us by no means as the central character of the story. The attention of the readers is never centralized on him. So, Crane's impression is that the story is most meaningfully illustrated when we think of the boys in the lunch room as 'utility' characters. "Each boy", Crane observes, "has his own special job to do in disclosing to us Hemingway's 'subject' in its two essential aspects: George to help us understand and feel the killers, Nick to give us Ole" 20. This observation of Crane is so logical and closely related to the textual properties of the story that we can hardly think of an alternative explanation.

Crane's essay on "The Killers" is particularly interesting because Crane starts with a basic premise laid down by

20 Ibid., p.313.
the master of modern fiction, Henry James. Placing the story neatly within the framework laid down by James, Crane proceeds to examine "The Killers" in terms of Aristotelian notion of plot. This is quite justified because "The Killers", though a short story, is full of dramatic elements. The entire story is constituted of a string of conversations connected by a very thin ribbon of commentary. Secondly, the story is dominated by action, ending with a definite suggestion of Ole's imminent death.

As a formalist Crane has taken into account 'the emotional form of the story and shows how the vagueness of Ole's offence contributes to the richness of the story.

Crane's analysis of the story shows his remarkable ability to handle short story - a genre not known to Aristotle - in Aristotelian terms. The essay seems to suggest that any creative, cognitive discourse is amenable to analysis by Aristotelian criteria. The study is highly original, very profound and full of critical insights.

In the essay on "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" also Crane applies the Aristotelian canons in order to ascertain the nature of Macomber's tragedy. In order to do this he discusses in detail the essential nature of an Aristotelian tragedy arising out of (i) the formal cause, (ii) the material cause and (iii) the efficient cause. In the process he also takes up the Aristotelian notion of
Catharsis. Crane makes a fine anatomy of the story in great detail and depth, and shows how the story fails to fulfil the Aristotelian criteria of tragedy. Crane, however, does not impose anything on the story from outside (ab extra), but elicits the information from inside (ab intra) to show how the plot is developed. A true Aristotelian he starts with an analysis of the (desired) effect on the readers and retrospectively identifies the factors that contribute to this effect.

Crane shows that the plot form of "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" is different from the plot of a tragedy as defined by Aristotle. A tragic plot, roughly speaking, requires the change of fortune from good to bad, and the ultimate effect of such a plot is a Catharsis of pity and fear. But in this story, Crane rightly says, "the change upon which the effect depends is not a change of fortune from good to bad but of character from bad to good". For, Macomber starts in his lowest condition (in the lion hunting) and proceeds to his greatest achievement before death. He has risen from the depth of unhappiness. His course of action and death, unlike that of a tragic hero, is not caused by 'hamartia'. The only similarity of the story with a tragedy in Aristotelian sense is that it involves the issues of life and death. But even then "they are involved in such a way

that we do not experience fear for Macomber as he proceeds to assert his new-found courage or pity for him when he falls"\(^22\). Naturally, the position of an Aristotelian tragic hero can hardly be claimed for Macomber.

Crane shows that Macomber-like characters (Cuckolds in subjection to their wives) have a long literary tradition. At first they were mere comic butts. But in the twentieth century such characters are often found as protagonists in serious plots. They are found to act unexpectedly and to create thus an impression of nobility. Crane believes that Hemingway in this story has done the same thing.

However, in respect of its construction Crane does not consider this story as one of the best stories of Hemingway. He observes that the plot of this story, unlike the plots of some of the best short stories, is too obvious. Macomber starts as an abject coward. He appears as a slave to Margot. Naturally, the only expected development of his character is to get over his fear as well as to make himself free from his wife's subjection. Crane also finds that Hemingway has taken resort to some easier devices in presenting his story. The opening part of the story, he says, arouses the expectation of "an objective and dramatic rendering of events in the manner, for instance, of 'The Killers'"\(^23\). But gradually the

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p.319.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., p.324.
author changes his device and Wilson is found to act as an observer-chorus. And towards the end of the story Hemingway takes help of direct statements of thought and feeling for both Macomber and Margot.

All of us, I think, will agree with Crane that Macomber is not a tragic hero in the Aristotelian sense. We may also agree with him in respect of what he says about the construction of the story, but it is difficult to agree with him that Margot deliberately killed Macomber out of hatred. A close reading of the concluding section of the story would lead us to different conclusion. In the beginning of the story Margot has definite hatred for Macomber. In fact, she even spites him by kissing Wilson in his presence. Before the buffalo hunt Wilson and Margot gravitate towards each other, although it is made abundantly clear that Wilson is a strong man and Margot goes to him mainly because she cannot stand her husband's cowardice. The buffalo hunt turns the whole situation upside down. For the first time Margot sees how Macomber can rise above his cowardice, behave courageously and face a charging buffalo. It is only then that sitting alone in the car Margot underwent a change and her ideas about her husband also changed. This is precisely the reason why at the last moment when she thinks that Macomber is about to be overpowered by the buffalo she tries to shoot it, but accidentally the bullet hits her husband and kills him. It is an accident. Otherwise she would not sit crying in the corner when Wilson
comes to congratulate her. ("Then he walked over to the motor
car where the woman sat crying in the corner. 'That was a
pretty thing to do', he said in a toneless voice. 'He would
have left you too'. 'Stop it', she said"24). The crying of
Margot, her resistance to Wilson, her inability to feel ela-
ted over her husband's death clearly indicate that she had
no intention to murder her husband, in which case she would
have felt happy in succeeding in her mission and getting rid
of an impediment in her union with Wilson. But that does not
happen. In the course of the last twenty lines she uses the
words "stop it" eight times. This shows the crowded emotions,
the confused state of mind which can be explained only if we
take Macomber's death as an accident. Wilson, a professional
hunter, is a man of low perceptivity and therefore cannot
understand the complex of feelings which Margot experiences.

V

Crane believes that a literary work should primarily be
judged by principles evolved from within the text. The critic
without being led dogmatically by the principles of any parti-
cular-ism, should try to explore the actual intention of the
author. He should pay adequate attention to the artistic and
structural problems faced by the author, and try to judge how
far and by what means the author solves his problems.Crane's

24 Hemingway, Ernest, "The Short Happy Life of Francis
Macomber", in The First Forty Nine Stories, op.cit.,p.42.
performance in the essays analysed in this chapter is quite in keeping with this idea of the function of a literary critic. In each of the essays, as we have seen, Crane has tried to discover the distinctive problems (artistic and structural) of each of the authors in their actual act of creation, and on the basis of his observation he suggests how far they have succeeded in solving their individual problems. And what is remarkable in his observation is that he does not impose any critical theory from outside in any of his discussion. While most of the critics approach a literary text with a particular theory in mind and analyse the text as the theory directs or allows them to do, in Crane's method the textual properties of a work - what the author actually does in it - exhibit the theoretical aspects, if any, attached to that work. His primary concern is with what the text, as the concrete literary object, actually contains. Thus in his analysis of the fourth voyage of *Gulliver's Travels* as well as of *Tom Jones* he contradicts some existing or established ideas, and confirms his own opinions on the basis of a detailed analysis of all the possible sides of the texts.

Another important quality of Crane as a practising critic is that unlike most other critics who speak more about what the artist fails to achieve, he is chiefly engaged in what (and how) the artist does achieve in his work. Thus, his way of criticism surely helps us to increase our knowledge of the text through its proper understanding.
Above everything else, however, we must note Crane's true wisdom and liberal mindedness as a literary critic. He is never dogmatic. He admits the limitations of a literary theory - its incapability of judging all types of literary works quite effectively and well. That is why he suggests, in his analysis of *Tom Jones*, that for the best result formal criticism should accompany historical criticism also. This attitude is something uncommon (but surely welcome) in practical criticism. For Crane, however, this practice is quite natural because it is part of Crane's pluralistic attitude.