CHAPTER II

Literature and Psychology
A) Literature and Psychology.

Literature is the record of all that is worthiest in human thought, the expression in language of those feelings and speculations which men hold the dearest and the truest. "It stores up the accumulated experience of the race, connecting past and present into a conscious unity". Its aim is the effective expression of truth. Its field is the whole nature of man. When all the three aspects of man's mental activity— the intellectual, the ethical and the aesthetic— come to expression simultaneously, it is possible to have that utterance of the whole concrete truth which constitutes literature in the true sense.

"By Letters or Literature is meant the expression of thought in Language, where by 'thought' I mean the ideas, feelings, views, reasonings, and other operations of the human mind". Both reality and imagination play their part in great literature. Literature is not merely a photographic copy of real life; nor is it a complete denial of life. Literature, therefore, is not an escape from reality, but an escape into reality. All great pieces of literature are "true to life". But the literary artist is not content to "hold the mirror unto nature", because, as Matthew Arnold pointed out, literature is a "criticism of life". H. Hudson states that "Literature is fundamentally an expression of life through the medium of language".

Art is a manifestation of the essential creativity of nature, through the creative mind of the artist. The real way to set about its examination must be the investigation of those laws of the mind from whence it proceeds. Literature is also an art. Hence all literature is founded upon psychological laws, and involves principles which are true for all peoples and for all times. The Laws of Literature may be grouped under three heads. They are founded on our threefold nature—intellectual, moral and aesthetic.

The intellectual form is the Principle of Vision.
The moral form is the principle of Sincerity.
The aesthetic form is the Principle of Beauty.

Truth is the aim of Literature. Sincerity is moral truth. Beauty is aesthetic truth. Among the arts, literature, specifically, seems to claim "truth" through the view of life which every artistically coherent work possesses.

Art appeals directly to subjective attitudes, and does not attempt to deal primarily with external conditions. It is for this reason that psychology draws many of its best illustrations from the sphere of art. If we find a general principle running through arts, we are led at once to the conclusion that there is a corresponding tendency in human nature. Most of the forms of balance and symmetry in architecture, painting and other forms of art, are efforts to meet the demands of human nature, rather than of external requirements.

What is true of architecture is much more obvious
with reference to literary art i.e. Literature. Literature, is an expression of human nature. Hence it is clear that the laws of literary composition must be laws of human nature, and the great artists have unquestionably followed with sufficient closeness the demands of human nature to leave their works as standards for future development and as expressions of the direction in which all individual development must tend.

Some purely formal indications of the completeness with which great literature conforms to the demands of human nature may be found in the fact that even prose rhythms show the tendency of writers to express an inner law. Evidently those who have contributed the great works to literature have succeeded in utilizing the language in which they wrote in such a way as to express an internal organization of their own, which was altogether appropriate to their theme, and this they have done spontaneously.

Poetry also furnishes another example of this very type.

The purely personal characteristics of a given writer are the characteristics which can be most readily discovered through comparative study. For this reason the usual forms of literary study deal with the personal characteristics of writers, rather than with the fundamental laws of mental nature involved. That there are fundamental laws appears at every step where a general scientific investigation is made, and there certainly is no ultimate reason why the scientific inquiry should not be extended in every direction. In the meantime, even the
personal usages of single writers challenge our efforts at explanation. On the other hand, a descriptive study supplemented by some psychological analysis of the literary device would tend to raise literary criticism to the level of an explanatory science. It is not at all asserted that the explanatory principles thus developed would make it possible for any one to create great literature; but just as geology teaches us more of the nature of volcanoes than does mere description, so the psychological consideration of literary forms would carry us further than mere enumeration of the forms of expression which appear in the great masterpieces. Thus the extension of psychological explanations of literary usages is possible and desirable.

Moreover we find in literature all the themes and patterns that are found in psychopathology. Ancient stories and dramas have depicted many a pathological situation. We have examples in Oedipus who slew his father, Electra who killed her mother, Phaedra who was in love with her son, and Hercules who killed his children. In Helen of Troy, Delilah, and Cleopatra we recognise the narcissistic type of woman who conquers rather than loves. Shakespeare gives us in Hamlet as pretty a picture of mother-fixation as we could wish. Hamlet's attachment to his mother prevented him from marrying Ophelia. Not only the characters of fiction but the authors themselves provide interesting studies when their works are looked upon as a symptomatic production that has many of its
roots in unsatisfied unconscious desires, wishes. Thus psychology sheds a considerable light upon literature.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries man discovered the New World. Since the seventeenth he has been discovering new worlds of Science. We call it 'the conquest of Science'. But since the late nineteenth century man has been discovering a new world inside himself— in what we rather vaguely call 'the Unconscious'. Thus Psychology only came into being as a separate science in the early part of the last century, and it is only within the last fifty years or so that the results of the new study became at all generally known.

Psychology of course means the science of the mind, and modern psychology ultimately derives from Descartes in the seventeenth century. He first directed attention to the need for an inquiry into the nature and capacity of mind. The ancient world and the thinkers of mediaeval times had fully understood the Fallibility of the Senses. But Mind, which had hitherto taken a comparatively back seat, now moved up into the front row. The more we think about this problem, the more there is in it to think about. So, gradually and without any flourish of trumpets, Psychology broke away from orthodox philosophy and became a separate science on its own.

I am aware that there are objections to describing Psychology as the science of the mind. For the province of Psychology is by no means limited to an investigation of the mental processes either of human beings or of
animals. It extends to the whole question of behaviour and the various ways in which behaviour is conditioned. And Social Psychology surveys an even wider field.

We are solely concerned with the effect which psychology has had upon literature generally, in the present age. It is the new information as to the constitution of our individual minds that has so profoundly affected modern writers and artists of every kind. Hitherto Mind had been regarded as an entity, a "something" which willed and felt and thought: existent for all practical purposes upon one plane— that is, the plane of consciousness. Philosophers, of course, had long recognized that there must be a part of Mind, perhaps a very considerable part, which lay below that level. Much of the mind's activity, which had previously been assumed without question to be "independent", now appeared to be due to forces over which the mind had no control. But the important step forward came from the study of the remarkable effects observed in hypnosis. Out of this developed the celebrated Freudian Method of Psycho-analysis.

The result of inquiry along these lines has been a revolution in our outlook. We must, therefore, think now of Mind as an affair, so to speak, of layers. The topmost, of course, is the old layer of consciousness still with its triple function of thinking and feeling and willing, but of considerably less importance according to modern ideas than it used to be thought in the past. Below it
lies the whole extent of the sub-conscious- or the Un-
conscious. We may make two layers of it. There is the sub-
conscious, let us say, immediately below the surface; and
deeper down, beneath all, the completely unconscious- lying,
exactly as the serpent. "Source of All Strength", according
to the Indian Vedantas, lies coiled in the lowest part of
the human body.

But, we say, all this was known before. For authors
were psychologists before psychology was invented. It is
only looking at a familiar object from an unfamiliar angle.
What fresh discovery, of interest to the artists, have the
psychologists made? They have made many. They have had
already an incalculable effect upon the form and method of
modern poetry.

Similarly the advances in depth-psychology have not
only authenticated and enlarged the modern writer's
experience with hidden motives, but, more important still,
they have also brought about a revolution in attitudes and
values, which has in its turn created a new climate of
tragedy in literature. It became obvious after the first
quarter of the century that Freudian psychology had projected
a set of contemporary myths in which writers found a rich
universe of discourse. Terms like id, ego, libido, repression,
fixation, Oedipus complex and regression were not only
integrated into the artistic idiom, but also became a part of
every man's vocabulary.

Freud extended the unsettling effects of the
intellectual revolution started by Darwin to biological determinism was now added psychological determinism. By stating that the ego is not master in its own house, Freud had brought tragedy nearer home to man. The human mind itself is the ground of conflict between an all-powerful, amoral, instinctive force, the id, and a repressive, hypermoral, cultural force, the super-ego. The ego is the helpless mediator which seeks neurotic solutions in order to escape the conflict. The most fundamental of the instinctive drives is, according to Freud, the child's incestuous desire for his mother, which, when thwarted by the curbs of civilization, becomes an intense hatred against the father. Conventional morality is therefore nothing but a manifestation of the Oedipus complex. Dreams, art and religion are only the regressive, ersatz gratifications invented by the 'pleasure principle' in order to evade the painful decrees of the 'reality principle'. Thus, on the face of it, Freudianism seemed to postulate an objective truth that had become readily subversive of all that tradition held to be valuable and sacred. As Freud himself made it clear, the poets and philosophers knew, long before him, all about the forces of evil and darkness residing in man's soul.

The whirligig of taste brought about by the new psychology aided writers in describing human behaviour with a total frankness and realism. Besides giving them a more precise and well-developed instrumentation for their probings into human motivation, it also gave a demonstrable plausibility to new literary techniques, such
as the interior monologue, the stream-of-consciousness, dream-condensation and even the distortion of language and imagery. It is hard to think of the work of a Joyce or a Faulkner in a completely pre-Freudian context. Freud had a secret appeal for the Lost Generation, for in defining the role of the self in relation to the milieu, he seemed to provide an efficient cause for the artist's alienation. Freud's later development of the theory of traumatic neurosis—whereby psychic life re-energized from time to time by the operation of repetition-compulsions—seemed to restore an element of will to the ego.

Adler questioned the sexual monism of the Freudian Unconscious, and claimed that the human personality functions more comprehensively in terms of its quest for meaning in the external world. The individual unconsciously builds fictive constructs for a derivation of purpose out of life, and thus the human conflict becomes a subjective problem of finding compensatory mechanisms. Jung concentrated on the objective, impersonal contents of the human psyche—thus establishing a link between the individual and the collective unconscious. Otto Rank, sensing the rationalistic deadlock in Freud's thesis, concluded that psychotherapy must eventually rest on a soul without psychology. Freud considered art as a form of neurosis, and this was both an oversimplification and a challenge to the writer. For, while psychology—in so far as it claims to be a science—must rest on the sufficiency of logic, literature has the need of a philosophical instrumentality,
for it contains within itself what Wheelwright calls "a paralogical dimension". It is exactly this extensive need inherent in imaginative art that Jung seemed to have met. The modern artist, to be worth his salt, must needs go beyond Freud as Joyce, Lawrence, Eliot, Faulkner and O'Neill have done and discover a new equation for his creative challenges and responsibilities. In this respect Jung's theories have been more productive in literature than elsewhere.

By postulating an evolutionary concept of the development of the unconscious mind into consciousness, and further suggesting that the unconscious itself is the psychic residuum of the collective unconscious, Jung widened the range of relationships in the individual's total experience. He also extended the scope of tragedy by tracing the conflicts of the individual to a primordial source of experience, and thus restored the mythic distance between man and his racial past, which is essential to tragic sublimity. His theory of archetypal patterns opened up a whole realm of metaphorical possibility in creative writing. The writer could now go beyond the banality of surface, and enrich his art with religious, mystic and universal insights. Thus, while social realists found a ready acceptance for Freud, writers, whose main interest was visionary or prophetic, found greater use for Jung. Eliot presented what C.S. Lewis calls the "Messianic vision" of the modern man's disintegration in 'The Waste Land' (1922), by making a creative use of Jung's personae, while
O'Neill revealed the predicament of American Adam by means of Jungian masks in 'The Great God Brown'. Joyce and Faulkner both were in debt to Jung. Furthermore, whereas Freud considered the poet as a neurotic, Jung described him as a representative collective man; the former's was a pragmatic approach, the latter's a mythopoetic. At a time when an increasing number of writers had begun to realize the mythic need of their art, Jung made myth respectable, and illuminating. Hence, in a relativistic sense, while society adopted Freud, literature adopted Jung.

There is no doubt that psychology has already an incalculable effect upon the form and method of modern literature, especially poetry, drama and fiction. Let us now see it one by one.

With the help of psychology we now know that there exists between the sub-conscious and the conscious a constant, though vague and indeterminate two-way traffic. We also know something of the contents of the sub-conscious mind. There are thoughts and feelings which appear to belong to the constitution of the mind itself; and there are thoughts and feelings which have been put down there out of the conscious, as one puts away in the attic unwanted luggage. All or any of these may share in the traffic: may float up to the surface, either unbidden, like "drawned faces in a pool," or they may be deliberately evoked. We all know "how one thing suggests another". That is the technique of evocation. Up they come, each linked with another down below; and that in its turn hooks another,
and so on and so on. This whole process, is what is known as "Free Association".

"Free Association" in itself, is only the process by which Suggestion works; and Suggestion when speaking of the Symbolists, has always been one of the recognized methods by which poetry obtains its effects. What is new is the rationalization of the process. We find, in modern poetry a deliberate attempt to explore the world-below-the-surface, based upon the drill-book provided by Psychology; and we find methods of evocation which are bound to seem strange and outre because they go beyond anything that was known before.

Evocation is a method of tapping the vast resources of the sub-conscious, as one taps a barrel of beer; but unlike beer, the stream from below flows better from a small tap than from a large one. As with the Imagists, so with the Evocators who succeeded and superseded them, the motto is "Minimum of Means to produce Maximum of Effect". Take a modern example of evocation:

"Vacant Shuttles
Weave the wind". 1

There is a kind of phantom procession musters at the gates of the mind. Words are being used to mean more than they appear to mean. The sentence as a whole is greater than itself.

1. From "Gerontion" by T.S. Eliot.
Eliot's 'Gerontion' is a sketch of the mind of an old man in reverie. He is revealed by himself in monologue—"Here I am, an old man in a dry mouth——" So he starts: and flows gently on. But the monologue is all at different levels; or rather, to be accurate, it is the vehicle of thoughts that come from different levels. The modern poet, like Browning, intends a picture of a mind: but, unlike Browning, he wants to show the mind working throughout all its parts. Consequently 'Gerontion' appears somewhat vague and scrappy, and less clear and crisp. It must be recognized that the modern author intends exactly vagueness.

In 'Gerontion' the thoughts or fragments of thoughts come from a different level. They come from a region of the mind where literal meaning does not matter and connexions may be still connexions even" without benefit of Reason". The old man is drawing upon memories of past experience and emotion, long ago put away and stored in the subconscious mind: and to draw them forth again he does not need to go to the trouble of making a strictly formal statement. For there is no strict logical censorship in the Kingdom of the Sub-conscious Mind. There is a kind of Wonderland irresponsibility, which reminds us of a nursery party when Nurse is out of the room.

Great poetry has a universal appeal, is the ancient maxim. Because the ideas with which it deals and the emotions upon which it plays are fundamental and common to all mankind. Modern psychological jargon would express
this differently; but the substance remains the same. Yet, the modern poets, like the novelists, are interested in the scattered pieces rather than the integrated whole. They too will not be definite; they too leave the ultimate synthesis to the reader.

The psychological influence on drama can best be seen in O'Neill's plays. Freudianism has had a pervasive influence on the American drama and has helped it come of age. Before the advent of psychoanalysis, dramatists were trying to push their work beyond mere theatricalism, and penetrate into the darker recesses of the human mind for dramatic values. But they were handicapped by the lack of a mature psychological idiom, and by the absence of an audience sufficiently responsive to psychological facts. By the end of the First World War, a comparatively mature American psychological drama was in the making. Starting obscurely with Arthur Hopkins's 'The Fatted Calf' (1912), the tenuous trickle of Freudian themes became the mainstream of dramatic energy, so that, by 1925, the generic character of the American drama was established firmly on a psychological base. 'Suppressed Desires', 'Rain', 'The Adding Machine', 'Icebound', 'A Square Peg', 'The Silver Cord', and a score of other plays enriched their content with Freudian problems or Freudian solutions. In a sense, the American stage had become a vast psychological laboratory; the modern industrial neurotic audiences could simply 'buy' their soul's remedies at the new theatre. At the same time, O'Neill brought a titanic psychological vitality to the
stage, rather than a literal and literate Freudianism.

O'Neill, in his search for meaning, has added many levels of depth to psychological vision in what are usually considered to be the most Freudian of his plays, 'Strange Interlude' and 'Mourning Becomes Electra'. Out of these plays emerges a stereoscopic dimension of symbolism and myth, bringing into dramatic perspective human character and motivation in terms of man's inner mode of 'being'. In 'Strange Interlude', O'Neill explores the psychology of being by means of a structural symbolism. The play has the range of a novel, the sweep of an epic, and the intensity of drama. It is an accurate study of human neurosis. In it O'Neill made a direct attempt to introduce stream of consciousness on the stage.

O'Neill's plays are more ostensibly tragedies of awareness than of the Unconscious. The conflict of his characters is post-Freudian in that it rests on a centre of consciousness in which the ego is where the id was. The will to live becomes far more significant in their scheme of things than the libido. Their suffering is less due to sexual repression than to an intense life-aversion. In motivating the actions of his characters, O'Neill has turned from Aeschylus and Sophocles to Freud and Jung. The new inwardness of his attitude to life is indicated by his acceptance of primary realism, and the simple revelation of character as adequate means of profound, symbolic drama.
One cognitive value in the drama and novels seems to be psychological. "The novelists can teach you more about human nature than the psychologists" is a familiar kind of assertion. Horney recommends Dostoevsky, Shakespeare, Ibsen, and Balzac as inexhaustible sources. The most characteristic aspect of twentieth-century fiction is its inward-turning to convey the flow of mental experience, what has been loosely called the "stream of consciousness".

Unlike the dramatist, the novelist can intrude himself between the reader and the story by commenting upon and describing the inner feelings of his characters. In this way he satisfies the curiosity of the reader who wishes to know from time to time more particularly how the character feels in a given situation and in general how his feelings and mental processes in a given situation reflect his general character. This detailed presentation of his feelings and mental processes is what in fiction is called psychology. Its application in literature means that element in the narrative art that concerns the psyche, that is, the subjective aspect of experience; and the novel in which this analysis of the mental process plays a significant role is called the Psychological Novel.

Between 1913 and 1915 was born the modern psychological novel—what we call in English, the stream-of-consciousness novel or the novel of the silent, the internal monologue, and in French, the modern analytic
novel. The psychological novel is not written as flowing thought. It seeks the very atmosphere of the mind. Marcel Proust, Miss Dorothy Richardson and James Joyce are those novelists who sought to retain and record the "inwardness" of experience.

The psychological novelist is primarily concerned with "what a man thinks and what he feels". These constitute "the history and the character of what he does." The psychological novel cannot be "read" in the usual sense—it can only be re-read. It is called "time-novel" also. For the psychological novelist attempts to arrest a moment of time at every step even as it flees before him. The "slice of life" of the nineteenth-Century realists here becomes the "slice of time". The psychological novelists begin as naturalists or realists— and end as symbolists!

The stream of consciousness' technique not only helps to reveal the character completely, historically as well as psychologically, it also presents development in character. What the traditional method achieves by extension, the "Stream of consciousness" method achieves by depth. It is a method by which a character can be presented outside time and place.

The eyes of the psychological novelists are upon the present and the future without one glance behind. Their method, naturally, is different. They make no attempt to portray character in the round, since life itself never presents a personality to us in that way.
On the contrary, character comes to us in fragments and bits which we have to put together for ourselves. Therefore the psychological novelist appears to concentrate his interest not upon the whole but upon the component parts— which are, in fact, those fascinating pieces into which the psychologists have split up mind, as the physicists have split the atom. His technique is different too. He does not comment. He gives us no neat little character sketch, no helpful summary. He leaves us in the light of our own intelligence to find our own answer.

With Joyce the inward turning penetrated to the deepest recesses of mental experience. He is the fountainhead of the modern psychological novel. And the modern psychological novel is "modern" in that it reflects the deeper and more searching inwardness of our century. That is why the modern novel reveals the innermost thoughts of the mind, and the deepest recesses of the soul and the subconscious impulses of nature. Psychology has revolutionized the conception of "character", and the exploring of the sub-conscious has been the object of all modern novelists. D.H.Lawrence and James Joyce are the most successful exponents of this type of characterization. But though Dostoevsky lived before Freud, he was the greatest and the most successful psycho-analyst. He has penetrated into such recesses of the human mind and has explored such depths of the sub-conscious that it seems almost uncanny.
It is surprising to know that much psychology is hidden away even in folk-legends, fairy tales and popular traditions. Narcissus, for example, has found a second immortality in psychoanalysis. We thought he was a fantasy about a flower. But he too is a reality. Not only this but "isms" in literature are not without psychological influences. Take for example, Romanticism. What is Romanticism? It is the revolt of Emotion against Reason. Lascelles Abercrombie explained Romanticism as the opposite of Realism, 'a withdrawal from outer experience to concentrate on inner experience'. There is a common psychological factor in all Romanticisms. And it is our primitive impulses.

In literature Realism corresponds to a dominace of the reality-principle; Classicism, very roughly, to a dominace of the 'super-ego' and Romanticism, also very roughly, to a dominace of impulses from the 'id'. In other words, our primitive impulses lead us towards Romanticism, our sense of reality towards Realism and our social sense towards Classicism— the art of men who honour a code and a tradition. The best literature tends to keep a balance of all these forces of Romanticism, Classicism and Realism— as Homer, Chaucer, Shakespeare do. In art, however, such balance is especially difficult since artists are often neurotic by temperament.

During two World Wars Dadaism was born (1916) and was succeeded by Surrealism (1922)— the effort to create
as automatically as a dream 'in the absence of all control by the reason, and outside all aesthetic or moral preoccupations'- in short, without reality-principle or ego-ideal. 'In Surrealism one relives the best of childhood'. 'The best of childhood', however, appears to include the most primitive and tedious obsessions with excrement, cruelty, masochism, fetichism, Narcissism, cannibalism, and necrophily.1

Let us turn back now from Romanticism in corruption to a quality valued far more by neo-CLASSICS than Romantics- wit. Even here, the Unconscious plays an important part. The psychology of wit has been exhaustively discussed by Freud in 'Der Witz'. He deals first with Wit, then with Comedy and Humour.

Freudian explanation regarding laughter is something like this- Why do we laugh? Because, it appears, we acquire a sudden surplus of psychic energy, which we then release in these curious convulsions. A sudden release of tension finds a noisy outlet. Freud suggests that much of the Comic consists ultimately in suddenly seeing our fellows as childish by comparison with ourselves.

'The laughable', said Aristotle, 'is some defect or deformity neither painful nor hurtful- like the distortion of the comic mask'. 'This world', said Horace Walpole very truly, 'is a comedy to those who think, a tragedy

Humour has been neatly defined as a sense for incongruities, in contrast to Wit as a sense for resemblances. By humour we seem generally to mean no more than a gift for seeing the comic in situations or persons, even when it is not obvious, or masked by inhibiting causes.

Here is perhaps something analogous to the healing value of artistic creation. As the artist lives out his conflicts in creation, while the criminal turns them against society and the neurotic against himself; so the mind, with a sense of humour can create from its own troubles a comic situation, with the momentary distance and detachment of a mere onlooker, and with the consoling satisfaction of a semi-artistic activity.

Freud suggests that Comedy, Humour and Wit may be three ways back towards the light-heartedness of childhood. Wit, in particular, he explains as follows. When we are small we enjoy mere nonsense and playing about with words. As we grow up, our critical reason gradually forbids this childish pleasure. Yet we still find a way back to these verbal enjoyments of the nursery, while placating the critical adult within us, by taking some idea that rises in our Preconscious to the brink of

utterance, plunging it for a moment into the Unconscious where it plays childishly with words or with nonsense in such a way as yet also to make sense, and producing the resulting compromise as wit. Thus the child in us plays with the nonsense; the adult in us is placated by the sense; and the energy employed to inhibit the irrational within us can then release itself in laughter.  

Wit is frequently aggressive- a weapon of attack on persons or laws or institutions. Improper wit, again, a veiled substitute for aggression in another form. If we take harmless wit in its simplest form, it proves a very simple riddle and we are left with a surplus for laughter.

Secondly, we enjoy also the aesthetic pleasure of seeing a thought packed with maximum neatness into minimum space. For 'brevity is the soul of wit'. We may apply the term 'wit' to expressions that present the challenge of an easy riddle, the neatness of a terse epigram. A witticism is a miniature piece of art. Its production resembles inspiration, in that it generally leaps, straight out of the Unconscious. Conscious thought will seldom produce wit, though it may improve and polish a piece of wit when produced. It is the riddling element that accounts for the prominence in wit of ambiguities and symbols, metaphors and similes.

---

Wit has been aptly defined by F.L.Lucas as "A clever saying, with a playful tinge". One may agree with Freud that witticisms, like literary or artistic inspirations, seem born rather than made— that is, they are conceived at unconscious levels. To conclude, wit seems a kind of extempore artistry, employing many devices— epigrammatic brevity, symbolism, allusiveness, ambiguity, comparison, and all this with nuance of comedy.

B) Psychology of Literature

Literature is self-expression through the medium of language. Such a self-expression is possible only through the medium of emotions. The literary genius proves to be an extra-ordinary person, when the emotional state of his mind bursts out to express his powerful feelings. Considering this very fact, he is conceived of as related to 'madness', ranging from neuroticism to psychosis. It is considered that the poet is the 'possessed'. He is unlike other persons, at once less and more. The unconscious out of which he speaks is felt to be at once sub-rational and superrational.

The latest findings of modern psychology lead us towards 'depth psychology'. It is another name for Freud's Psycho-analysis. Freud holds that our conscious thoughts and desires are the reflections of unconscious wishes, which are not known and therefore cannot be

1. Based on "Theory of Literature" by R.Wellek and A.Warren.
controlled. The conscious is determined by the un-
conscious which is beyond our control. Thus Freud proved
that the unconscious is the main-spring or the source of
most of our actions. Moreover his theory of Psycho-
analysis is responsible for a positive creed of self-
expression. To thwart an instinctive drive is to injure
the personality at its root. He has shown that neuroses
are due to the repression of natural desires (libido).
Therefore, his theory has led to the belief that self-
expression or fulfilment of a natural desire is a primary
duty, and repression of it is a sin. And human conduct is
motivated by his unconscious wishes. Similarly, the artist
is for Freud, a 'neurotic' who seeks and finds in art a
'substitutive gratification' of his thwarted desires. Thus
Freud's psychological views bring art, particularly
literature, closer to psychology.

By 'psychology of literature', we may mean—
1. The psychological study of the writer, as type and
   as individual.
2. The study of the creative process.
3. The study of the psychological types and laws present
   within works of literature, and
4. The effects of literature upon its readers (audience
   psychology).
All the four shall here be discussed in turn. Probably
only the third belongs, in the strictest sense, to
literary study. The first two are subdivisions of the
psychology of art, while the fourth comes under the
relations between 'Literature and Society'.

1. The Psychological Study of the Writer, as Type and as
   Individual.

   An early conception regarding the poet's 'gift' is
   that it is compensatory. For example, the blind Tiresias
   was given prophetic vision. Handicap and endowment are not
   always so directly correlative; and the malady or deformity
   may be psychological or social instead of physical. Pope
   was a hunchback and a dwarf; Byron had a club-foot;
   Proust was an asthmatic neurotic; Keats was shorter than
   other men and Thomas Wolfe, much taller. The difficulty
   with this theory is its very ease. After the event, any
   success can be attributed to compensatory motivation, for
   everyone has liabilities which may serve him as spurs.
   There is a widespread view that neuroticism- and
   'compensation'- differentiate artists from scientists.
   The obvious distinction is that writers often document
   their own cases, turning their maladies into their
   thematic material.

   The basic questions are these: If the writer is a
   neurotic, does his neurosis provide the themes of his work
   or only its motivation? If the latter, then the writer is
   not to be differentiated from other contemplatives. The
   other question is: If the writer is neurotic in his
   themes (as Kafka certainly is), how is it that his work
   is intelligible to his readers? The writer must be doing
far more than putting down a case history. He must either be dealing with an archetypal pattern (as does Dostoevsky, in "The Brothers Karamazov") or with a 'neurotic personality' pattern.

Freud's view of the writer is not quite steady. He discovered in literature many insights anticipating and corroborating his own — in Dostoevsky's "The Brothers Karamazov," in Diderot's "Nephew of Rameau," in Shakespeare's "Hamlet," in Goethe. But he also thought of the author as an obdurate neurotic. "The artist," says, Freud, "is originally a man who turns from reality because he cannot come to terms with the demand for the renunciation of instinctual satisfaction as it is first made, and who then in phantasy-life allows full play to his erotic and ambitious wishes. But he finds a way of return from this world of phantasy back to reality; with his special gifts, he moulds his phantasies into a new kind of reality, and men concede them a justifications as valuable reflections of actual life. Thus by a certain path he actually becomes the hero, king, creator, favourite he desired to be, without the circuitous path of creating real alterations in the outer world." The poet, that is, is a daydreamer who is socially validated. Instead of altering his character, he perpetuates and publishes his phantasies.

Such an account fails to recognize that creation is itself a mode of work in the outer world; that, while
the day-dreamer is content to dream of writing his dreams
one who is actually writing is engaged in an act of
externalization and of adjustment to society.

Most writers have drawn back from subscription to
orthodox Freudianism or from completing their psycho-
analytic treatment. Most of them have not wanted to be
"cured" or "adjusted", either thinking they would cease
to write if they were adjusted, or that the adjustment
proposed was to a normality or a social environment which
they rejected as philistine or bourgeois. Thus Auden has
asserted that artists should be as neurotic as they can
endure; and many have agreed that Freud's conceptions
of neurosis and normality, need to be corrected by Marx
and the anthropologists.

The theory of art as neurosis raises the question
of imagination in relation to belief. Is the novelist
analogous not only to the romantic child who 'tells
stories', but also to the man who suffers from hallucina-
tions, confounding the world of reality with the
phantasy world of his hopes and fears? Some novelists
(e.g., Dickens) have spoken of vividly seeing and hearing
their characters, and, again, of the characters as
taking over the control of the story, shaping it to an
end different from the novelist's preliminary design. None
of the instances cited by psychologists seem to bear out
the charge of hallucination. Some novelists may, however,
have the capacity of eidetic imagery. In the judgement
of Erich Jaensch, this capacity is symptomatic of the artist's special integration of perceptual and conceptual. He retains, and has developed, an archaic trait of the race; he feels and even sees his thoughts.

Another trait sometimes assigned to the literary man—more specifically, the poet—is synaesthesia. Synaesthesia is a literary technique, a form of metaphysical translation, the stylized expression of a metaphysical-aesthetic attitude towards life. Historically, this attitude and style are characteristic of the Baroque and the Romantic periods and correspondingly distasteful to rationalist periods.

T.S. Eliot has urged an inclusive view of the poet as recapitulating his strata of the race-history, of keeping his communication open with his own childhood and that of the race while reaching forward into the future. "The artist", he wrote, "is more primitive, as well as more civilized, than his contemporaries." He cites with approval the work of Cailliet and Bede on the relation of the Symbolist Movement to the primitive psyche, summarizing: "the pre-logical mentality persists in civilized man, but becomes available only to or through the poet".

In these passages it is not difficult to discover the influence of Carl Jung and a restatement of the Jungian thesis that beneath the individual "unconscious"—the blocked-off residue of our past, particularly our
childhood and infancy- lies the "collective unconscious"-
the blocked- off memory of our racial past, even of our
pre-humanity.

Jung has an elaborate psychological typology, according
to which "extravert" and "introvert" subdivide the four types
based upon the dominance respectively of thinking, feeling,
intuition, and sensation. He does not, as one might have supposed
assign all writers to the intuitive-introverted category, or
more generally, to the category of the introvert. As a
further guard against simplification, he remarks that some
writers reveal their type in their creative work, while
others reveal their anti-type, their complement.

One of the German typologists, Kretschmer, separates
the poets from the novelists. The Poets are considered to
be leptosomatic who incline to schizophrenia, whereas the
novelists are pyknic of physical structure and manic-
 depressive or 'cycloid' of temperament. There is certainly
a typological pair of the 'Possessed' and the 'maker'. The
'possessed' is the automatic or obsessive or prophetic
poet, and the 'maker' is the writer who is primarily a
trained, skillful, responsible craftsman. The distinction
seems partly historical: the 'possessed' is the primitive
poet, the shaman; then the Romantic, the Expressionist,
the Surrealist, we say. The professional poets, the poets of
the Renaissance and neo-classicism, are "makers". Of course
these types must be understood as not mutually exclusive but
polar. In the instances of great writers- including Milton,
Poe, James, and Eliot as well as Shakespeare and Dostoevsky
we have to think of the writer as both "maker" and "possessed", as combining an obsessively held vision of life with a conscious, precise care for the presentation of that vision. The "maker" is classical and the "possessed" is romantic.

The French psychologist Ribot divided the literary artists between the two chief types of imagination. The "plastic" characterizes the sharp visualizer who is primarily incited by observation of the outside world, by perception, while the "diffluent" (the auditory and symbolic) is that of the symbolist poet or the writer of Romantic tales (like Poe), who starts from his own emotions and feelings, projecting them through rhythms and images.

L.Rusu, a Rumanian scholar distinguishes three basic types of artist: the "sympathetic" type, the demonic anarchic" type and the "demonic equilibrium" type. The "sympathetic" type is conceived of as gay, spontaneous, bird-like in its creativity. There is a general suggestiveness to the thesis and antithesis of "sympathetic" and "anarchic" with a synthesizing greatest types in which the struggle with the demon has ended in triumph, an equilibrium of tensions. Rusu cites Goethe as the example of this greatness, but we shall have to assign it all our greatest names—Dante, Shakespeare, Balzac, Dickens, Tolstoy, and Dostoevsky.


The creative process should cover the entire
sequence from the subconscious origins of a literary work to those last revisions which, with some writers, are the most genuinely creative part of the whole.

There is a distinction to be made between the mental structure of a poet and the composition of a poem, between impression and expression. Croce reduced both impression and expression to aesthetic intuition. The painter sees as a painter; the painting is the clarification and completion of his seeing. The poet is a maker of poems, but the matter of his poems is the whole of his percipient life. With the artist, in any medium, every impression is shaped by his art, he accumulates no inchoate experience.

"Inspiration" is the traditional name for the unconscious factor in creation. It is classically associated with the Muses, the daughter of memory, and in Christian thought with the Holy Spirit. By definition, the inspired state of a shaman, prophet, or poet, differs from his ordinary state. In primitive societies the shaman may voluntarily be able to put himself into a trance, or he may involuntarily be "possessed" by some ancestral or totemic spirit-control. In modern times, inspiration is felt to have the essential marks of suddenness (like conversion) and impersonality: the work seems written through one.

May not inspiration be induced? Creative habits there assuredly are, as well as stimulants and rituals. Alcohol, opium and other drugs dull the conscious mind, the over-
critical "censor", and release the activity of the sub-
conscious. Coleridge and De Quincey made a more grandiose
claim that through opium, a whole new world of experience
was opened up for literary treatment; but in the light of
modern clinical reports it appears that the unusual elements
in the work of such poets derive from their neurotic psyches
and not from the specific effect of the drug.

As the mantic poets of primitive communities are
taught methods of putting themselves into states conducive
to "possession", so writers of the modern world learn, or
think they learn, rituals for inducing the creative state.
Schiller kept rotten apples in his work-desk; Balzac
wrote dressed in the robes of a monk. Many writers think
"horizontally", and even write in bed—writers as different
as Proust and Mark Twain. Some require silence and
solitude, but others prefer to write in the midst of the
family or the company at a café. There are instances,
which attract attention as sensational of authors who
work through the night and sleep during the day. Probably
this devotion to the night (time of contemplation, the
dream, the subconscious) is the chief Romantic tradition;
but there is, we must remember, a rival Romantic trad-
tion, the Wordsworthian, which exalts the early morning
(the freshness of childhood). Dr. Johnson, who found all
such theories distasteful, believed that a man might
write at any time if he would set himself doggedly to it;
he himself wrote confessedly under economic compulsion.
But one can suppose that these seemingly capricious rituals, by association and habit, facilitate systematic production.

Does the mode of transcription have any demonstrable effect on the literary style? Does it matter whether one writes a first draught with pen and ink or composes directly on the type-writer? Hemingway thinks that the typewriter "solidifies one's sentences before they are ready to print", hence makes revision as an integral part of writing difficult; others suppose the instrument has made for overfluent or journalistic style. No empirical investigation has been made. As for dictation, it has been used by authors of very various quality and spirit. Interesting are the examples of Scott, Henry James and Goethe. With them, though the structure has been thought out in advance, the verbal texture is extemporized. In the case of James, at least, it seems possible to make some causal connection between dictation and the "later manner", which is oral and even conversational.

Any modern treatment of the creative process will chiefly concern the relative parts played by the unconscious and the conscious mind. It would be easy to contrast literary periods to distinguish romantic and expressionistic periods which exalt the unconscious from classical and realistic periods which stress intelligence, revision and communication. But such a contrast may readily be exaggerated: the critical theories of classicism and romanticism differ more violently than the
There are obvious reasons why self-conscious artists speak as though their art were impersonal, as though they chose their themes either by editorial compulsion or as a gratuitous aesthetic problem. The most famous document on the topic is Poe's "Philosophy of Composition". He professes to explain by what methodological strategies, proceeding from what initial aesthetic axioms, his "Raven" was constructed. To defend his vanity against the charge that his horror tales were literary imitations, Poe wrote that their horrors were not of Germany but of the soul, yet that they were of his own soul he could not admit. He professed to be a literary engineer, skilled at manipulating the souls of others. In Poe, the division is terrifyingly complete between the unconscious, which provides the obsessive themes of delirium, torture, and death, and the conscious, which literarily develops them.

For the discovery of literary talent there would be tests of two kinds: one, that for poets in the modern sense, would concern itself with words and their combination, with image and metaphor, with linkages semantic and phonetic (i.e. rhyme, assonance, alliteration) the latter, for narrative writers (novelists and dramatists) would concern itself with characterization and plot-structure.

The literary man is a specialist in association ('wit'), dissociation ('Judgement'), and recombination
He uses words as his medium. As a child, he may collect words as other children collect dolls, stamps or pets. For the poet, the word is not primarily a "sign", but a "symbol". It may even be an "object" or "thing", dear for its sound or hook. Some novelists may use words as signs (Scott, Cooper) in which case they may be read to advantage translated into another language, or remembered as mythic structure; poets normally use words "symbolically".

The traditional phrase, the "association of ideas", is an inaccurate name. Beyond the associative linkage of word with word, there is the association of the objects to which our mental "ideas" refer. The chief categories of such association are contiguity in time and place, and similarity or dissimilarity. The novelist operates, in terms of the former, the poet, in terms of the latter.

Describing the creative process Lowes speaks of the "hooked atoms" or (in the phrase of Henry James) of images and ideas as dropping for a time "into the deep well of unconscious cerebration", to emerge having undergone a "sea-change". He formally acknowledges that "at the zenith of its power the creative energy is both conscious and unconscious—controlling consciously the throng of images which in the reservoir (the 'well' of the unconscious) have undergone unconscious metamorphosis"; but he scarcely attends to or attempts to define the
really purposive and constructive in the creative process.

In the narrative writer, we think of his creation of characters and his 'invention' of stories. The creation of characters may be supposed to blend, in varying degrees inherited literary types, persons observed, and the self. The realist, we might say, chiefly observes behaviour or 'empathizes', while the Romantic writer 'projects'. Faust, Werther and Meister are all, says one psychologist, "projections into fiction of various aspects of Goethe's own nature". The novelist's potential selves are all potential personae. "One man's mood is another man's character". Dostoevsky's four brothers Karamazov are all aspects of Dostoevsky. Only selves recognized from within as potential can become "living characters", not "flat" but "round". Whatever characters a novelist has succeeded with must be parts of himself, since only from himself, and not ex nihilo, could he give them life.

What kind of relation have these "living characters" to the novelist's actual self? The more numerous and separate his characters, the less definite his own "personality", it would seem. Shakespeare disappears into his plays. The character of the poet, Keats once wrote, is to have no self: "it is everything and nothing. ——— A poet is the most unpoetical of any thing in existence, because he has no Identity".

All these theories discussed belong to the psychology of the writer. The processes of his creation
are the legitimate object of the psychologists' investigative curiosity. They can classify the poet according to physiological and psychological types. They can describe his mental ills. They may even explore his subconscious mind. The evidence of the psychologist may come from unliterary documents or it may be drawn from the works themselves. In the latter case, it needs to be checked with the documentary evidence, to be carefully interpreted.

Can psychology, in its turn, be used to interpret and evaluate the literary works themselves? Psychology obviously can illuminate the creative process. As we have seen, attention has been given to the varying methods of composition, to the habits of authors in revising and rewriting. There has been study of the genesis of works; the early stages, the drafts, the rejected readings. Yet the critical relevance of much of this information, especially the many anecdotes about writers' habits, is surely overrated. A study of revisions, corrections and the like may help us perceive critically relevant fissures, inconsistencies, turnings, distortions in a work of art. Analyzing how Proust composed his cyclic novel enables us to distinguish several layers in his text. A study of variants seems to permit glimpses into an author's workshop.

3. The Study of Psychology in the Works of Literature.

There remains the question of "psychology" in the
works themselves. Characters in plays and novels are judged by us to be "psychologically" true. Situations are praised and plots accepted because of this same quality. Sometimes, a psychological theory, held either consciously or dimly by an author, seems to fit a figure or a situation. Thus Edith Campbell has argued that Hamlet fits the type of "sanguine man's suffering from melancholy duress" known to the Elizabethans from their psychological theories. In like fashion Oscar Campbell has tried to show that Jaques, in "As You Like It", is a case of "unnatural melancholy produced by adjustment of phlegm". Walter Shandy could be shown to suffer from the disease of linguistic association described in Locke. Rodion Raskolnikov's motives and feelings are analyzed in a way which suggests some knowledge of clinical psychology. Proust certainly has a whole psychological theory of memory, important even for the organization of his work. Freudian psychoanalysis is used quite consciously by novelists such as Conrad Aiken or Waldo Frank.

Mere statements of the author's knowledge or his theories would not count. They would be "matter" or "content", like any other type of information to be found in literature, e.g. facts from navigation, astronomy, or history. In some cases, the reference to contemporary psychology may be doubted or minimized. The attempts to fit Hamlet or Jaques into some scheme of Elizabethan psychology seem mistaken, because Elizabethan psychology
was contradictory, confusing and confused, and Hamlet and Jaques are more than types. Though Raskolnikova fits certain psychological theory, he does so only incompletely and intermittently. Sorel sometimes behaves in a most melodramatic manner. Raskolnikov's initial crime is inadequately motivated. These books are not primarily psychological studies or expositions of theories but dramas or melodramas, where striking situations are more important than realistic psychological motivation. If one examines "stream of consciousness" novels, one soon discovers that there is no "real" reproduction of the actual mental processes of the subject, that the stream of consciousness is rather a device of dramatizing the mind of making us aware concretely what Benjy, the idiot in Faulkner's 'The Sound and the Fury', is like, or what Mrs. Bloom is like. But there is little that seems scientific or even "realistic" about the device.

Even if we assume that an author succeeds in making his characters behave with "psychological truth", we may well raise the question whether such "truth" is an artistic value. Much great art continuously violates standards of psychology, either contemporary with it or subsequent. It works with improbable situations, with fantastic motifs. Like the demand for social realism, psychological truth is a naturalistic standard without universal validity. In some cases, to be sure, psychological insight seems to enhance artistic value. But such
insight can be reached by other means than a theoretical knowledge of psychology. In the sense of a conscious and systematic theory of the mind and its workings, psychology is unnecessary to art and not in itself of artistic value.

For some conscious artists, psychology may have tightened their sense of reality, sharpened their powers of observation or allowed them to fall into hitherto undiscovered patterns. But, in itself, psychology is only preparatory to the act of creation; and in the work itself, psychological truth is an artistic value only if it enhances coherence and complexity—if, in short, it is art.

4. Audience Psychology (e.g., Literature and Society).

Literature mirrors or expresses life. The function of literature, some say, is to relieve us—either writers or readers—from the pressure of emotions. To express emotions is to get free of them, as Goethe is said to have freed himself from Weltschmerz by composing 'The Sorrows of Werther'. And the spectator of a tragedy or the reader of a novel is also said to experience release and relief. His emotions have been provided with focus, leaving, at the end of his aesthetic experience, with "calm of mind".

But does literature relieve us of emotions or, instead, incite them? Tragedy and comedy, Plato thought, "nourish and water our emotions when we ought to dry them up. "Or, if literature relieves us of our emotions, are
they not wrongly discharged when they are expended on poetic fictions? Is some literature incitory and some cathartic, or are we to distinguish between groups of readers and the nature of their response? Again: should all art be cathartic? These are problems for treatment under "The Relation of Literature to Psychology" and "The Relation of Literature to Society".

That, for proper readers, literature does not and should not incite the emotions is our hypothetical answer. Emotions represented in literature are, neither for writer nor for reader, the same as emotions in "real life"; they are "recollected in tranquility"; they are "expressed"—that is, released—by analysis; they are the feelings of emotions, the perceptions of emotions, the perceptions of emotions.

Literature is a social institution, using as its medium language, a social creation. Such traditional devices as symbolism and meter are social in their very nature. But furthermore, literature "imitates" "life"; and is, in large measure, a social reality, even though the natural world and the inner or subjective world of the individual have also been objects of literary "imitation". The poet himself is a member of society, possessed of a specific social status: he receives some degree of social recognition and reward; he addresses an audience, however hypothetical. Indeed, literature has usually arisen in close connection with particular
social institutions; and in primitive society we may even be unable to distinguish poetry from ritual, magic, work or play. Literature has also a social function, or "use" which cannot be purely individual.

The relation between literature and society is usually discussed by starting with the phrase, derived from De Bonald, that "literature is an expression of society". It means that an author should be aware of specific social situations.

First, there is the sociology of the writer and the profession and institutions of literature, the whole question of the economic basis of literary production, the social provenience and status of the writer, his social ideology, which may find expression in extra-literary pronouncements and activities. Then there is the problem of the social content, the implications and social purpose of the works of literature themselves. Lastly, there are the problems of the audience and the actual social influence of literature. The question how far literature is actually determined by or dependent on its social setting, on social change and development, is one which, in one way or another, will enter into all the three divisions of our problem: the sociology of the writer, the social content of the works themselves, and the influence of literature on society.

Since every writer is a member of society, he can be studied as a social being. Though his biography is the
main source, such a study can easily widen into one of the whole milieu from which he came and in which he lived. It will be possible to accumulate information about the social provenience, the family background, the economic position of writers. We can show what was the exact share of aristocrats, bourgeois, and proletarians in the history of literature. For example, in modern Europe, literature recruited its practitioners largely from the middle classes, since aristocracy was preoccupied with the pursuit of glory or leisure while the lower classes had little opportunity for education. The role of the aristocracy in English literature was uncommonly great. With a few exceptions, all modern Russian writers before Chekhov were aristocratic in origin. Even Dostoevsky was technically a nobleman. Outside of Russia, most Communist writers are not proletarian in origin.

The social origins of a writer play only a minor part in the questions raised by his social status, allegiance, and ideology; for writers, it is clear, have often put themselves at the service of another class. Most Court poetry was written by men, who though born in lower estate, adopted the ideology and taste of their patrons.

The social allegiance, attitude, and ideology of a writer can be studied not only in his writings but also, frequently, in biographical extra-literary documents. The writer has been a citizen, has pronounced
on questions of social and political importance, has
taken part in the issues of his time.

Much work has been done upon political and social
views of individual writers, and in recent times more and
more attention has been devoted to the economic implica-
tions of these views. Thus L.C. Knights, arguing that Ben
Johnson's economic attitude was profoundly medieval,
shows how, like several of his fellow-dramatists, he
satirized the rising class of usurers, monopolists
speculators, and "undertakers". Many works of litera-
ture—e.g. the "histories" of Shakespeare and Swift's
"Gulliver's Travels"—have been reinterpreted in close
relation to the political context of the time.

The problems of social origins, allegiance, and
ideology will, if systematized, lead to a sociology of
the writer as a type, or as a type at a particular time
and place. We can distinguish between writers according
to their degree of integration into the social process.
It is very close in popular literature. On the whole,
in modern times, and in the West, the literary man seems
to have lessened his class ties. There has arisen an
"intelligentsia", a comparatively independent in-between
class of professionals. It will be the task of literary
sociology to trace its exact social status, its degree
of dependence on the ruling class, the exact economic
sources of its support, the prestige of the writer in
each society.
The great financial rewards came only in the nineteenth century, when Scott and Byron wielded an enormous influence upon taste and public opinion. Voltaire and Goethe had vastly increased the prestige and independence of the writer on the Continent. The growth of the reading public, the founding of the great reviews like the 'Quarterly' made literature more and more the almost independent "institution".

Thus a study of the economic basis of literature and of the social status of the writer is inextricably bound up with a study of the audience he addresses and upon which he is dependent financially. Even the aristocratic patron is an audience. In even earlier society, in the group where folk poetry flourishes, the dependence of the author on the audience is even greater; his work will not be transmitted unless it pleases immediately. The role of the audience in the theatre is, at least, as tangible. There have been even attempts to trace the changes in Shakespeare's periods and style to the change in the audience. It becomes harder to trace the specific relation between author and public at a later time when the reading public rapidly expands, becomes dispersed and heterogeneous, and when the relationships of author and public grow more indirect and oblique. The number of intermediaries between writers and the public increases—We can study the role of such social institutions and
associations as the salon, the café, the club, the academy and the university. We can trace the history of reviews and magazines as well as of publishing houses. The critic becomes an important middleman. The associations of literary men themselves may help to create a special public of writers or would-be writers.

The graph of a book's success, survival and recrudescence, or a writer's reputation and fame is, mainly, a social phenomenon. In part it belongs, of course, to literary 'history', since fame and reputation are measured by the actual influence of a writer on other writers, his general power of transforming and changing the literary tradition. In part, reputation is a matter of critical responses till now, it has been traced chiefly on the basis of more or less formal pronouncements assumed to be representative of a period's "general reader". Fashion is also an important phenomenon in modern literature.

The modern writer's isolation from society invites sociological study. A Russian socialist, G. Plekhanov, believes that the doctrine of "art for art's sake" develops when artists feel a "hopeless contradiction between their aims and the aims of the society to which they belong. Artists must be very hostile to their society and they must see no hope of changing it."

Writers may succeed in creating their own special public; indeed, as Coleridge knew, every new writer has
to create the taste which will enjoy him. The writer is not only influenced by society; he influences it. Art not merely reproduces life but also shapes it. People may model their lives upon the patterns of fictional heroes and heroines. They have made love, committed crimes and suicide according to the book, be it Goethe's "Sorrows of Werther" or Duma's "Musketeers".

The most common approach to the relations of literature and society is the study of works of literature as social documents, as assumed pictures of social reality. It cannot be doubted that some kind of social picture can be abstracted from literature. Indeed this has been one of the earliest uses to which literature has been put by systematic students. Thomas Warton, the first real historian of English poetry, argued that literature has the "peculiar merit of faithfully recording the features of the times, and of preserving the most picturesque and expressive representation of manners. "To him literature was primarily a treasury of costumes and customs, a source book for the history of civilization, especially of chivalry and its decline. As for modern readers, many of them derive their chief impressions of foreign societies from the reading of novels, from S. Lewis and Galsworthy, from Balzac and Turgenev.

Used as a social document, literature can be made to yield the outlines of social history. Chaucer and
Longland preserve two views of fourteenth-century society. The Prologue to the "Canterbury Tales" was early seen to offer an almost complete survey of social types. Shakespeare, in the "Merry Wives of Windsor", Ben Jonson in several plays seem to tell us something about the Elizabethan middle class. Jane Austen depicts the country gentry and country persons early in the nineteenth century; and Trollope, Thackeray and Dickens, depict the Victorian world. At the turn of the century, Galsworthy shows us the English upper middle classes; Wells, the lower middle classes; Bennett, the provincial towns.

The life of post-Restoration Paris and France seems preserved in the hundreds of characters moving through the pages of Balzac's "Human Comedy", and Proust traced in endless detail the social stratifications of the decaying French aristocracy. The Russia of the nineteenth century landowners appears in the novels of Turgenev and Tolstoy; we have glimpses of the merchant and the intellectual in Chekhov's stories and plays and of collectivized farmers in Sholokhov.

Examples can be multiplied indefinitely. But such studies seem of little value so long as they take it for granted that literature is simply a mirror of life, a reproduction, and thus, obviously, a social document. Such studies make sense only if we know the artistic method of the novelist studied, can say— in what relation the picture stands to the social reality.
Marxist criticism is at its best when it exposes the implied, or latent, social implications of a writer's work. In this respect it is a technique of interpretation parallel to those founded upon the insights of Freud or of Nietzsche or of Pareto. The central distinction is that Nietzsche's and Freud's methods are psychological, while Pareto's analysis of "residues" and "Derivatives" is sociological.