355

**Marian
Janssen**

THE KENYON REVIEW (1939 -- 1970)

A CRITICAL HISTORY

A CRITICAL HISTORY

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor in de letteren
aan de Katholieke Universiteit te Nijmegen,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Prof. Dr. B.M.F. van Iersel
volgens besluit van het College van Decanen
in het openbaar te verdedigen op vrijdag 4 december 1987
des namiddags te 3.30 uur
door

MARIA LINA MARGARETHA JANSSEN

geboren te Deventer

NIJMEGEN 1987

Promotor: Prof. Dr. G.A.M. Janssens

to my mother

and the memory of my father

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
PROLOGUE: THE AMERICAN LITERARY REVIEW	1
1. TOWARDS THE FIRST ISSUE	11
John Crowe Ransom, Fugitives, Agrarians	11
Associates and Advisors	18
The Scope of the Magazine	25
Finances, Circulation, Promotion	30
Characterizing the New Critics	37
The New York Intellectuals	46
The First Issue	50
2. A MULTIPLICITY OF INTERESTS (1939-1942)	56
Criticism	56
Pedagogics, Philosophy, Politics, Psychology	73
Poetry	89
Fiction and the Fine Arts	95
Finances, World War II, and <u>The Southern Review</u>	100
3. A FLOWERING OF CRITICISM (1942-1947)	110
Philip Blair Rice, Advisory Editors, Rockefeller Fellows	110
Special Issues, "Reconsiderations," New Critical Articles	120
The New York Intellectuals, Kenneth Burke	141
4. POETRY, FICTION, AND OTHER INTERESTS (1942-1947)	146

Contents

Other Critics, Philosophy, Politics	146
Poetry and Fiction	161
Drama and the Fine Arts	173
Finances and the Rockefeller Foundation	178
 5. RECOGNITION AND NEW DIRECTIONS (1947-1955)	 182
Academic Influence, the Bollingen Prize, the Rockefeller Foundation	182
The Kenyon School of English and the <u>Kenyon Review</u> Fellows	196
Challenging the New Criticism	208
 6. A SECOND FLOWERING OF CRITICISM (1947-1955)	 215
The Donne Series and the Dante Symposium	215
Individual Approaches to Criticism	220
New Critics and New York Intellectuals	236
 7. LITERATURE AND THE ARTS (1947-1955)	 265
Philosophy and Politics	265
Poetry	268
Fiction	283
Drama and Film	295
Finances and Foundations	304
 8. DECLINE (1955-1960)	 312
The Institutionalization of the Quarterlies	312
The Search for a Successor	320
Criticism	334
Poetry, Fiction, the Fine Arts	355

Contents

AFTERMATH: RANSOM'S REVIEW IN PERSPECTIVE	369
Change-over	369
Change for the Worse	396
The End of a Tradition	407
NOTES	418
INDEX	488

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the writing of this study I have been helped in many ways by individuals and institutions.

First of all I am indebted to Helen Ransom Forman, literary executrix of the John Crowe Ransom estate, and her daughter Elizabeth, for granting me permission to consult and quote the Ransom correspondence, and for talking to me about The Kenyon Review in its Ransom days. My thanks also go to Evan Rice, Philip Blair Rice's son, for making his father's correspondence available and for sharing his remembrances.

I am very grateful to Robie Macauley, George Lanning, and Ellington White for answering, during long interviews, my many questions about their editorial intentions and about other matters concerning The Kenyon Review. Eric Bentley, Cleanth Brooks, Kenneth Burke, and Robert Penn Warren, all important contributors, also were most gracious and freely exchanged views with me about literary criticism and literary magazines. David McDowell recalled for me the Kenyon's early days, when he helped Ransom and Rice to get out the magazine. George Core and Thomas Daniel Young, experts in the field of Southern literature and literary magazines, shared some of that expertise with me. Irving Kreutz, Monroe K. Spears, and Peter Taylor patiently answered my question-filled letters.

Ronald Sharp and Frederick Turner, the founders and first editors of the second series of The Kenyon Review (1979-) talked with me about their editorial views and retrieved from their archives at Gambier, Ohio, boxes full of material mainly dealing with business matters concerning the first series. Others at Kenyon College were equally

helpful. Kenyon's President, Philip H. Jordan, Jr., its head librarian, William T. Dameron, and its archivist, Thomas B. Greenslade made all correspondence, memos, and other original materials about The Kenyon Review available to me. Gerrit and Janet Roelofs and the late Robert Daniel were among the many friendly people at Gambier who talked to me about The Kenyon Review.

Next to Kenyon College, I acknowledge the assistance of over fifty institutions in making letters and documents in their collections available to me. For brevity's sake I cite here only those institutions that have provided me with material from which I have quoted in the text: University of Arkansas Library; Boston University Library; Brown University Library, University of California at Berkeley Library; Columbia University Library, Cornell University Library; East Texas State University Library; Harvard University Library; Hudson Review Office; Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Indiana University Library, University of Iowa Library; Library of Congress; University of Maryland Library; University of Minnesota Library; Newberry Library; New York Public Library; University of Pennsylvania Library; Pennsylvania State University Library; Princeton University Library; Rockefeller Foundation Archives; Sewanee Review Office; Tennessee State Library and Archives; Vanderbilt University Library; University of Virginia Library; University of Washington Library; Washington University Library; Washington and Lee University Library; and Yale University Library.

I am most grateful to Professor T.A. Birrell and Professor Harry Finestone, who read an incomplete version of my manuscript; their suggestions have greatly furthered its growth towards healthy maturity.

Berna Hendriks, Nico de Milliano, Ninette Nelis, Marjan de Ruyter, Chris Wouters, and Anneke Zwaan have assisted me with the more practical aspects of my work: I thank them. I am grateful to Roos van Rooy for proofreading the manuscript and to Félix Villanueva for designing the cover.

The birth of The Kenyon Review in 1939, its life, and its death in 1970 escaped the attention of the majority of the American reading public. Yet it was this review, with its circulation of 6,000 at most, which to an important degree shaped the literary sensibility of a generation. As G.A.M. Janssens has so exemplarily shown, The Kenyon Review belongs to the tradition of the twentieth-century American literary review which came into being in New York City in January 1920 when the old Chicago Dial was reconstructed by Scofield Thayer and James Sibley Watson. The new Dial (1920-1929) was modelled on La Nouvelle Revue Française, established in France in 1909; and it felt affinity, as did its successors, to T.S. Eliot's Criterion, edited in Great Britain from 1922 to 1939. These successors constitute a group of similarly serious and intellectual magazines, which were closely patterned after The Dial, though they all possessed distinctive personal characteristics. They are the lively, youthful Hound & Horn (1927-1934), which emphasized literary criticism and a topical coverage of the arts with special attention for the American scene; the disinterested Symposium (1930-1933), which crossed to and fro between literary criticism and philosophy, had a theoretical slant and was internationally oriented; and, most comprehensive of all, the personable Southern Review (1935-1942), which stressed literary criticism--as a creative pursuit and as an academic discipline--and cultural and political debate, and was interested in both national and international and regional issues.¹

These short-lived highbrow magazines are the immediate predecessors of the leading literary reviews of the malleable forties and fifties, The Kenyon Review, the reconstructed Sewanee Review, Partisan Review,

and a newcomer in 1948, The Hudson Review. Each of these reviews has its own distinctive character and its own specific history determined by internal, editorial and external, cultural factors. Still, their common parentage and the way in which they presented themselves to the public warrant grouping them into one family. Crudely categorizing their common traits, we find that they were manifestly and proudly highbrow and that they published, first of all, serious, searching criticism, mainly of literature but also of the other arts. They also published poetry and fiction, which were usually selected according to the same criteria as the criticism and, consequently, complemented and highlighted the criticism. We find that these literary reviews refused to bow down to the people who regarded them as futile undertakings read only by those few writing for them; in their heyday they often published critical and creative writing which would be generally accepted only years later.

"The ideal task of the critical quarterly is not to give the public what it wants, or what it thinks it wants but what--through the medium of its most intelligent members--it ought to have," Allen Tate, the power behind many literary reviews, asserted unhesitatingly in 1936; only in 1944, when he had become the editor of The Sewanee Review, did he discover the chasm between aspiration and achievement, between ideals and reality. Still, the editors of the main reviews of the forties and fifties were driven by such a sense of mission as is revealed in Tate's words; and it is precisely this missionary zeal which made their magazines into the literary legislators of their times. These editors cared so passionately for and were so fervent in their defence of a certain conception of literature that their reviews became nuclei toward which like-minded contributors gravitated

naturally. Consequently, it was soon a common charge that the literary reviews published and discussed the same writers time and again--but then, as Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, the editors of The Southern Review, remarked, it "is only natural that when an affinity is discovered between a magazine and a writer the work of that writer will appear there rather often."² Besides, while the critical cultivation of a core of writers the editors believed in gave their magazines their individual character, in their heyday these literary reviews never were house organs of only one kind of criticism; they were open to other kinds of superior criticism, always aiming for the perfect balance between a too exclusive cliquishness and an all-inclusive catholicity.

Charges of prejudiced partisanship--and of an overemphasis on criticism--brought against the reviews were often fed by nostalgia for the little magazines that had flourished from World War I until the thirties. In the sixties a new wave of little magazines, also designed to shock, challenge, and change, flooded the literary landscape.³ Wedged between these two ages of expansion and experimentation, the forties and fifties were an age of concentration and introspection; they have come to be called, usually derogatively, the age of criticism. But the editors of the literary reviews, which filled the void the littles had left, were only a little less passionate, if more solemn, than the editors of the little magazines. They set out to explore and explain the new literature that had sprung up and which they themselves had sometimes helped to blossom; simultaneously, they set out to show that literature has its own unique value, that it is not just a propagandist means to political ends, and therefore deserves, even demands, its own unique attention.

In bracketing Partisan Review with the Kenyon, Sewanee, and Hudson

reviews, we have done some violence to, yet not roughly violated literary history. The Kenyon, Sewanee, and, later, Hudson reviews had modelled themselves on The Dial, The Hound & Horn, The Southern Review, and each other, what is more, the first two were edited by a group of friends bound by background and literary beliefs. Partisan Review had started out quite differently. It began in New York City in 1934 as a publication of the John Reed Club and so was initially committed to Party Line critical and creative writing. Within a few years, however, after its turn against Stalinism, the propagandist emphasis of this magazine decreased, whereas its literary value increased. In 1943 Dwight Macdonald, one of its editors, resigned in disgust because Partisan had left the thorny fields of politics and had become too exclusively 'literary.'⁴ Yet, during the early years, Partisan Review kept its leftist orientation and the bulk of the criticism it printed was imbued with the notion that writers are influenced by the politics of their times.

With the advancing age and, perhaps, the ageing of Partisan's editors and contributors, their writings, which once had been radically informed, became liberally informed. Meanwhile, although The Kenyon Review was being stereotyped as politically conservative, mainly because of the Agrarian background of John Crowe Ransom, its main editor, Ransom's political convictions had become liberal. What is more to the point, however, is that the The Kenyon Review had always eschewed political debate and from the first had explicitly and particularly dissociated itself from Southern patriotism. At any rate, by the mid-fifties Partisan Review had, roughly, exchanged its--putative--proletarian reading public for an intellectual elite and its political ideological criteria for aesthetic ones. In its emphasis on

distinguished writing Partisan had come to resemble the Kenyon, Sewanee, and Hudson reviews so closely that they were often lumped together under some such title as 'The American Big Four.'⁵

The great influence of the literary reviews in the forties and fifties, as Monroe K. Spears has written, "need not be argued, for no one denies that they have a considerable influence; the common tendency, in fact, is to exaggerate this influence and hold the quarterlies responsible for whatever is wrong in the literary world." There is also general agreement about the predominance of the Kenyon and Partisan among these reviews. The role Partisan Review has played has been given extensive attention; directly, in a full-blown book, Writers and Partisans (1968) by James Gilbert, in a dissertation, "Partisan Review," (1980) by Herbert Eugene Shapiro, and in numerous articles; indirectly, in the spate of publications about the New York intellectuals, including the memoirs of such members of the Partisan family as Lionel Abel, William Barrett, Irving Howe, Alfred Kazin, William Phillips, and Norman Podhoretz. Although, indeed, some of those most intimately connected with The Kenyon Review--John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, and Robert Penn Warren--have also been discussed extensively, their relationship to the Kenyon has usually been neglected. "[W]ith the founding of the Kenyon Review [Ransom] entered upon his time of greatest influence in criticism and poetry," Louis D. Rubin remarked in a review of Gentleman in a Dustcoat: A Biography of John Crowe Ransom (1976) by Thomas Daniel Young. In this long biography, however, the account of Ransom's twenty-one years as the editor of the Kenyon is surprisingly short. Moreover, in the few articles in which The Kenyon Review is treated individually and not as just one of the "Four Reviews," the Kenyon is often misconceived as a

narrowly New Critical magazine dominated by a coterie of reactionary Southerners. With the possible exception of a dissertation by Donald Lloyd Clarke, "John Crowe Ransom: Editor" (1972), dealing superficially with the first twelve years of Ransom's editorship of the Kenyon, hardly any serious attempt to demythicize this imaginary Kenyon Review has been made. Therefore, to right the record and to give this magazine the place it deserves, a history of The Kenyon Review, on the one hand internal and individual, concentrating on its contents, and on the other hand external and general, taking into account the American literary situation at large, would seem a useful undertaking.⁶

A literary magazine is a complex organism and the analyst who would do justice to all its aspects and nuances must not be tempted by a limiting parti pris. In his "Little Magazines: Notes towards a Methodology," Alan Wall stresses the importance of beginning "from the magazines themselves, from their own unique mode of production, if false accordances are not to be established after the fact."⁷ This study starts from no preconceived notions about The Kenyon Review. It quantifies and analyses the relation between critical and creative writing in the magazine, the different approaches to criticism and their prominence, and the balance and shifts between different editorial concerns such as literature, philosophy, and the arts. It tries to assess the particularity and place of the individual contribution in the ongoing editorial concern for significance and continuity. While attention is given to maverick contributors and incidental editorial discoveries and firsts in all fields, the lineaments of the magazine can be best traced in the impact of the regular circle of Kenyon contributors.

The final estimate of the place and the importance of a literary

review rests in its bound volumes, but much of the interest of a critical history of its coming-to-be and its influence derives from the extent in which it is possible to recreate its daily life. Private editorial intentions and ambitions are often but dimly reflected in the periodic instalments offered to the world at large, and the only way in which these intentions and ambitions can be recaptured is by interviews and, most illuminatingly, from original unpublished sources. In this study extensive use has been made of such sources. Wherever possible, the analysis of the Kenyon's contents has been informed by insights about editorial considerations, about the authors' intentions and readers' reactions, culled from private correspondence or gained from interviews. The use of these original materials, dealing with everything from lowly but crucial financial matters to splendid but unrealistic editorial dreams, has clarified much about what went into the making of a most influential literary review.

Based, then, on the Kenyon's contents and on unpublished sources, and taking account of the literary situation, the argument of this critical history will be that during the first decade, at a time when a new and serious approach to literature was desperately needed, The Kenyon Review was the magazine which most frequently and most consistently published creative, impassioned New Criticism, without closing its pages to other kinds of imaginative, serious criticism. Contrary to common opinion, the cultural criticism of such New York intellectuals as Philip Rahv, Isaac Rosenfeld, and, particularly, the Kenyon's advisory editor from 1942 to 1963, Lionel Trilling, was not only not repulsed, but, indeed, welcomed warmly; this was mainly thanks to Philip Blair Rice, Ransom's versatile, indispensable associate editor. Besides criticism, philosophical and, during its first few

years, pedagogical concerns made up a generous part of its contents. But political and regional issues were avoided; reading the Kenyon of the early forties one has virtually no sense that World War II was being fought. From the first, poetry was an essential and glorious feature and the Kenyon inspired and helped to advance many of the most distinguished mid-century American poets, among them Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell, and Karl Shapiro. When The Southern Review expired in 1942, it left its emphasis on fiction to its rightful heir, The Kenyon Review, and talented short story writers, in much greater number and diversity than is commonly assumed, began to frequent the Kenyon's pages.

These important creative aspects of the Kenyon have been grossly neglected because the brave spirit of its criticism has overshadowed the excellence of its record in poetry and, to a lesser degree, in fiction. Within a decade of the Kenyon's birth the vibrant originality of its critical articles had made criticism the order of the day. With the other literary reviews in its wake, The Kenyon Review, which had been the demon of the academy when criticism was suspect, had become its darling. By the fifties virtually all universities had rallied round the banner of the New Criticism, regarding the Kenyon as their leader. Paradoxically, by this time the criticism published in The Kenyon Review was almost anything but New Critical. With the publication of superior samples of all kinds of new approaches to criticism, from biographical to mythical, the magazine was once more ahead of its time. The creative writing appearing in its pages was of the same high quality as its literary criticism; excellent drama and movie criticism added extra spice to this exciting salmagundi. It can indeed be shown, then, that although the Kenyon of the fifties is known

as the epitome of the New Criticism, its contents belie this assumption.

During the final years of Ransom's editorship, from about 1955 onwards, The Kenyon Review declined steeply. Several new literary reviews had been founded or would soon appear--Chicago Review, The Georgia Review, The Massachusetts Review, The Minnesota Review, Shenandoah, Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature--and the market for criticism had reached its saturation point. The fight for a critical approach to literature had been won with brilliant success. Moreover, Ransom was tired out; he was nearing seventy and while editing had once been his passion, it had now become mere routine. Unadventurous, conservative, anaemic, and academic, the Kenyon barely coasted along on its reputation.

When Ransom retired in 1960, it was hoped that the new editor, Robie Macauley, would bring a much needed fresh impetus to the magazine. Eric Bentley, for one, as he wrote to Macauley, would have 'like[d] to drag [the Kenyon] down from its academic height. . . . [A] sign of the victory of the critical approach in departments of literature is that even PMLA has become less arid. But as it moves toward KR, KR should back away fast! . . . As Chesterton said, nothing fails like success. . . . Things have been quietly going to sleep recently, not just at KR but 'at' all such reviews. Evergreen Review has grabbed a new audience but not in a fashion I'd like to see you copy. But what to do?"⁸ Macauley had a number of answers to that question. He shifted the Kenyon's focus from criticism—for which the literary review is a pre-eminently suitable vehicle--to fiction; he shifted its focus from America to the world at large, and he shifted its appeal from highbrow to middlebrow. But in his zeal to move with

his times, Macauley introduced so many new traits that The Kenyon Review lost its personality. Playboy, admiring the stories Macauley had published, kidnapped him in 1966 and made him its fiction editor. Macauley's successor, George Lanning, pursued Macauley's editorial policies, but lacked his creativity and drive. Moreover, whereas the social-literary weeklies and fortnightlies, including the newly founded New York Review of Books, could meet the renewed urgent need for immediate information and opinion about political issues, the Kenyon, appearing five times a year, was impotent. In other areas, too, The Kenyon Review simply was out of touch and no longer of vital interest or consequence to the intellectuals, let alone to the middlebrow public it had hoped to reach.

When The Kenyon Review was killed off in 1970, the literary world did not mourn the passing of Macauley's and Lanning's magazine; although contemporaneous, it had been so nondescript as to fade from memory almost instantly. Ransom's magazine, on the other hand, which had had its halcyon days a literary generation earlier, had been so clearly and brilliantly present as to be unforgettable, and it was his magazine that was commemorated. Therefore, The Kenyon Review under the editorship of Macauley and Lanning will be briefly discussed as a postscript to, and an elucidation of the magazine's golden years. This study, then, will put the emphasis where it is due, on the first fifteen years of The Kenyon Review, on a time when its contents formed a treasure house of critical and creative writing, on a time when it helped to define the literary culture because it tried, in Matthew Arnold's familiar words about the Revue des Deux Mondes, 'to understand and utter the best that is known and thought in the world.'⁹

John Crowe Ransom, Fugitives, Agrarians

When Gordon Keith Chalmers was elected President of Kenyon College in early 1937 he became the head of a school which, if it was known at all, certainly was not famous for its intellectual distinction. At the time of his selection Dr. Chalmers was President of Rockford College for women at Rockford, Illinois. Born in 1904, the son of a Baptist minister, he spent his boyhood in Philadelphia. After attending eastern private schools, he graduated from Brown University in 1925 and went to Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, where he received his B.A. in English literature. It was at Oxford that Gordon Chalmers met his future wife, Roberta Teale Swartz, a poet and fellow-American, who, as Ransom recalled in 1963, "really founded the Review. During her college days a strong-minded old mistress had enrolled her in an Eighteenth Century course, and made her read the British quarterlies of the period, not without remarking that no Review of such quality had yet appeared in America. Roberta at once resolved to remedy this disaster, and it is now known . . . that she early came to an understanding with Gordon that he would bring it about if and when he could."¹

Gordon Chalmers had taught English at Mount Holyoke College till 1934 when he became President of Rockford College. At Kenyon, where he succeeded the sixty-nine year old William Forster Peirce, Chalmers' main task, as Wilbur L. Cummings, chairman of the selection committee for the new President, wrote to him, was to raise the standards of scholarship.² He certainly lost no time in doing so: Chalmers was elected President at the Trustees meeting of May 1, and we already find

a memo by him referring to a visit to Kenyon College on May 15 and 16 by John Crowe Ransom with respect to a possible job as professor of philosophy and poetry. From the correspondence between Ransom and Chalmers during May and June of that year it becomes clear that the former did not have an inkling that Chalmers was planning to found a review at Kenyon. As Ransom did not feel qualified to head the philosophy department, Chalmers offered him a high position in the English department only, and Ransom immediately worried that his advanced teaching would condemn the other members of the department to elementary teaching. He obviously thought that the greater part of his time would be spent in teaching, but there is every indication that Chalmers had already set his heart on a review with Ransom as its editor: he even went so far as to go in person to Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee in order to persuade Ransom to come to Kenyon College.

In fact it was Robert Frost, whose word the Chalmerses took for gospel, who had suggested that Ransom be offered the editorship. At first sight it is a mystery why Frost proposed Ransom. Allen Tate, Ransom's closest friend and literary associate, admitted: "Well, not even his old friends were sure that he would become one of the great modern editors. He had not been very eager to know contemporary literature, so I for one supposed that he might well get out a quarterly in which his own fastidious taste was illustrated, and in which he might occasionally issue gentle fulminations against modern errors."³ He may have been Frost's choice, because he was one of the few American men of letters whom Frost did not regard as a threat to himself. Ransom, after all, had not published a book of poetry since his Two Gentlemen in Bonds appeared in 1927. Then, Roberta Chalmers'

second-place prize in the 1923 poetry contest held by The Fugitive--a magazine Ransom had helped edit--may have also played a role in Chalmers' decision. But for all that, there is no obvious clue in Ransom's history that accounts for his becoming one of America's foremost editors.

John Crowe Ransom, a Methodist minister's son, was born on April 30, 1888 in Pulaski, Tennessee, and spent most of his childhood in small towns in that state. He entered Vanderbilt University at fifteen, and studied philosophy and the classics. Because of his excellent record he was appointed a Rhodes scholar and studied "Greats" at Oxford--a programme which included Greek, Latin, philosophy, and ancient history--from September 1910 until July 1913. Back in America, Ransom became an instructor in English at Vanderbilt. In Nashville, Ransom also joined a group centred around the mystic Sidney Miron Hirsch, and took part in their philosophical discussions. This group of friends, which grew in number and would come to be known as the "Fugitives," met regularly after World War I. Soon their discussions shifted from philosophy to poetry and even Hirsch came to acknowledge Ransom's "leadership and influence in the Fugitive group," among other reasons because Ransom was the only member to have published a volume of poetry.⁴

In November 1921 Donald Davidson, who also taught English at Vanderbilt, took one of his pupils, Allen Tate, along to a Fugitive meeting. Tate was in his early twenties then. Born in Winchester, Kentucky in 1899, Tate had had a difficult youth and a haphazard education before he entered Vanderbilt in 1918, where he soon attracted Davidson's attention. Tate was the first undergraduate to be accepted into this group. His deep attachment to modernist poetry was eyed with

suspicion by his fellow-Fugitives. Indeed, the only serious falling-out Ransom ever had with Tate during their life-long friendship, which originated in this period in their lives, was over T.S. Eliot's The Waste Land, a poem Allen Tate immediately recognized as a masterpiece, while Ransom at that time still regarded it as an interesting oddity at best. This difference of opinion may have been one of the reasons why Tate had his doubts about Ransom's becoming a great editor.

Ransom's subsequent involvement with the Agrarian movement made him an even less likely choice as the editor of a midwestern quarterly. By the late thirties, Agrarianism was generally considered out of touch, reactionary, and, by some, racist. It is startling, therefore, that Chalmers should have wanted one of its foremost spokesmen to be the editor of the review that was intended to give prestige to his college. Still, there are some indications, however slight, that point to Ransom's eventual success as an editor. For one thing, although Ransom had not been appreciative of modernist poetry during his early Fugitive period, he became more favourably disposed to it as he grew closer to Allen Tate through the years. Then, too, there was his editorial experience on The Fugitive. Even though the usual editorial procedure at the Fugitive was to 'cling to an old-fashioned, roundabout method of group-action . . . with the very idea of securing the blessings of individual liberty against the possible suspicion of a tyrant," the actual editing was partly carried out by Ransom and provided him with some first-hand experience of editorial routine.⁵

It was also during this time that Ransom formed a close relationship with Robert Penn Warren, a relationship that was to prove reciprocally advantageous too. Indeed, ever since Warren attended his first Fugitive meeting in 1923 at the age of eighteen, Ransom, next to

1. Towards the First Issue

becoming a close personal friend, was the foremost influence on his development as a major American poet, novelist, and critic. Thus, as a Fugitive, Ransom acquired editorial experience and formed alliances with writers of stature, who became valuable contributors as well as advisors to The Kenyon Review. Both Tate and Warren, through their wide interests and their many contacts in the literary world, would bring new writers to Ransom's attention or themselves procure contributions for The Kenyon Review. Furthermore, during their meetings the Fugitives discussed each other's poems by paying close attention to the text and thus Ransom came to lay the groundwork for the critical theories which guided him when he came to edit The Kenyon Review.

As for his Agrarian beliefs, one must keep in mind that, in contrast to, for instance, Donald Davidson and John Gould Fletcher, Ransom was not really interested in the economic and sociological reality of Agrarianism. To him an agrarian society was an ideal world in which man could value God, nature, and art in all their fullness and complexity; he was interested in "the aesthetic and social relationship of man to nature." A few weeks before the actual release, on April 30, 1936, of the second collection of Agrarian essays, Who Owns America?, Ransom, one of the contributors, had written to Tate that he was "signing off but a little by degrees." A few months later, again in a letter to Tate, Ransom expressed himself much more forcefully: "patriotism has nearly eaten me up, and I've got to get out of it;" as a way out of Agrarianism he proposed to found an "American Academy of Letters" with Tate--which never came about--as "we need an objective literary standard." He went on to reject as prospective members of the Academy Agrarians like Andrew Lytle and John Gould Fletcher because he did not want "our list [to] be confused with a Fugitive or Agrarian

organization.⁶

Still, although all this makes Ransom's eventual editorial success a little less unexpected, his appointment remains hard to explain. For one thing, Frost and Chalmers could not have known that Ransom had already privately given up Agrarianism when the idea of his editorship was first raised. In any case, Chalmers' offer came at a good time, for although Ransom had earned his professorship at Vanderbilt without having obtained his Ph.D. and was highly esteemed by most of his colleagues and students, he was none too happy. At Vanderbilt Ransom remained identified with the Agrarian cause, was loaded with committee work, which he hated, and was continually being hounded to get his Ph.D., which he refused to do on principle, as he considered the mainly bio- and bibliographical emphases on which these degrees were usually based as having nothing to do with a true understanding of literature. Moreover, at Kenyon College Ransom would have a lighter teaching load, so that he could devote more time to his own writing. Finally, at Vanderbilt Ransom was earning \$3,820.00 a year, out of which he had to pay \$45.00 a month for rent, while the Kenyon offer was for \$4,500.00 in addition to the use of a house.⁷ All these considerations must have played their part in Ransom's decision, wired on June 11, 1937, to accept Chalmers' proposal and to leave the South and his Alma Mater for an old but undistinguished college in a tiny midwestern village.

An additional motive is furnished by Allen Tate. He regarded Ransom's leaving Tennessee . . . as [a] disaster, but found himself partly to blame for it. I pushed him into Ohio. Although this is an exaggeration, the rumpus that Tate in particular created when he heard that Vanderbilt's most prestigious professor might leave, may have tipped the scales in Kenyon's favour. When Tate realized that Ransom

was seriously pondering the Kenyon offer, he wrote an open letter to Vanderbilt's retiring Chancellor, James H. Kirkland, which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of May 26, 1937. Tate chided Kirkland for letting go "one of the most distinguished men of letters in the world today."⁸ Donald Davidson, Lyle Lanier, Andrew Lytle, and other Agrarians immediately rallied to this worthy cause: letters were written to F. Rand, the President of the Vanderbilt Board of Trustees, C. Cason, Director of the Alumni Association, O.C. Carmichael, the Chancellor elect, and to others, protesting Ransom's possible departure and urging Vanderbilt to match the Kenyon proposal. Vanderbilt students such as George Marion O'Donnell, Peter Taylor, Randall Jarrell, and David McDowell also championed Ransom: Jarrell, for instance, wrote a petition that was offered to Kirkland which celebrated Ransom as the university's best teacher for over two decades.

Though he realized that "John will not be pleased," Tate felt that if they did not put up a fight, the cause of literature in the South would suffer. He could only hope that Ransom would not be offended by his "high-handed methods" and would remain one of his "dearest friends." Next to writing petitions and angry letters to the literary world at large, Tate--who had actually returned to Kirkland his 'diploma to the University because it is no longer an honor to be one of her alumni"--was the main organizer of a dinner in Ransom's honour which was given on June 10, 1937. This dinner, at which Ford Madox Ford presided, was sponsored by the Southern and Virginia Quarterly reviews, and was attended by over a hundred people. Letters and telegrams by distinguished men and women of letters like T.S. Eliot ("Delighted add name Ransom testimonial"), Morton Dauwen Zabel ("Now that Vanderbilt is losing Ransom, another college will soon be mentioned enviously as a

place where one goes for something better than a degree, a diploma, and a lifetime exemption from responsible thinking and productive curiosity"), and Katherine Anne Porter ("Do raise the devil of a row. . . . [M]y deep regard and respect to John Crowe Ransom"), were read at this occasion.⁹

But all to no avail. At the dinner Ransom, characteristically the only one to keep his head, who had remained aloof from all these hectic activities, announced his decision to leave the South. This conclusion cannot really have come as much of a surprise, for on June 4 Andrew Lytle had already written to Tate that "the chances of retaining John look slim. He has given up all hope of staying."¹⁰

Associates and Advisors

On October 29, 1937 Ransom informed his mother of a "profound secret," which was that "the President called me to talk about founding and editing a great Review here; that is more than I ever ventured to hope for, and the most interesting thing I could possibly get into." When, on the same day, Ransom described this "very interesting situation" to Tate, he added that Chalmers

thinks of its editing as a full-time one-man job, aside from secretarial and business help. Doesn't want to withdraw me from all teaching, and proposes to go out and get another man to be a co-editor with me, both of us to teach half-time. . . . Wants to consider long and hard with me the choice of the man. Names a name or two I don't know and therefore suspect, is much impressed

1. Towards the First Issue

with the idea of [Mark] Van Doren. I held my peace but instantly occupied my mind with the idea of: TATE.

After Tate, Warren, of course.

Ransom realized that Kenyon was not the most intellectually exciting place to live, but he wanted Tate, as "we could really found criticism if we got together on it."¹¹

Chalmers gave reasons for establishing a quarterly to the Trustees of Kenyon College in a letter written at the end of December. He tried to sell them the idea that a "successful quarterly if well subsidized and well edited and managed, turns out to be the best possible publicity for the institution to which it is attached." Moreover, "the general intellectual and creative activity of the place is much stimulated by the creative and original men who are attracted to it because of the quarterly." Since a "quarterly stands or falls on the ability of its editor," Kenyon College was "most fortunate to have Mr. Ransom on the faculty, for his creative and critical experience certainly ranks him with the most sound and penetrating editors in this country and in England." Therefore, under his leadership Kenyon might 'develop a quarterly which will become a real influence in this country."¹²

Ransom meanwhile felt "greatly cheered" over Tate's immediate acceptance of Kenyon and the review project. He had already decided "that our cue would be to stick to literature entirely," and not to turn it into a quarterly also devoted to politics. Soon after, in his determination "to make sure of your connection with it," Ransom developed a plan to have Scribners, Tate's publisher, back the new review more or less in the way that Faber and Faber was financing J.S. Eliot's Criterion in England. Maxwell Perkins, however, Scribners'

legendary literary editor, showed no interest in a literary review.¹³

In late November Ransom wrote apprehensively about "the latest catch that . . . we make it a perfectly general Review, with all sorts of things, political and otherwise. . . . The distinction would be gone before we started.' In spite of the threat of a general review Ransom kept working towards his own kind of magazine as appears from a list of possible names for the new quarterly which he handed to Chalmers on December 8: Letters, Literature, Arts and Thought, The American Critic, American Letters, and also The Kenyon Reviewer and The Kenyon Review. These titles suggest that Ransom was still biased towards a literary review. Nevertheless, his report, two days later, of an extensive conversation with Chalmers shows that he had resigned himself more or less to a general review.

Personally I don't so much mind the thought of political philosophy, religion, philosophy in general, having representation in the review if I . . . have an editorial veto . . . in exercise of a literary control; and if it is understood that this . . . at once enlarges the size and scale of the project and does not propose to reduce the pure literary exhibit.

In this same conversation, Ransom proposed Tate to Chalmers, he had delayed mentioning Tate, hoping that the President would 'see of his own accord the unsuitability of most people for the position and be all the more agreeable to my proposal.' In spite of the fact that Chalmers had initially seemed somewhat diffident with respect to having two Agrarians as editors, Ransom could inform Tate that 'the prospect is

good."¹⁴

It soon appeared, however, that in spite of his enthusiasm for the review, which had also found expression in his letters to Scribners about their possible backing of the quarterly, Tate had more strings to his bow. He and his wife, the novelist Caroline Gordon, accepted an offer from the Woman's College at Greensboro, North Carolina, even though Tate would "prefer to be with Ransom." But should Tate not have accepted the Greensboro proposal--"which asks of us almost no work . . . and gives in return an amount of money . . . perfectly incredible"--he still would not have become Ransom's co-editor. For it appeared that Tate simply would have been too expensive. Ransom, thinking "that maybe in spite of your latest letter you were not irrevocably committed to Greensboro," had had a long talk with Chalmers who "had been extremely anxious to get you here with me." But, Ransom continued his New Year's Day letter, "things didn't work out right, a great disappointment of 1937 for me," as "the more we talked the more he felt that the financial prospect here wasn't of a kind to put up against the kind in hand there."¹⁵

Now that Tate was out of the running, another editor had to be found. Ransom realized that if Tate would have unbalanced the Kenyon budget, so would Robert Penn Warren, and he therefore left the search up to Chalmers. The latter immediately wrote to Philip Blair Rice to ask him, without as yet mentioning the review, whether he would be interested in "an appointment in philosophy." Chalmers had first met Rice at Oxford, where Rice too had been a Rhodes Scholar from 1925 to 1928. He was born in 1904, at Martinsville, Indiana. There he was brought up by his mother and his maternal grandfather, his father having disappeared when he was only one month old. Rice got his B.A.

1. Towards the First Issue

from Indiana University at Bloomington, Indiana, where his brilliant record procured him a Rhodes scholarship. Already at that time his interests were both in philosophy and literature. From Oxford, where, in Chalmers' words, he would "quote page after page of Santayana" and talked about "almost everything of importance: The newest poets, political theory, and philosophy," Rice went to Paris to become a reporter on the Paris Times. His friends there included, among others, Vernon Venable, with whom he collaborated by mail on an unsuccessful play and who later taught philosophy at Vassar College; Joseph Sagmaster, also from Indiana, who became a reporter on the Cincinnati Times-Star; and Theodore Geisel, who became famous as Dr. Seuss, the author of children's books. In 1930 Rice returned to the United States and soon became an assistant professor in philosophy at the University of Cincinnati. He devoted his spare time to both leftist politics and literature. Rice regularly contributed to The Symposium--where he published an attack on The Wasteland--The Nation, Poetry, and Partisan Review.¹⁶

Indeed Rice was, as Ransom wrote, "a most competent philosopher, [who] wishes he were a literary man." Therefore, when it appeared at the interview Chalmers had with Rice that his prospects at Kenyon involved not only his heading the new philosophy department, but also spending half his time as the managing editor of a literary review, Rice showed an immediate interest. When it turned out that a half-time salary would burden the review's low budget too heavily, Chalmers, at the end of May 1938, officially invited Rice to join the Kenyon faculty on a one-quarter review and three-quarters philosophy basis.¹⁷

A week earlier Ransom, who judged Rice to be "a good man though not a great one" and "very capable," had contacted Rice on his own

initiative to tell him that he had "laid it down as a condition with Chalmers that I'm unwilling to go it alone, that is, without your distinguished help. It would be too much of a responsibility, and would take up all my time." Ransom continued this letter with a most astonishing remark: "I need not enlarge on my own desire to see you here, for the double purpose of founding a Review and of improving the intellectual quality of Kenyon life. As for the former, it would be my pious expectation and hope that before long I would retire to the Editorial Board and leave you holding the bag; assuming of course that you found this move congenial."¹⁸

While the overall tone of this letter is honeyed, this last observation seems not mere flattery, but seriously and honestly meant, in which case Ransom's subsequent twenty-one years of editing The Kenyon Review would indicate that his enjoyment of the work was greater than he had initially expected. Besides, Ransom probably intended to give up editing in order to devote himself to poetry, but when it appeared that his vein of poetry had dried up, he continued the editorship of The Kenyon Review. That Ransom wanted Rice is beyond doubt, as appears again from his description of the Kenyon situation to Tate:

[Chalmers] was a little alarmed at your reference to Rice as a Leftist. He knew that perfectly well, and Rice is as honest as a man can be . . . but I guess he had hoped that Rice wasn't publicly known as a Leftist.
. . .

Rice has already come in, though Chalmers confessed to me that he would not have had Rice, except that I

1. Towards the First Issue

insisted on him, and that he thought I might keep Rice straight. . . . Each time I have been with him I have liked him better. His Leftism is not a literary matter; he only sees Collectivism as inevitable, he doesn't think it has anything to do with literature directly.¹⁹

In view of the fact that Kenyon College was going to publish a general review, that is, one including politics, and considering that the wealthy Trustees who backed The Kenyon Review were not of the society-improving kind, it is quite understandable that Chalmers, who had to answer to these influential Trustees, was alarmed. Thus, Ransom's insistence on Rice must have put him in a difficult position. Another factor that probably played a part in Chalmers' decision to appoint Rice after all, is that he may well have reasoned that with an editor with an Agrarian background and with a leftist managing editor, the review would get a balanced political section. It is also interesting to see that Ransom was not at all disturbed by Rice's leftism since it was only political and "not a literary matter." This shows that, as in his Agrarian days, Ransom was not interested in everyday active politics.

Chalmers now had an editor and a managing editor; he had also found a "young and enterprising and admirable" secretary, Norman Johnson from Harvard, "who had the double role . . . of secretary to the Kenyon Review (3/4 time) and Instructor of one section of Freshman composition." This "principle of stability" would be "the office man, the man who opens and files every communication, and nags . . . till the proper answer is made to each one, provided it is a communication that he cannot answer himself."²⁰ It soon appeared, though, that

Johnson was not all that stable: he left Kenyon College and the Kenyon within two years, mainly because he could not get along with Rice.

The Scope of the Magazine

Ransom and Chalmers also disagreed about the nature of the review: Chalmers and his Trustees wanting a general periodical along the lines of The Yale Review, while Ransom vastly preferred a review like The Dial, devoted to arts and letters only. But as he preferred a general review to no review at all, Ransom had acquiesced and had drawn up a four-page proposal for a general review for Chalmers at the end of January 1938. In spite of this serious attempt at outlining a general review in which Ransom described politics as "of maximum interest with readers," and briefly referred to possible sections on the social sciences, religion, and economics, he made it quite plain where his priorities lay. Ransom stressed that the "first distinction of a new Review . . . might lie in its superior literary quality," while, furthermore, his interpretation of his "Literature and the other Arts" section is clear: "In no field is there better room for a new periodical There are not Reviews enough to take care of the good literary critics who have emerged in this and the previous decade." He went on to describe the book review section and the foreign contributors, and emphasized that "the one art which a Review can exhibit in action is literature."²¹

On May 20, Ransom wrote to Tate that the review was "right on the edge of starting" and that it would be "a handsome thing, and of the most distinction I can make it, and prompt and regular" but, he again added, "my interest in it would be greater if it were a literary

magazine." About a week later the situation had changed drastically: Ransom had got his way because there was not "money enough to get out a real Review, I am glad to say. We've canvassed printers, who charge a lot of money hereabouts; and have finally dropped the notion of a skimpy publication trying to compete with the comprehensive article re[p]resented by 200-pagers like Yale and Southern Reviews, 170-pagers like Virginia Quarterly Review. We will get out 100-page issues and devote the pages exclusively to literature and the arts."²² In his report to Chalmers on "the present state of our periodical project" Ransom wrote more specifically:

We have turned, very naturally, to the idea of a Review devoted to literature and the arts Our dimensions are ample for a rich and substantial publication of this restricted character. At present there is nothing in America published under just this classification; but we would be a successor to several very brilliant periodicals which used to flourish in this field: SEVEN ARTS, THE DIAL, HOUND AND HORN. . . . Professionally, it is what I could edit best, better than the comprehensive kind of Review, and it is more according to my preference. I believe it is also closer to the interests of Professor Rice and Mr. Johnson, the other members of the Staff. . . . And, really, to me that sort of publication seems more becoming for the style of a periodical published under the auspices of a small college, whereas the general Review would seem rather to belong to an institution with large and

1. Towards the First Issue

diversified interest, to say nothing of a large war-chest, such as Yale University.²³

Naturally, Chalmers was less pleased by this change dictated by lack of money and on 28 May wrote that he regarded "the arts and letters as very generally related to all affairs and, consequently, will be inclined to interpret that phrase to include from time to time treatment of subjects not conventionally called literary or artistic."²⁴ It was on this same day, seven months after Chalmers had first broached the subject of a magazine to Ransom, that the Board of Trustees authorized the publication of the new review, the first issue to be out in December, 1938. The Kenyon Review was now a fact.

A fact, yes, but still a nameless one. Ransom reflected: "Kenyon might appear in the title . . . I don't dislike the term and it will mean a lot of subscriptions from dutiful though likely dumb Kenyon alumni." Soon he "had come to the name 'The Critic', or 'The American Critic'; but that scared [Chalmers] somehow; and I thought it mattered so little that I waived my insistence in view of more important concessions on his part. So it's THE KENYON REVIEW; with some sort of sub-title or qualification like, 'Devoted to Arts and Letters,'"²⁵

And Chalmers certainly made concessions, particularly in the matter of advisory editors. This subject came up first, naturally, in Ransom's letters to his literary confidant Tate. Ransom stated that "the last but not least item in our organization is a Board of Advisory Editors, of whom one shall be Tate; indeed the Chairman, if there is such an office. I fear it is an empty honor, at least it will not carry any compensation. . . . Be ready to name your accomplices." In Ransom's view to have Tate as an advisory editor at the least--"Much better if I

had you at Kenyon, and we were co-editors"--was of paramount importance. A few weeks later, when Ransom proposed Howard Baker, William Empson, Paul Rosenfeld, Allen Tate, Mark Van Doren, and Mrs. Chalmers, Gordon Chalmers wondered why he did not "refer to other members of the Kenyon Staff or to Kenyon Alumni." Ransom did not mind accommodating Chalmers somewhat by adding Philip Timberlake of the English department to the list as "it is not in him to do us harm" and as this would probably facilitate the relationship with the English department. A good move, for in the eyes of the members of this department Ransom was a Southern newcomer who earned more than they did and got the editorship of the new quarterly to boot. Ransom, however, did not want to "fill up our list with Faculty men regardless of their qualifications" and vetoing Rice's suggestion of Archibald MacLeish was his only other concession to Chalmers. On the final list of advisory editors only Philip Timberlake and Mrs. Chalmers [R.T. Swartz] appeared as courtesy names representing Kenyon College. Ridgely Torrance, a poet second only to Frost in Chalmers' opinion, was not on it, and neither was Gordon Chalmers, who in May had still asserted that 'I, also, shall be an associate [advisory] editor.' There were a few other names mentioned by Ransom himself that came to nothing: "Gilbert Seldes; he represents Movie-art (if any); . . . Marianne Moore; though I don't know if she would serve; [and] A painting man."²⁶

The following names, then, appeared as advisory editors on the masthead of the first issue of The Kenyon Review: R.P. Blackmur, "for moral support and for advertising purposes," P. Rosenfeld, "a music man, the best writer in that field . . . and we should have one non-letters man; he used to be with Hound and Horn," R.T. Swartz, A. Tate, P. Timberlake, M. Van Doren, and E. Vivas, a philosopher friend of

Rice's. As we have already seen, Timberlake and Swartz were there mainly to placate the Kenyon community. But while Eliseo Vivas, "a Venezuelan, a professor of philosophy at Wisconsin, considered brilliant among the philosopher group, and a pretty good literary man" must have been chosen partly for his closeness to Rice, and Mark Van Doren for his name, Ransom sincerely hoped to be counselled not only by Tate, but also by all non-Kenyon advisors. As Ransom wrote to Van Doren: "The duties of an Advisory Editor are whatever he will make them; we want his advices, his contributions, and his name on our masthead. It is all in our favor, not his." He asked them, for instance, to send a frank critique of the first issue of the magazine and hoped that they would steer any contribution they thought well of, and supposed Ransom or Rice had not heard of, in the Kenyon's direction. As it turned out, Ransom had to tell Tate after some three years that he remained "the one whose advice I have constantly sought, the only one."²⁷ Consequently, for this and other reasons which will be discussed in a later chapter, this first board of advisory editors--who received complimentary subscriptions, but no financial compensation--was disbanded as of the Autumn 1942 issue of The Kenyon Review. The job of the later advisory editors was not usually merely honorary; on the contrary, as will appear, some of them, such as Robert Penn Warren, Cleanth Brooks, and Eric Bentley, played an important part in the direction The Kenyon Review was to take. The importance of choosing the first group of advisory editors lies therefore not so much in the actual advice they gave, or, rather, did not give, but in the fact that it shows that from the very beginning of their relationship, Ransom had the upper hand even though Chalmers often tried to exert control.

Finances, Circulation, Promotion

In 1934 Ransom had written to John Gould Fletcher, impressionist poet and fanatic fellow-Agrarian, who had suggested that they publish an "unfashionable agrarian sheet," that he "would not care to be connected with a publication that did not promise to have a good run of life, to be soundly administered by a circulation department other than the poor editors, and to have some self respect by reason of a fairly full and presentable appearance." Now, in 1938, Ransom could be assured of nearly all of these conditions. As for the budget, thanks to large gifts of \$500.00 to \$1,000.00 per annum by individual Trustees and over a hundred smaller gifts by people who wished the new review well--among them were John Berryman, Richard Eberhart, Wallace Stevens, Ludora Welty, Paul Rosenfeld, the Fugitive poet Merrill Moore, and Frederick Dupee, one of the editors of Partisan Review--The Kenyon Review at the end of May, 1938 had \$15,000.00 pledged.²⁸

In December 1937, on the basis of a conversation with Lambert Davis of The Virginia Quarterly Review, Chalmers had announced to the Trustees that the average guaranteed annual subsidy necessary for a Kenyon quarterly review would be about \$6,000.00. When in spite of extensive canvassing it appeared that about \$5,000.00 annually would be all that they could count on, Chalmers had had to make the difficult decision to have a 100-page arts and letters review instead of a 132-page general one. But the approximately \$15,000.00 which was eventually pledged to the Kenyon was not meant to span three full years of publication, for a fair amount had to be spent before first publication on, for example, the over 4,000 copies of the first issue which were

sent out for promotional purposes to Kenyon's 2,700 alumni and others. The budget that Ransom sent to Chalmers in June gives a detailed account of how the money was to be spent. The Manufacturing Printers Company, at nearby Mount Vernon, Ohio, undertook to print 2,000 copies of a 96-page quarterly, including the cover, at \$440.00 per issue. As envelopes and mailing would come to about \$35.00 per issue, the total printing and mailing costs were \$1,900.00 annually. Furthermore, it was decided to pay contributors \$5.00 per page for prose, and about 50 cents per line for verse, thus making for a yearly amount of \$1,800.00. The other items on the list were Rice's salary of \$800.00, Johnson's salary of \$1,000.00, and office expenses, covering postage, stationary, office supplies, additional printer's costs for extra copies, circulars, and so on. Against total outgoings of \$6,700.00, income came from two sources only: the pledges and the sales in the form of subscriptions at \$2.00 per year and newsstand sales at 50 cents a copy.²⁹

The budget statement of July 31, 1939 indicates that The Kenyon Review had about 600 subscribers, an amount that had almost doubled by September 1941, reached the 2,000 mark by 1946 and remained more or less steady at between 2,000 and 3,000 during Ransom's editorship. When Robie Macauley took over as editor, he prided himself on having boosted the number of paid subscriptions to over 5,000 within a short period of time. It must be noted, however, that circulation figures may be misleading. Still, it would be going too far to agree with William Phillips, staunch editor of Partisan Review, who reasons that the number of subscriptions of a periodical directly correlates with the amount of money spent on promotion. Thoroughly researched and consequently much more dependable is Richard Blackmur's "Literary

Magazines Study" for the Rockefeller Foundation. In this study, which he submitted in 1944, Blackmur concludes that there is a "three thousand maximum paid circulation for a literary quarterly, ten thousand for a monthly, and twenty-three thousand for a weekly." Only through compromises in quality could these amounts be raised, Blackmur warned. Naturally, there are some links between circulation and the time and money spent on promotion, but one must keep in mind that the regular, faithful subscribers to a magazine, the ones that count, are only initially won over by promotion, but renew because of the quality of the periodical's contents. Blackmur's figures, it must be marked, should be understood as time bound: today they may probably be multiplied. Another indication that circulation figures are deceptive is that they do not reflect the number of readers, if only, as Monroe Spears noted, because "most of the quarterlies send almost half their copies to libraries."³⁰ In other words, circulation figures do not necessarily indicate influence.

Although too much promotion is liable to attract the May-fly type of reader, Ransom knew that some promotion was necessary to make the really interested reader aware of the existence of his quarterly and he campaigned doggedly. Here is George Lanning's account:

each year before Christmas we did a mailing--usually to our own subscribers and recent lapses--in the hope that readers would not only send in renewals but order gift subscriptions at (of course) a remarkable saving. Mr. Ransom either wrote the copy himself or extensively revised that done by other people; and I am sure there is at least one Ph.D.dissertation to be got from the

1. Towards the First Issue

Stately Subscription Letters of John Crowe Ransom. He began several of them "Dear Literate," which must have occasioned surprise as well as gratification in some of the recipients. The Dear Literates never responded in droves--except in the sense that the volume of manuscript submissions picked up for a month or two, each Dear Literate being persuaded that we would prefer his story, poem, or essay to his check. Everybody dreaded and hated these campaigns . . . The annual labor was gone through glumly, and when, weeks later, the last of those reply-paid envelopes came drifting in a euphoria seized the staff. We knew you had to do this kind of thing, and we had done it, but now we could forget the whole business for another year. . . .

Once in a while Mr. Ransom and Phil Rice would brood on possible features that might make the magazine more popular with the general reader. The only one I can recall Mr. Ransom suggesting--and he came up with it every time--was a crossword puzzle which would occupy the magazine's back page. It would be, of course of the highest literary order, difficult and yet irresistible. . . . I suppose Mr. Ransom envisioned . . . addicts scattered about in our colleges and universities, all of whom would have to subscribe to the Review in order to work on the puzzle, rather than meanly reading a library or departmental copy.³¹

1. Towards the First Issue

An example of a failed promotion campaign is Ransom's very first try: the sending of 2,700 free copies of the inaugural issue to Kenyon's alumni resulted in only a few one-year subscriptions, while Ransom had expected them to come through in hordes. Others were more co-operative. In November 1939, for instance, James Johnson Sweeney, one-time associate editor of the little magazine transition (1927-1939), offered Ransom "a list of names and addresses of Transition subscribers." "It would be doing them a good turn to call their attention to The Kenyon Review if they have not seen it. For in four issues you have done a great job," Sweeney wrote.³² It is unclear, though, whether his offer resulted in new subscribers to the Kenyon. At any rate, Ransom tried hard, if not always effectually, to launch his magazine. He had asked relatives and friends to make up lists of prospective subscribers and he gave his mother a subscription for Christmas.

Subsequently, in the course of the magazine's first year and a half, the promotion part was handled somewhat more efficiently. This was mainly due to the efforts of Philip Blair Rice. He reported:

Our promotion methods so far have consisted principally in the following methods: circulars to selected lists, advertisements in other periodicals, club subscription offers, and personal contacts by the staff. We have sent out some 30,000 circulars, in most cases following them up at least once and often twice by other circulars. . . .

We have received a considerable number of subscriptions from advertisements in other magazines. Most of these

1. Towards the First Issue

have been exchange ads and have cost us nothing except the space in the Review.³³

Rice also noted in this report that although the number of subscribers had increased satisfactorily, they had encountered difficulties with their newsstand sales. For one thing, the Kenyon's price of 50 cents per copy was higher than customary for a magazine of its size. All in all, however, one may conclude that with respect to its circulation The Kenyon Review did as well as might be expected from a magazine of its kind during Ransom's editorship.

Promotional problems were not the only ones Ransom and his staff were up against. Although already in September Ransom had decided that the cover was to be printed on gray Strathmore Emssary, he still had to find a design for that cover. Finally, Kenyon College was enlisted, and Norris Rahming, "the painter here directing the art students," drew a "most unusual and . . . distinguished cover." That Ransom actually admired this parochial cover, the main part of which consisted of a rather crude drawing of Bishop Philander Chase, the Episcopal founder of Kenyon College, on horseback, is hard to credit. Malcolm Cowley, one of the editors of The New Republic, voiced the feelings of most readers when he wrote to Rice that he could not have "my frank opinion of your cover because this letter is being dictated and there are certain words that I can't use. But if I translated my thoughts into respectable language, I'd say that it was God-awful."³⁴ After a second equally disastrous design by Rahming, it must have been Philip Blair Rice, who was much more sensitive to the visual arts than Ransom, who finally persuaded Ransom to follow Cowley's suggestion and have the artist Moholy-Nagy design the cover. Consequently, from the 1942 Autumn issue

until Robie Macauley became the editor, the Kenyon's cover was the simple, direct, two-colour one that still comes most readily to mind when one thinks of The Kenyon Review.

The first person Ransom turned to for help with regard to the contents of the maiden issue was, of course, Allen Tate, to whom he explained that it was not as difficult to find good critical articles as it was to maintain a high standard of writing. In the circular sent out to hundreds of prospective contributors, in which they were invited to submit critical essays--book reviews were usually assigned--this was stressed: "The KENYON REVIEW hopes to carry on literary and aesthetic discussion in language of rather severer economy than is usual, provided no sacrifice is required in the warmth of the style, or literary quality." Next to sending out this circular, both Ransom and Tate wrote personal notes to critics and poets they particularly coveted in order to make a splash with the first issue; among these were Ford Madox Ford, Ezra Pound, Delmore Schwartz, Edmund Wilson and Philip Wheelwright, one of the editors of the former review The Symposium. "Thanks for the announcement," Pound wrote from Rapallo. "On the face of it, it wd. seem that you mean to fill a long felt want." But, he added, 'I imagine I had better see the first issue before merely looking into my owne heart and typing.'³⁵ Meanwhile, Tate also contacted writers in Britain such as William Empson, Dylan Thomas, and T.S. Eliot. But the writers Ransom had most dearly wanted to display in his first issue were Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren, and Richard Blackmur, none of whom actually appeared in it. Blackmur had not yet secured permission from the Adams family to publish about Henry Adams; Warren had had to beg off because of other commitments; and Tate, although he had initially consented to do a review, also withdrew

at the last moment because he too was pressed for time.

Still, there also were people who needed no circulars, no urging at all. George Marion O'Donnell, for instance, had heard rumours about the new review and immediately sent a batch of poems, asked in the same breath about books he would like to review, what Ransom's policy was on critical articles, and whether he was interested in short stories. Similar submissions led Rice to lament to Kenneth Burke that they had received reams of poetry, but little that was worth printing, and to ask Burke to submit something. The poetry that finally did appear in the first issue came from much closer quarters, from Randall Jarrell and Robert Lowell, both at Kenyon College.³⁶

And so, although Ransom complained to Mark Van Doren "that the motions of a green editor are pitiful," the inaugural issue of The Kenyon Review took shape.³⁷ Most of the contributions were in by November 10, so that before the end of 1938, a little over a year after Chalmers had first mentioned the possibility of a quarterly to Ransom, the editor could send the very first issue of the magazine that came off the press to his mother. The Kenyon Review had been launched.

Characterizing the New Critics

Before the first issue was published it appeared, however, that Ransom had not irrevocably lost his heart to editing The Kenyon Review. When in November 1938 Tate wrote to Ransom about a possible position at the Woman's College at Greensboro, North Carolina, Ransom professed interest. The actual offer proved to be so attractive that Ransom wrote to his mother that "it looks like 'Ca'Lina' from here." Another very important consideration was that Tate was at Greensboro. Ransom foresaw

a great career for both of them in that they would "crowd" the North Carolina Press with "fine critical books," and would "get a foothold with educational conferences . . . and preach criticism and have fun."³⁸

But there were some drawbacks, too. For although The Kenyon Review "probably costs me more than it is worth," Ransom's "principal hesitation" was that he might be "letting down" Chalmers. Therefore, during the first negotiations with the Greensboro authorities Ransom had already specified that he wanted to see the Kenyon through its two trial years. And although no length of tenure had been stipulated in Ransom's Kenyon contract, Ransom gave Chalmers "every opportunity to talk me out of the [Greensboro] thing," and to procure money from an outside source. This money was both to relieve the Kenyon budget of the heavy burden of Ransom's salary--which far exceeded that of his colleagues--and to more or less meet the Greensboro offer. Chalmers secured a ten-year Carnegie grant of \$60,000.00 in total; and meanwhile Tate had resolved to leave Greensboro for Princeton. So Ransom decided to stay at Kenyon College after all. He explained: "The job here is at least equivalent to the Greensboro offer in every respect, and in fact a little better."³⁹ The Kenyon Review was saved, since, basically, Ransom was The Kenyon Review. This is not to say that Rice, Tate, and some of the other advisory editors were without influence with respect to editorial policies, but Ransom was in command: their power was based on his respect for their judgment. This autocratic control worked only for the good of the Kenyon.

Ransom's special interests were mirrored in The Kenyon Review and gave it its personality. Reading "Greats" at Oxford had made philosophy one of Ransom's durable interests. In a 1983 interview, Robert Penn

Warren recalled that when he was a student at Vanderbilt, Ransom read Plato and Kant all the time, and that Ransom kept struggling with Kantian problems all through his life. In Warren's opinion, Ransom took philosophy as seriously as literature, perhaps even regarding philosophy as "more of a profession," because it was something you had to "bite into."⁴⁰

However, Ransom always treasured poetry most. Even if his own poetry suffered under the strain of editing the magazine, his interest in poetry remained intense; to this the careers of Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell, and James Wright bear witness. Fiction, on the other hand, never won his heart. "I have the idea there is nothing to modern fiction but its ideology," Ransom wrote to George Marion O'Donnell in 1939. "The Marxists have done that for us, and all the critics are ideologizing now."⁴¹ The fact that most of his own critical articles deal with poetry also shows Ransom's preference. It must be added, however, that Ransom's opinion of fiction became more favourable over the years.

In the late thirties Ransom was no longer concerned with Agrarianism. In December 1937 he explicitly told Chalmers that he "would not like to see the Review pinned to any economic or political program," and in soliciting material from his old friend Donald Davidson he stipulated that "we won't be in the field for patriotic and agrarian things." Higher education now took the place Agrarianism had formerly occupied in Ransom's mind. There is a clear link between his interest in education and his preoccupation with criticism. Basically, Ransom's pedagogical ideas were the methodological elaborations of his critical theories. In early October 1937 he had written to Tate that "we certainly need some close modern critical studies; I mean modern as

1. Towards the First Issue

based on some close modern work as object of study; and we rarely get it." A few weeks later Ransom foresaw "so much future for critical studies that my own are just beginning; it's the biggest field that could possibly be found for systematic study, almost a virgin field. I want to wade right into it."⁴² And that is precisely what Ransom did with his Kenyon Review.

Initially, though, there was a danger that he would not be free to have his likes and dislikes determine the contents of the Kenyon. Ransom conceded that Chalmers had some "responsibility in the matter; it's his project, and he is responsible to the donors and to the Board and to the Kenyon community." But when he realized that Chalmers intended to interfere with the actual contents of the magazine, Ransom angrily informed Tate that "it is clear that I won't have that." Apparently that danger soon passed, for in August Ransom blithely told Rice that 'Chalmers . . . is not disposed at all to offer directions.' That Chalmers seemed to have every confidence in Ransom also appears from his moving heaven and earth to avoid losing Ransom to Greensboro. However, in early 1940 Chalmers overrode Ransom's recommendation of Robert Lowell and appointed David McDowell the Kenyon's secretary. Ransom felt that Chalmers had done so in order "to assert his authority" as "he is beginning to be afraid I am too highbrow an influence."⁴³ As a matter of fact, this uneasy, oscillating attitude was representative of Chalmers' relationship with the Kenyon to the end.

As Ransom's interest in criticism mainly determined the contents of his magazine, a closer look at the kind of criticism he believed in is called for. Just prior to his editorship of the Kenyon, in "Criticism, Inc.,"--virtually the one essay he continued to subscribe to all

through his life--Ransom had tried to define his brand of criticism:

What is criticism? Easier to ask, What is criticism not? . . . Professor Crane [of the Chicago School of Criticism] excludes from criticism works of historical scholarship and of Neo-Humanism, but more exclusions are possible than that. I should wish to exclude:

1. Personal registrations, which are declarations of the art-work upon the critic as reader. The first law to be prescribed to criticism, if we may assume such authority, is that it shall be objective, shall cite the nature of the object rather than its effects upon the subject.

2. Synopsis and paraphrase. . . .

3. Historical studies. . . .

4. Linguistic studies. . . . Acquaintance with all the languages and literatures in the world would not necessarily produce a critic, though it might save one from damaging errors.

5. Moral studies. . . . [T]he moral content is not the whole content, which never should be relinquished.

6. Any other special studies which deal with some abstract or prose content taken out of the work.

After having extensively described what criticism is not, Ransom, in trying to define what it is, only gets as far as the following:

However the critic may spell them, the two terms are in his mind: the prose core [or "structure" in Ransom's

later terminology] to which he can violently reduce the total object, and the differentia, residue, or tissue, [later: "texture"] which keeps the object poetical or entire. The character of the poem resides for the good critic in its way of exhibiting the residuary quality.⁴⁴

It is not surprising that a pronouncement like this, one which was worked out in Ransom's book The New Criticism, in which he again stressed that "the distinction . . . especially of DM [Determinate Meaning, a refinement on his term structure], and IM [Indeterminate Meaning, a refinement on his term texture] is the vocation par excellence of criticism," would come under fire. This emphasis on technique was branded "academic" and lacked "gusto;" this kind of criticism had become 'a science' and was "monstrous--an obsession with skill... that made criticism larger than life... and never touched it"--; it was, in short, "mere barbarism." One must remember, however, that Ransom paid so much attention to texture and structure, to form, because it had been completely submerged in the reigning approaches to literature in the thirties, ranging from Humanism to Marxism. This appears from his using words like "a change of policy" and "strategy" in "Criticism, Inc.," and from the fact that, once his battle was won, Ransom was the first to stress that the prose content of a poem is as important as its texture, and that historical studies can be useful. This is not to say that Ransom was inconsistent. He merely changed emphasis: in "Criticism, Inc." he had already added to his extensive description of what criticism is not that "the critic may well inform himself of [all] these materials as possessed by the

artist, but his business as critic is to discuss the literary assimilation of them."⁴⁵

Surely, Cleanth Brooks, Allen Tate, R.P. Blackmur, William Empson, and Ransom himself are New Critics: they in fact labelled themselves as such in 1948. But here we strike a snag, for both Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren have repeatedly argued that Ransom is not a New Critic. And in "A Burden for Critics" R.P. Blackmur describes the New Criticism as "facile," finds it too exclusively technical and only suitable for a very restricted kind of poetry. In his turn, Cleanth Brooks is condemned by Ransom for paying too much attention to detail "in the manner of the bee who gathers honey from the several blossoms as he comes to them, without noticing the bush which supports all the blossoms;" and Ransom criticizes William Empson for his overindulgence in ambiguity for ambiguity's sake. If these New Critics, for all their superficial likenesses, are so much at variance with each other, less prototypical New Critics such as Robert Penn Warren, Austin Warren, Arthur Mizener, and, especially, such critics as Eric Bentley, Francis Fergusson, Eliseo Vivas, and F.O. Matthiessen who are only infrequently classified among them, reinforce Tate's observation that the "New Critics look alike as Mongolians look alike to me; as Mr. Ransom might look, to them, like the late Babe Ruth."⁴⁶

In spite of the stress here given to the differences and disagreements among the New Critics, the term does have a characterizing significance. All three of Ransom's archetypal New Critics--I.A. Richards, Y. Winters, and T.S. Eliot--discussed in The New Criticism (1941) are commended by him for their emphasis on the literary text. Richards is described as an "astute reader" whose "most incontestable contribution . . . is in developing the ideal or exempla-

ry readings, and in provoking such readings from other scholars;" Winters' "distinction is his skill in analyzing structure;" while "it is likely that we have had no better critic than Eliot," who is an even "closer" reader than Dryden or Johnson. In 1979 Cleanth Brooks confirmed this view of the New Critics as truly essential by pointing out that a critic has a choice of three possibilities: to put emphasis on the reader, the writer, or the writing, and that the New Critics chose the third option.⁴⁷

The emphasis on the text itself led to a concern with the technical aspects of the text, and terms like "wit," "paradox," and "irony" became the fashion. It is easy to see that this kind of detailed analysis is more readily applicable to poetry than to prose, and more suitable to dense, complicated metaphysical and modernist poems than to sprawling, less tight and complex romantic poems, which indeed the New Critics neglected. George Core's opinion that "the New Criticism was created in part as a means of coping with . . . modernism" is shared by many other critics. Also, the emphasis on technique sometimes led to excesses, when for some critics obscurity became an essential characteristic of good poetry. This moved William Barrett to object to the New Critical "use of an elaborate apparatus to reach a point which I find usually very trivial, even banal."⁴⁸

Most frequently the New Criticism is linked with reactionary politics. The Agrarian background of most of the Southern New Critics, the contributions of some of them to Seward Collins' eventually fascist American Review, and T.S. Eliot's political conservatism probably all account for this association. In contrast to the Marxist critics, most of the New Critics consciously avoided political implications in their discussions of literature, and that too could be--and has been--

interpreted as evincing a reactionary political stand. But in fact Ransom became a New Dealer in the early forties, and Empson, Bentley, Rice, and F.O. Matthiessen had always held leftist political views. Besides, it is less to the point to attack the New Critics for their alleged reactionary views than to call them to account for their literary misinterpretations.

Other complaints that have often been voiced are that the New Criticism feels a "strong antipathy to . . . the historical method of studying literature;" has "at least a limiting or negative influence on much of the [creative] work produced;" is "narrow and dogmatic and also erratic," "too much like an intellectualized version of art for art's sake," and, in effect, the "equivalent of the scientist's escape from life into the laboratory." They "take in each other's washing and listen to each other's disputations with admirable gravity and seem to themselves to be of the first importance in moulding literary opinion in the United States. . . . For them, your people, sir, is a great beast; and they therefore retreat upon . . . the impression that Mr. Eliot's essays have somehow profoundly revolutionized the literature of the age."⁴⁹ What is noteworthy with respect to the torrent of adverse comments against the New Critics is that it was turbulent in the late thirties and early forties, quietened down during the mid-forties, and gained strength again towards the end of that decade and, apart from a brief calm, into the fifties and sixties. The growth in influence of the New Criticism may be seen to account for this fluctuation.

In the broad definition of the New Criticism, with its emphasis on the writing rather than on the reader or the writer, we must certainly call The Kenyon Review during the first ten years of Ransom's editorship a New Critical magazine. Next to Ransom and Rice themselves,

R.P. Blackmur, Cleanth Brooks, Robert Penn Warren, Arthur Mizener, Eliseo Vivas, and Eric Bentley, all of whom may fairly be called New Critics, were the main contributors to the Kenyon during this period. Most of these critics also contributed to The Hound & Horn and The Southern Review, but as both these magazines were of a more general nature than The Kenyon Review and, above all, as The Kenyon Review appeared at exactly the right moment in history--at a time when there was a critical vacuum waiting to be filled--it was The Kenyon Review that came to be known as the epitome of the New Criticism.⁵⁰

The New York Intellectuals

The Kenyon Review was never limited to the New Criticism only. Already during the first years of its existence the editors gave ample space to the writings of the New York intellectuals. It is quite as hard to characterize them as it is to pin down the New Critics. Sometimes, in fact, these two groups of critics are interchangeable. Delmore Schwartz, for instance, who was labelled a New York intellectual by his biographer James Atlas, wrote to Tate in 1938: 'when I do write good criticism I am merely extending something I have learned from Eliot or yourself.' Even Lionel Trilling, whom Grant Webster described as "the Intellectuals' Representative Man," and whom Alfred Kazin has called 'an Emersonian teacher of the [New York intellectual] tribe"--even Trilling was convincingly ranked among the New Critics by Cleanth Brooks in 'The Formalist Critics.'⁵¹

Nevertheless, as in the case of the New Critics, the term New York intellectual is not an empty one. General characteristics of the New York intellectuals are that, obviously, most of them were born New

Yorkers; that they had close connections with Partisan Review; that nearly all of them had an interest in politics, an interest that, very broadly, moved away from the left through the years; that many of them were Jewish; and that they so often met, praised, and abused each other that Norman Podhoretz dubbed them "the Family."⁵² Also, while the attention of the New Critics was mainly directed to poetry, the New York intellectuals more generally concerned themselves with fiction. Another common characteristic is that in their criticism they were often concerned with the relation of art to culture; Ransom therefore named them "cultural critics." The following critics fulfilled most of these characteristics: Lionel and Diana Trilling, Philip Rahv, William Phillips, Dwight Macdonald, William Barrett, Isaac Rosenfeld, Delmore Schwartz, Robert Warshow, Elizabeth Hardwick, Mary McCarthy, Alfred Kazin, and Irving Howe. In A Margin of Hope the latter also includes Sidney Hook, Meyer Schapiro, Harold Rosenberg, Saul Bellow, and even Randall Jarrell and John Berryman.⁵³

The New York intellectuals and the New Critics shared a deep concern for literature as literature and a belief in the value and necessity of literary criticism. This formed a strong if uneasy bond between them, a measure of agreement that has often been obscured by the disproportionate attention paid to their disagreements and differences. The antipathies that existed were mainly political and rather one-sided to boot: the New York intellectuals found grave fault with the alleged conservatism of the New Critics, while most of the time the New Critics could not care less about the political beliefs of the New Yorkers. In general, there was more that drew these two groups together than kept them apart. The common concern for literature proved such a firm bond that when the "Protofascists" actually met the

"Communists," they recognized "with almost ludicrous rapidity that they were very close together indeed in literary matters and felt alike on an astonishing number of social issues."⁵⁴

Many of the New York intellectuals were published in The Kenyon Review from its very beginning: Lionel Trilling, Rahv, and Schwartz regularly contributed from its earliest issues onwards. Ransom's ability to recognize the genius of these critics, even if their emphases differed from his, was to be characteristic of his editorial career and one of the reasons for its success. Still, although Rice's part in the prominence of The Kenyon Review will be discussed in a later chapter, it must be stressed here that it was Rice rather than Ransom--"whom they probably suspected of lynching a nigger every week"--who got the New York intellectuals actually to submit their work to the Kenyon.⁵⁵

So we find that the early Kenyon Review fulfills Eliot's criteria for an ideal literary quarterly: the influx of the New Yorkers prevented it from becoming too "narrow," while there clearly remained "a residue of a common [New Critical] tendency, in the light of which many occasional contributors, otherwise irrelevant or even antagonistic, may take their place and counteract . . . sectarianism." Many readers, however, were not alive to the broader, the non-New Critical aspects of the Kenyon: John Marshall, an officer of the Rockefeller Foundation voiced a widely shared attitude towards the Kenyon when he wrote that it was "a journal representative of an exceedingly small and exceedingly advanced group." R.P. Blackmur, on the other hand, found The Kenyon Review too much of a 'miscellany' and wanted Ransom to choose his contributors more strictly; neither taste nor standards can exist without a continuous element of decisiveness--which is the vital

risk in the cultural enterprise that, successively taken, becomes a policy."⁵⁶

Our discussion of the first four volumes of the Kenyon will show that both these opinions were biased and that Ransom admirably realized Eliot's criteria, which corresponded with his own explicitly stated editorial policies:

We should not wish to be construed as representing some "school" or theory of literature or art, unless a very broad one. Within the limits of our taste we take the best writing we can find, or commission writing from the best writers that we can approach.

But I hope we are not without character. . . .

As for the substantial part of our character, I must plead guilty to having an "aesthetic," or philosophy of art, though not a narrow one; and I am more serious about that than about nearly anything else in the world. . . . But we do not print our own and similar views exclusively.

Are we then too "highbrow," or are we too "arty"? I cannot tell. I should prefer to answer the question by recalling, for the purpose, four distinguished quarterlies which might be said to be in some sense our predecessors: the Dial, the Symposium, the Hound and Horn, and the Criterion of T.S. Eliot's in England. I should say that we are much less heavy and dogmatic than the last of these; less technically philosophical than the Symposium and with more soundness in the writing and less irresponsible and faddish than the

other two.⁵⁷

The First Issue

Although Ransom described the first issue of The Kenyon Review to Tate as 'good not great,' it did reflect most of his interests and intentions. It is primarily a critical issue, representing both New Critics and New York intellectuals; it discusses education, publishes young poets, and there are contributions dealing with the other arts. As expected, we do not find any fiction or discussions of political questions. The issue is unusual, though, in that philosophy is not represented. The contributions by the New Critics in this issue--Ransom, Rice, Blackmur, and Winters--all appeared in the book review section. Following the tradition of the literary magazines that Ransom acknowledged, the reviews were substantial, Ransom emphasized that 'it should not be taken for granted that, in being smaller than the essays, the reviews are critically inferior. Good reviews are likely to hold to an extreme economy, but sometimes are all the more wonderful in their easy deployment of critical principles and methods answering to the purpose.'⁵⁸ He generally chose to publish few, long reviews rather than short, superficial ones; and though the reviews in The Kenyon Review were sometimes too heavy, or too indecisive, they are vastly superior to the puffs and invectives that generally went by the name of book reviews in the literary and cultural weeklies.

Ransom did not write an introductory editorial for the first issue to state his policies, but his review of Understanding Poetry (1938) by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren leaves the reader in no doubt

about his priorities:

But now it is the Age of Criticism. I need only cite: Eliot, Richards, Empson, Tate, Winters, Blackmur--a list of intensive critics the like of which has certainly not been furnished in literary history at one time before. The living art decays, for that must be the impression of an editor reading faithfully through the manuscripts on the desk. . . . We shall have other ages in which criticism relaxes, and poetry spontaneously increases, but not now. Our age is critical, and it has its own passionate enjoyments.⁵⁹

Ransom's other--rather dull--review deals with Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns by Walter Clyde Curry, fellow-Fugitive and Vanderbilt colleague. He disagrees with Curry's thesis that Shakespeare --not a favourite of Ransom's at that time anyway--was a profound philosopher and suggests that Curry apply his considerable scholarly intelligence more appropriately, more critically.⁶⁰

Blackmur's review of Claude Colleer Abbot's edition of Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins constitutes a New Critical manifesto. He has enjoyed reading Hopkins' letters "as a lesson in the direct operation of mature intelligence," but "emphatically" insists that the letters cannot "affect the poetry or understanding of it as poetry so far as the poetry was successful in its own right." Rice's review of James Laughlin's New Directions 1938 is noteworthy for the perspicacity with which he singles out for praise its most gifted writers, namely John Berryman, Delmore Schwartz, and Eleanor Clark. Yvor Winters, the

fourth New Critic in this issue, highly commended The Complete Collected Poems of William Carlos Williams, 1906-1936, thereby refuting the myth that the New Critics only discussed poets in the Pound-Eliot tradition. The review was not a characteristic example of Winters' brand of New Criticism though: close structural analyses are practically absent. Still, when it is taken into account that Williams' collection numbered 313 pages and that Winters had only three pages at his disposal, it is astonishing how to the point, especially with respect to Williams' use of free verse, most of Winters' remarks were. Also to the point was his prediction that "the end of the present century will see [Williams] securely established, along with Stevens, as one of the two best poets of his generation." Ransom was in high feather about this review; he found it "exhilarating" that Winters had proved "that an alleged whizbang like Williams is a great classical artist."61

Delmore Schwartz's "The Two Audens," a "pretty good model of effectiveness by condensation," proves how blurred the dividing line between the New Critics and the New York intellectuals sometimes was. After having applied the terms "Ego" and "Id" to the Marxist and the private aspects of Auden's poetry respectively, Schwartz remarks New Critically that "the proof that these terms are relevant . . . is to be found where all proof of judgment awaits us, in the text itself," and goes on to suit the action to the word. Another masterly essay by a New York intellectual is Philip Rahv's "Franz Kafka: The Hero As Lonely Man." Realizing that "the application of Freudian ideas to literature has often been gratuitous," Rahv finds that Kafka could not "be explained adequately by a strictly literary analysis," and considers "the methods of Freud . . . superior . . . to the metaphysical flights

which he has inspired in his German critics."⁶² By extensively applying both psychoanalysis and biography to the text, Rahv indeed sheds new light on Kafka's works.

The best critical article in this maiden issue, the beautifully written lead essay on the recently deceased novelist Thomas Wolfe, was contributed by John Peale Bishop, who was neither a New Critic, nor a New York intellectual. Ransom regarded the essay as a "swell job" and included it in The Kenyon Critics, the Kenyon Review anthology, which was published in 1951. At a time when Wolfe stood extremely high in the estimation of both critics and common reader, Bishop unabashedly points out that, genius though Wolfe was, he was incapable of making his novels cohere. As, according to Bishop, "the meaning of a novel should be in its structure," this was severe criticism indeed.⁶³

Ransom's preoccupation with education is apparent from his review, already mentioned, of Understanding Poetry, in which he refers to "the authorized distortions of pedants who are placed over the courses in literature by the colleges" and whose learning is "peripheral."⁶⁴ Ransom would like to see Understanding Poetry, a textbook with a New Critical approach, adopted in all colleges, but fears that this may take ages because of the ignoramuses in charge of the English departments. As it turned out, Understanding Poetry became the vade mecum of nearly every student of English within a few years.

The first issue further contained Robert Lowell's dense, complex, and ironic "The Cities' Summer Death" and "The Dandelion Girls," his first published poems. Though they are definitely minor, by printing these poems Ransom publicly showed his confidence in his pupil. Jarrell's less conventional "The Winter's Tale" does stand on its own, even if it is not one of his best early poems.⁶⁵

As for the other arts, Paul Rosenfeld, the advisory editor, published the first part of "The Advent of American Music," the second instalment of which appeared in the Spring issue. The impressionistic and voluble style of his essay clashes with Ransom's wish for clarity and economy. Ford Madox Ford's "Paris Letter," a hymn to Paris as the eternal seat of international culture, also belongs to the "arts" part of The Kenyon Review. Ransom praised the first draft for its "warmth of style," but asked Ford to cut it as "we are 112-pages big, a very poor dimension," and "want to practice economy." Ford willingly complied: he could not "bear to think of taking up too much of your space and crowding out a lot of young things who are panting to appear." The eventual result, "a beautiful thing," was Ford's only contribution to the Kenyon; he died in June 1939.⁶⁶

In the book review section attention was paid to the arts, too: B.H. Haggin, the former music critic of The Hound & Horn who now regularly wrote for the Nation, reviewed George Gershwin by Merle Armitage, and Seldon Cheney discussed a book on Toulouse-Lautrec. This review was Cheney's sole contribution to the Kenyon, as was Vernon Venable's hostile review of Bertrand Russell's Power: A New social Analysis. Howard Baker acclaimed Allen Tate's only novel, The Fathers. He found it "symbolic . . . [and] organically significant," but "not in the least lacking in flesh and blood;" this was a laudative, illuminating review, even though Baker overemphasizes Tate's "determinism" and his "essential religious belief in the innate evil of man." In a letter to Tate, though, Ransom apologized for the review as "just a so-so job" and it remained Baker's only contribution during Ransom's editorship. The two remaining, rather unremarkable reviews are by H.M. Chevalier on Jules Romains' Death of a World and by C.A.

1. Towards the First Issue

Millspaugh on books of poetry by Kay Boyle, Frederic Prokosch, and Ben Belitt.⁶⁷

All in all, it was a good first issue. Press reactions, which were on the whole restricted to the Ohio area, were extremely favourable. Most of the reviewers understood Ransom's intentions: "Judged by its initial number, the new quarterly rates the sort of serious attention given the Yale Review, Southern Review and other university periodicals aimed at the discriminating in the national audience." The reviewer in the Cleveland Plain Dealer was positively euphoric: "if 'The Kenyon Review' could come out once a week, it wouldn't be too often for me." From outside the state boundaries came the apposite Vanderbilt Alumnus editorial: "It offers a diet that is sternly intellectual, and though the style of its articles is distinguished and interesting, no effort is made anywhere to appeal to popular taste."⁶⁸

Criticism

The editorial direction was etched more clearly still in the following issues. One of the key theoretical essays on the New Criticism was Ransom's review, in the second issue, of Cleanth Brooks's Modern Poetry and the Tradition. It honours Brooks as "very likely, the most expert living 'reader' or interpreter of difficult verse." But although he has no equal with respect to the explanation of the texture of a poem, his understanding of its structure, its framework, is deficient. Ransom stresses that "the logic is . . . more organic to the imaginative effects than Mr. Brooks will admit." Still, Ransom considered it a "magnificent" book. Brooks was "very well satisfied with the review as a whole," although he did agree with Donald Davidson "that John is out on a limb in his emphasis on 'logic.'" Austin Warren's reaction to this essay was representative of that of many readers: he was "surprised" as he "had been in the habit of assuming that the critical performances of Penn Warren & Brooks were orthodoxly Ransomian."¹

In his Winter 1941 editorial "Ubiquitous Moralists" Ransom discusses an important book by another New Critic, Blackmur's The Expense of Greatness. And, again, Ransom finds fault: Blackmur "has no theory of poetry which is comparable in distinction with his specific judgments." Worse, when Blackmur feels "it incumbent upon him to declare a critical position in order to have somewhere officially to stand," it turns out to be a moralist position. Although both the Marxists and the Humanists have also taken this stand, "coming from him it is particularly depressing." However, "when he is going properly,"

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

that is, when Blackmur is a practical critic, he 'is not really a moralistic critic at all.' In his capacity as practical critic Blackmur is given the highest praise: "few, if any critics live who write better criticism than Mr. R.P. Blackmur. . . . and his judgments . . . are close enough to infallible." In this essay Ransom also touches upon the "violent disagreements among the new critics," but concludes that they do form a group as "any one of these critics shows the influence of the others, and the total effort amounts to a sort of collaboration."²

Of paramount importance was a joint review of Ransom's The New Criticism, Reason in Madness by Tate, and The Intent of the Critic, a collection of essays by Edmund Wilson, Norman Foerster, W.H. Auden, and Ransom. As Ransom realized that the objectivity of such a review would be easily doubted, he had initially vetoed it. However, Rice insisted, Ransom yielded, and, astonishingly, I.A. Richards, one of the critics discussed in The New Criticism, was asked to review. Astonishingly, for if Richards had accepted, the objectivity of the review would have been all the more questionable. Fortunately, Richards declined: "Mr. Ransom seems to me to have just simply mistaken so much of the point and aim of my early books [in The New Criticism] that to me it's as though he were shooting into a pool, not at me. And I do not think the attempt to clear these mistakes up publicly could be profitable to anyone." Ransom himself was the most severe critic of his own book, in which he had in fact only repeated, elaborated, and applied positions which he had already, and more persuasively taken in The World's Body. He described it to Kenneth Burke as "a laborious book without any grace about it" and wrote to Tate that he had "sacrificed the critics in order to get my own oar in; in view of a systematic book on poetic theory I found

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

myself using the given critics to point to one." A few years later Ransom even began to doubt the value of this poetic theory: "I should never have proposed structure and texture till I could put the case much more fully."³ It is telling, too, that The New Criticism was the only book Ransom would not allow to be reprinted, in spite of the fact that David McDowell, when he turned publisher, repeatedly tried to get Ransom's consent to do so.

Kenneth Burke had a much higher opinion of The New Criticism. He had agreed to review the three books and characterizes them as having been "written by some of the best men writing literary criticism in America today." He goes on to discuss succinctly The Intent of the Critic, omitting Ransom's contribution "since it gives a curtailed version of his thesis in The New Criticism"--which Burke then proceeds to review. Burke finds great virtue in Ransom's use of structure and texture as it "keep[s] us fully aware of the fact that a good poem is not just one steady over-all concentration, but a constant succession of minor concentrations, each with some stylistic virtue of its own." But, Burke adds astutely, Mr. Ransom could profitably round out his terminology by some such third term as the 'structure of texture' . . . a general tenor discernible among the heterogeneities, something that limits the range of variations, or that points them thematically in the same direction." Burke also pointedly discusses Reason in Madness, noting that Tate's 'best work here is done on the specific analysis of texts . . . but in his general articles he is more given to pursuing the enemy . . . visiting upon them such scorn as would cause them to pine and wither.'⁴

When he asked Burke to review these books, Ransom had thought of Burke as a Marxist critic, but had assured him that he "needn't worry

over attacking the Editor. We'd take pride in going out of our gang, if there is a gang, to get a severe reviewer." The actual review made Ransom realize that Burke was critically much closer to him than he had assumed; so he immediately annexed him to the New Critics, and even suggested to Burke that they "write a joint book." This does not imply, of course, that Ransom now was in complete agreement with him--Ransom was temperamentally incapable of complete critical agreement with anybody--but he admitted to Burke: "I would have treated Burke as my critic of structure [in The New Criticism] if I had known your work at that time better," especially as Winters had made "some heavy borrowings from you." That Ransom's interest in Burke's work was definitely aroused is apparent from his "An Address to Kenneth Burke," which appeared in the next issue. In this article Ransom discussed the title-essay of Burke's latest book, The Philosophy of Literary Form (1941). He finds much to praise, but, as was to be expected, disagrees with Burke's purely dramatic, structural approach to literature.⁵

As usual with writers praised by Ransom, the object of his tribute felt censured. Burke complained to Tate: "The most astounding thing to me about Ransom's piece was his complete refusal to let me build up a single point of mine in my own words. . . . In strict accordance with my firm belief in the saying that no editor ever lost a controversy in his own columns, I am not asking him for a chance to rebut. . . . I am asking him simply to let me publish there my analysis of the Keats Ode. . . . But will he?"⁶ Ransom would not, yet Burke became a regular and valued contributor to the Kenyon, who, however, never quite convinced himself that Ransom truly held him in high esteem.

These and similar theoretical articles representing a New Critical point of view regularly appeared in The Kenyon Review and attracted

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

much attention. The New Critics would not have made so large an impact, however, if their theories had not been supported by an abundance of excellent practical criticism, part of which was naturally published in the early Kenyon. Truly seminal was George Marion O'Donnell's "Faulkner's Mythology." Published in the Summer issue of the first volume, this essay gave the first impulse to a full-fledged revaluation of Faulkner in the United States. Its early insight into Faulkner was unparalleled. A few years after its appearance in print Tate told O'Donnell that Malcolm Cowley, the editor of The Portable Faulkner, "thought your Faulkner essay the best thing ever written about him. I think so too."⁷

A prime example of close New Critical analysis is Randall Jarrell's brief essay "Texts from Housman." In this article, which also appeared in the first Summer issue, Jarrell discusses every aspect of two short Housman poems in a generally appreciative way. Irving Howe's classification of Jarrell as a New York intellectual in his A Margin of Hope, is, incidentally, invalidated by this early essay as well as by Jarrell's later, better-known practical criticism. For in spite of Jarrell's famous denunciation of the New Criticism in his Poetry and the Age (1953) ("The Age of Criticism"), his inimitable, cataloguing criticism of the fifties remained grafted upon the literary text itself.⁸

In 1940, upon the intercession of I.A. Richards and Richard Eberhart, Ransom published a radio talk by William Empson on the use of Basic English in analysing poetry. Empson defends using Basic English as "it lets [the reader] get more grip on what he is reading." To prove this Empson uses some lines by Wordsworth which he turns into Basic English, ingeniously showing that doing so "makes you put the right

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

questions," and, consequently, makes you understand the poem. This well written essay is also exemplary of the importance of close analysis for the understanding of poetry, in this case close analysis with the help of Basic English.⁹

More seminal than these articles by Jarrell and Empson is Robert Penn Warren's essay on Katherine Anne Porter, another Southern writer whose distinction had not yet been sufficiently noticed. By discussing Porter's method of composition, her style, by paraphrasing, by quoting, by closely analysing, in short, by discussing her fiction in the New Critical way, Warren firmly places Porter among "the relatively small group of writers . . . who have done serious, consistent, original, and vital work in the form of short fiction."¹⁰ This essay abundantly proves that New Criticism could also be fruitfully applied to fiction, and that Robert Penn Warren was a master at it.

Other New Critical articles that are worth mentioning are Ransom, "Yeats and His Symbols;" Vivas, "Lawrence's Problems;" and Austin Warren, "Edward Taylor's Poetry: Colonial Baroque." Certainly outstanding, if only because of its controversial nature, is Yvor Winters' discussion of T.S. Eliot. Because of its length, the essay was one of the few articles to be published in two parts in the Kenyon. Winters does not leave his readers in suspense about his opinion of Eliot's failings as a critic and a poet. His essay starts:

T.S. Eliot is probably the most widely respected literary figure of our time; he is known primarily as the leader of the intellectual reaction against the romanticism of which he began his career as a disciple. It is my purpose to show that his intellectualism and

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

his reactionary position are alike an illusion.¹¹

Winters goes on to find fault with Eliot's theories on autotelic art, on the objective correlative, on thought and emotion in poetry, on poetry and belief, and on tradition. In the second instalment he accuses Eliot of being both determinist and anti-determinist, and contends that it is impossible to find out what Eliot means by the dramatic element in lyric poetry. But he is at his most famously vitriolic with respect to Eliot's poetic practice. The treatment of the subject matter of The Waste Land Winters finds trivial; its metre "a broken blank verse interspersed with bad free verse and rimed doggerel;" its method "the death of the mind and of the sensibility alike."¹²

No wonder the literary world was scandalized. Delmore Schwartz was one of many to give vent to his anger in a letter to Tate: "But really that man's become a kind of small-time Lucifer. His reading of Eliot, when it is not pretty close to dishonesty through distorted quotation, reminds me of myself translating French [badly]. . . . Eliot ought to be examined very carefully right now; but of course not with Winters' stupidity." Naturally, the Kenyon also received reactions. In the Autumn issue Ransom published one of the more reasonable letters, by Louis Coxé, and even 'edited some matter out of his communication which seemed slightly abusive." But Winters was furious: he regarded Coxé's letter as "immature," "abusive," and "downright mendacious." When Ransom refused to either "print any editorial retraction on behalf of [Winters'] fancied injury," or to publish Winters' venomous reply to Coxé, Winters exploded. He requested the return of his already accepted essay on Wallace Stevens, stated that he would never submit to The

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Kenyon Review again, and even cancelled his complimentary subscription, given to him in 1938 "in view of our admiration for your criticism and our hope that you will be a frequent contributor." Winters kept his word; his last contribution was a book review on Theodore Roethke, which appeared in the very issue in which Coxe's letter was published.¹³ Ransom's attempt to make a stir by publishing Winters on Eliot had succeeded beyond his expectation.

But in those early years it was the book reviews rather than the articles which spread the New Critical gospel in the Kenyon. The second issue contained a truly excellent review section, the leading review by Tate on George Whicher's critical biography of Emily Dickinson. Tate shows that although Whicher is scholarly and thorough with respect to Emily Dickinson's biography and background, he is not worthy of the label "critic:" "Not towards a single poem by Miss Dickinson does Mr. Whicher behave as if it were a whole, substantial object, the focus and the final test of the quantity and quality of its background; the poems (few are even quoted entire) appear to exist as illustration of Mr. Whicher's commentary." Jarrell discusses Winters' Maule's Curse. He points to Winters' "absolute moral dogmatism" "which produces occasional judgments, that a tactful admirer might characterize as trembling on the brink of absurdity," such as ranking Bridges above Hopkins, and T. Sturge Moore above Yeats. But Jarrell also notes admiringly that Winters "reads each writer as if he had never been read before; he is a critical instrument completely uninfluenced by any fear of ridicule or consideration of expediency," and concludes that "Maule's Curse [is] the best book on American literature I ever read." Robert Penn Warren reviews Matthew Arnold by Lionel Trilling. He calls it "admirable . . . well written, thoughtful and dispassionate," but,

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

like Tate on Whicher, he deplores the fact that Trilling has not undertaken the task "of analyzing very closely the poems as poems and of relating their specific poetic method and quality to the body of Arnold's ideas." So Warren undertakes to do this himself and succeeds in showing up, in short compass, Arnold's strengths and weaknesses. In Ransom's estimate it was "about the best review ever written."¹⁴

Almost as perspicacious is Ransom's treatment of M: One Thousand Autobiographical Sonnets by his fellow-Fugitive, turned Boston psychiatrist, Merrill Moore. Ransom puts Moore's sonnets in perspective as charming and technically satisfactory, but not mature and intense enough; and he suggests that Moore write fewer but more condensed sonnets. This review is representative of the objective way in which Ransom viewed his friends' works. Somewhat naively, Ransom never expected them to take even his severest criticisms personally. In this case, by way of exception, the victim was warned in advance: 'I shan't ever overpraise anybody, even my best friends, you understand,' Ransom wrote to Moore in November, 1938. And the fact that Moore had lavishly donated to the Kenyon did not--properly--make any difference either. Perhaps Ransom undervalued Moore's poetry, because, as he himself admitted, he was 'a high-brow and intellectualist . . . poet and critic.'¹⁵

Being "high-brow and intellectualist" was definitely to Ransom's advantage in his review of the 1941 New Directions publication of Young American Poets: Mary Barnard, W.R. Moses, George Marion O'Donnell, Jarrell, and Berryman. By paying attention to structure, texture, and metre, as well as by quoting extensively, Ransom argues convincingly that 'Jarrell is quite the most brilliant of the five,' and that while both Berryman and O'Donnell are "the most technically proficient,"

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Berryman is the greater poet. These two reviews prove that Ransom was not only a theoretical but also a fine practical New Critic with a generally keen eye for the qualities of young poets. This trait found expression in his publishing many of the most talented young poets in his magazine. Ransom's judgment was not infallible, of course. In this same issue appeared Winters' review of Theodore Roethke's Open House, the first serious, laudatory review in Roethke's career; but Ransom was "disgusted" with Winters for trying to prove that Roethke is "a great classical artist" and did not publish Roethke until 1950, in spite of Roethke's bombarding him with poems from 1938 onwards.¹⁶

One of Kenyon's best reviewers was Cleanth Brooks. Already in 1939 he pointed out what other critics would come to much later, that Robert Frost's "'directness'" and "'simplicity'" had been overemphasized in contrast to the "'tortured obscurity'" of other modern poets. Without wanting to assign him "to one of the modern schools of Donne," Brooks shows that Frost's best poetry 'is in reality sophisticated, not naive.' In the Winter 1941 issue Brooks discusses Housman, another poet who does not belong to the New Critical canon. In his review of the recently published Collected Poems, Brooks describes Housman as "essentially a romantic poet," but one whose best poems are in flat contradiction to Housman's explicitly stated distrust of the obscurity of metaphor, of irony and wit "as smacking of the unpoetic intellect." Comparing this extremely fair and balanced review, which was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics, to the earlier Kenyon article on Housman by Jarrell, one finds that Brooks gives a better overall portrait of the poet, and that Jarrell's article is too clearly part of a larger whole, his master's thesis on Housman.¹⁷

Brooks's review of Auden's The Double Man and John Peale Bishop's

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Selected Poems was also both New Critical and just. Bishop has often been accused of writing poetry about poetry, of being merely concerned with form, but Brooks reminds us that "form . . . is not a coating applied to the mass of content," and that in Bishop's poems the "problems of writing poetry and the problems of a formless and chaotic age become at many points identical." Less attention is paid to Auden, not because Brooks rates him the lesser poet, but because Auden's distinction had already been sufficiently recognized. Though he considered himself an "admirer" of Auden's and felt attracted to his honest and intelligent mind as revealed in "New Year Letter," which was to him "the most interesting item in his new volume," Brooks's characteristic criticism of this poem is that "the logic of the discourse tends to override the texture."¹⁸

The contributions of the New York intellectuals lent additional distinction to the criticism and book review departments of the early Kenyon Review. Philip Rahv's second article, reprinted in The Kenyon Critics, is the classic "Paleface and Redskin," an essay that does not stand in need of discussion as the terms "paleface" and "redskin" have become literary household words. Another seminal article is Delmore Schwartz's 1939 MLA speech, "The Isolation of Modern Poetry," which Ransom had solicited for the Kenyon after hearing Schwartz's lecture. However, when Ransom read the paper, he was disappointed and disinclined to publish it. He found it too "encyclopedic" and not representative of Schwartz at his "highest written power." But as the Kenyon had "been running a year without a piece from [Schwartz]," and as Ransom knew that Schwartz needed the money, he left the decision up to him.¹⁹ The essay was published in Kenyon's Spring 1941 number and although it is indeed somewhat discursive for a dense quarterly like

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

The Kenyon Review, the reasons given by Schwartz to account for the obscurity of modern poetry and for its being limited to the lyrical form are signally stimulating.

Lionel Trilling contributed two excellent essays on Sherwood Anderson and E.M. Forster. In the first, which was included in his The Liberal Imagination (1950), Trilling takes a retrospective look at Anderson's literary career on the occasion of his death. One could not mistake this essay for New Criticism: Trilling starts out with personal impressions and shows that Anderson was a victim of his early success and of the cultural situation in general. The essay on the British novelist E.M. Forster constitutes the first chapter of Trilling's E.M. Forster (1943), which heralded a Forster revaluation. Trilling sees Forster as a passionate naturalist. In contrast to Anderson--with whom he has much in common, such as disliking the middle class and celebrating love, passion, and the liberated personality--Forster never writes vaguely and abstractly, but roots his ideals in the particulars of reality.²⁰ Again, Trilling does not closely analyse separate passages from Forster's novels: his remarks deal with the interrelations between history, biography, culture and, very broadly, the contents of the texts. In short, in these essays Trilling honours Ransom's description of him as a "cultural critic."

As a regular reviewer Trilling discussed books by Dorothy Richardson, John Dos Passos, Waldo Frank, and Sinclair Lewis. His major review in these early years was of Let us Now Praise Famous Men by James Agee with photographs by Walker Evans. David McDowell, who was the Kenyon's secretary at that time, and part of whose job it was to make a preliminary choice from among the piles of books sent in by publishers, remembers how he enthusiastically told Ransom that this

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

wonderful book simply had to be reviewed. Leafing through Evans' photographs, however, Ransom decided against it, supposing the book to be a leftist political documentary about the South. But within a week Trilling wrote to say that he very much wanted to review it. Ransom held Trilling in such esteem that he did not refuse him and he thought so highly of the actual result that he made it the lead review of the Winter 1942 issue. The review was one of the few Agee was pleased with, not in the first place because it was favourable, but because Trilling understood Agee's agonizing feelings of impropriety in intruding upon the sharecroppers' lives. Trilling also sees that Let Us Now Praise Famous Men "is full of marvelous writing which gives a kind of hot pleasure that words can do so much;" he shows that Agee's one failure lies in his "inability to see [the sharecroppers he describes] as anything but good."²¹

Another excellent review, reprinted in The Kenyon Critics, was young John Berryman's analysis of Dylan Thomas' The World I Breathe, entitled "The Loud Hill of Wales." Although Howe labels Berryman without reservations a New York intellectual, on the basis of Berryman's admiration for R.P. Blackmur and on the basis of much of his criticism he may be regarded as a New Critic with equal reason. His New Critical bent is clearly brought out in his review of Thomas, published in the autumn of 1940, by the way in which he defends him against allegations, in Kenyon's Winter 1940 issue, made by the leftist British critic Julian Symons:

I have not time to notice any considerable part of Mr. Symons's nonsense; one quotation must serve. 'What is said in Mr. Thomas's poems is that the seasons change;

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

that we decrease in vigour as we grow older; that life has no obvious meaning; that love dies. His poems mean no more than that. They mean too little.' Evidently it is necessary to point out to Mr. Symons, what is elementary, that a poem means more than the abstract, banal statement of its theme: it means its imagery, the disparate parts and relations of it, its ambiguities, by extension the techniques which produced it and the emotions it legitimately produces.²²

Berryman goes on to show that much of Thomas' creativity goes into his technique, but admits that, perhaps as a consequence, many of his poems are obscure.

The publication of Berryman's review on Dylan Thomas to counter-balance Symons' Marxist article reflects Ransom's dislike of Marxist critics, whom he once compared to "the bull in the china shop, the swine that eats the pearls; so simplified is their strategy for art." Haakon Chevalier's essay "André Malraux: The Return of the Hero," which highly praises Man's Fate because it heralds the beginnings of a heroic literature as opposed to novels with an alienated main character, met with a similar demurrer: in his editorial notes Ransom recorded "a personal apprehension" as Malraux' "ardor for the [leftist] ideas strikes me as having displaced some of the interest in the art."²³

No less clear was the editorial line with respect to Humanist inspired criticism. Two reviews of books by Van Wyck Brooks reflect this. One of them, Delmore Schwartz's completely destructive discussion of Brooks's New England: Indian Summer, was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics. In his letter to Ransom asking to be allowed to review the

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

book, Schwartz wrote that, after first having simmered with anger at "seeing Henry James and Henry Adams abused and misunderstood and misrepresented by Brooks' impressionism, which pretends to be above literary criticism," he had "more or less boiled over" by the time he came to Brooks's passages on T.S. Eliot and Wallace Stevens. The tone of this letter was continued in the review, which ends tartly: "If a masterpiece is a book many people read and enjoy for a long time, Mr. Brooks has produced a masterpiece. But one is profoundly mistaken, if one takes it for literary criticism, literary history, or anything close to those difficult arts." Robert Penn Warren's review of The Opinions of Oliver Allston is no less derisive. Warren takes the position of a long-time admirer of Van Wyck Brooks's persona, Oliver Allston, who considers Allston's "untimely death" as "a real loss to American letters;" however, his seemingly innocuous praise of Brooks's intellectual biography of Allston is devastating.²⁴

The Kenyon Review was not the only literary magazine to condemn Van Wyck Brooks's middlebrow denunciations of Joyce, James, Proust, Eliot, and others as coterie writers who were merely interested in form and not in celebrating the great themes of life such as love, courage, and justice. In the January 1942 issue of Partisan Review, Ransom himself lined up with Tate, Trilling, and four others to condemn Brooks's nationalistic, moralistic ideas about literature as exposed in Dwight Macdonald's article "Kulturbolschewismus Is Here" in an earlier issue of that review. Ransom admitted that hardly any successful fiction and poetry was being written but argued "bitterly in defense of the greatness of a few moderns, such as James, Yeats, and Proust." He found it "as incredible as it is cynical" that Brooks "blame[d] the tendency of the literature upon the vanity of the writers or their misanthropy,"

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

and he praised the moderns for not "evad[ing] their difficulties by denying them," calling Brooks's "idea of doing so . . . dogmatic, and . . . Christian Science."²⁵

Of course, there also are contributions worth mentioning in these early issues which are neither indicative of strong editorial preferences, nor readily pigeonholed as New Critical or New York intellectual. An example is Daniel Aaron's fine tribute to F.O. Matthiessen's momentous American Renaissance. Robie Macauley, who had just graduated from Kenyon College, made his first, inconspicuous appearance in 1942 with a superficial review of novels by Mark Schorer and Robert Paul Smith. His was not the only review to come out of Kenyon College: Paul A. Palmer of the department of political science contributed twice, while Chalmers sang the praises of Irving Babbitt's Spanish Character and other Essays. Fortunately, this remained the President's only literary contribution to the Kenyon. As for the articles, a few deserve special mention: in "On Rereading Balzac" William Troy gives an excellent analysis of Balzac's novels; Lawrence Thompson's "Bert Brecht" is an early American evaluation of the German poet and playwright in exile; and in "Poet on Horseback" Justin O'Brien convincingly shows up Roy Campbell as a banal plagiarist of Baudelaire, Rimbaud, and Valéry.²⁶

Of special interest are two articles on foreign literary magazines. Both appeared in the 1939 Autumn issue. Delmore Schwartz wrote a glowing article on the recently folded Criterion, the bound volumes of which he deferentially described to Ransom as constituting "a permanent fund of awareness." The Criterion was also mentioned in Rice's more general survey of "Foreign Periodicals." James Atlas calls Schwartz's essay "a masterly . . . résumé of Criterion's history, taking issue

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

with Eliot's political views, his editorial choices and the inconsistent ideas put forth in his commentaries." Atlas also quotes part of a letter by T.S. Eliot, Schwartz's hero at that time, in praise of this essay and adds that "no single event in Delmore's career was more significant to him than this letter." In Rice's opinion, too, the demise of The Criterion was a great loss to letters: "no British periodical has yet arisen to take its place. . . . Scrutiny . . . perhaps is closest, although it falls wide of the mark. Its contributions lack the brilliance and the philosophical incisiveness of The Criterion in its best days, the tone is often academic, and there is a more persistent concern with pedagogical than with larger aesthetic issues."²⁷ Here emerges an image of Rice's ideal literary quarterly, which is further adumbrated by the admiration he expresses for the French Nouvelle Revue Française and the Mexican Taller and Abside.

So, with respect to criticism, which constituted the bulk of the magazine during these years, The Kenyon Review featured very many New Critical, quite a few New York intellectual, and a good many unclassifiable literary articles and book reviews. The foregoing discussion, which has encompassed in considerable detail much of the criticism published in The Kenyon Review up to the Autumn 1942 issue has tried to show that the abundance, the distinction, and the variety of the criticism are all representative of The Kenyon Review during its first, epoch-making decade. The majority of the early Kenyon's main critics, R.P. Blackmur, Cleanth Brooks, Robert Penn Warren, Kenneth Burke, Randall Jarrell, Philip Rahv, Lionel Trilling, and, of course, Ransom and Rice, all remained devoted contributors to the Kenyon in their common battle for the recognition of serious criticism in the

universities and the literary world at large.

Pedagogics, Philosophy, Politics, Psychology

Although Ransom's Kenyon Review is generally known for its criticism only, other interests were represented too. For instance, during its infancy, the Kenyon paid considerable attention to pedagogical issues. For all Rice's objections to Scrutiny's pedagogical bent, education was in fact one of Ransom's hobbyhorses. This interest was exemplified by the symposium "Literature and the Professors." Already in August 1939 Ransom had asked Cleanth Brooks for a contribution on the teaching of English; as a working title Ransom suggested "Lit. Intelligence of the Teachers of Lit." Brooks replied that he had thought of that subject entirely in terms of a book, and that he was not at all sure whether he could handle it convincingly in an essay. A few months later Ransom's enduring enthusiasm for the project made him try again to kindle Brooks's interest. Did not Brooks feel "driven to take up that essay-project on the English professors?"²⁸ But only after Tate had delivered his inflammatory paper "Miss Emily and the Bibliographer" at Princeton on April 10, 1940, did Brooks feel sufficiently stirred to respond warmly to Ransom's suggestion of a symposium on the state of teaching in the United States to be published simultaneously in the Southern and Kenyon reviews.

In "Miss Emily and the Bibliographer" Tate had not only accused the literary profession of burying literature under a mass of biographical details, of having "lost confidence in literature," and of "The Great Refusal . . . to judge," but also of "insincerity" and of having created a situation "in which it is virtually impossible for a young

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

man to get a critical, literary education." Naturally, Tate's attack had weakened his position at Princeton and it did not further his cause when Richard Blackmur started intriguing against him; he fell from grace and had to leave Princeton, where he had been Poet-in-Residence, as soon as his three-year contract expired, and Blackmur fell heir to his place. Of course, Ransom was wholeheartedly with Tate, and in his summer 1940 editorial "Mr. Tate and the Professors" explained that Tate had "helped crystallize some editorial intentions," which would result in the symposium "Literature and the Professors." Ransom continued that he had decided upon the structure of a symposium because "combined essays . . . have a more formidable effect than that of those single studies that find publication now and then, and here and there."²⁹ Ransom had initially suggested that the Southern and Kenyon reviews would duplicate the essays, but Brooks came up with an alternative:

[W]e might get four or six people lined up . . . and allocate two or three of the articles to THE SOUTHERN and two or three to THE KENYON. We could act jointly to see that the balance in quality and in subject matter and so on was maintained, so that one magazine got as fair and powerful a set as the other. The essays in THE SOUTHERN could make explicit reference to the KENYON and vice versa, and each magazine would call attention very prominently to the other part of the Symposium in the other. This plan . . . might get heavier gunfire on the subject than the first plan.³⁰

Ransom agreed, but also suggested that two graduate students be asked

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

to contribute and that Brooks and Ransom appear as symposiasts in their own reviews. Though Brooks foresaw possible trouble for the students, who by putting themselves on record as being against their professors might jeopardize their careers, he was pleased with the provocative aspects of the first suggestion. But he disagreed with Ransom's second suggestion, as that would certainly invite local hard feeling; therefore they compromised and appeared in each other's reviews.

By the time the Summer 1940 issue appeared, Ransom had already approached Tate, Arthur Mizener, Willard Thorp, M.D. Zabel, I.A. Richards, Harry Levin, Lionel Trilling, and Joe Horrell, a Louisiana State University graduate student. Except for I.A. Richards and Thorp, professor of English at Princeton, who had been asked to write on the political side of the issue, all accepted, though Zabel finally did not contribute. There also were volunteers. In July 1940 Philip Wheelwright told Rice that he would like to write an essay for the symposium, and Blackmur confessed to Tate that he was sorely tempted to contribute, but in the end neither participated. John Gould Fletcher submitted an article, but his essay was so far below the mark that it was not accepted. Finally, in the autumn of 1940, Ransom, Tate, Horrell, Levin, and Wright Thomas appeared in The Southern Review and Brooks, Trilling, Mizener, Sidney Cox, and Hade Saunders in The Kenyon Review. Over 4,000 circulars announcing this symposium were sent out by The Southern Review while The Kenyon Review circularized 7,500 people, including all college English teachers and the membership of the Modern Language Association. Still, Ransom feared that "many who needed most to read it will never see it."³¹

Apart from his "Strategy for English Studies," which appeared as the lead essay in The Southern Review, and which was actually only a

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

tepid retake of "Criticism Inc.," Ransom devoted a brief editorial to the symposium in his own magazine. In "Concerning the Symposium" Ransom frowns upon a Professor Gulette, who had complained about the quality of the student body. Ransom lectures the professor for not perceiving that "college students of all ranks seem entitled to the real creativeness of the professor," pointing out that it is not "to the credit of the professors if the studies which interest them are of no possible interest to the young men at large."³²

The well-expressed arguments in Brooks's and Mizener's essays in The Kenyon Review part of the symposium are also close to those set forth in "Criticism Inc.," and consequently do not need reiteration. In effect Trilling's paper, "Literature and Power," does not differ much either. Trilling states that though "any method which can bring enlightenment to literature is appropriate," what should be avoided is "that all the multifarious processes which necessarily go on about literature . . . substitute themselves for literature itself." John L. Stewart, who in 1965 would publish The Burden of Time: The Fugitives and Agrarians, contributed 'The Graduate Student in English' under the pseudonym of Hade Saunders. His jeremiad ends with the lament that the only thing the graduate student, "poor devil," is being taught about the literature of the past is to regard a poem as "'Exhibit A' in an elaborate detective mystery. He reads lines for literary debts and sources. He can tell you all about the background of Webster's plays but is totally unmoved by their great dirges and secretly wonders what the real difference between blank verse and prose is anyway. Of such is his knowledge of literature."³³

It is quite unclear why Ransom included "If We Care Enough," an unsolicited article by Sidney Cox, professor of English at Dartmouth

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

College. Though indeed quite different from the academic historical-biographical approach with which the symposium took issue, Cox's impressionism hardly accords with the ideal the other symposiasts stood for. Cox holds that "the only way to know a poet is to flow and form with him, and, after, by oneself." His ideal teacher "work[s] like hell to keep [the students'] common experiences open to the emergence of memories and feelings Without violating his own or the student's privacies, he will exert all his energy to keep his own and the student's dark and dangerous impulses in play."³⁴

The Kenyon Review received mainly positive reactions to "Literature and the Professors." Philip Wheelwright and Justin O'Brien, for instance, had greatly "enjoyed" the symposium and even Winters found it "all very interesting." About the only dissenting voice was Trilling's. He noted in his own paper "an insufficient sincerity," and was dissatisfied with the other articles "partly because their tone did not . . . seem just," as "the subject is somehow more important than I--and the others--made it." Nevertheless, Trilling was "glad it is being noticed, for of course the tendency of the pieces is right enough." Although little had been said that was startling or unusual--especially to readers of Ransom's earlier essays--the symposium certainly added fuel to the fire Tate had lit at Princeton. Because it was a concentrated and well-promoted effort, it had the desired "formidable effect." The symposium tapped sources of simmering discontent among young teachers and graduates, and it proved one of the most potent impulses towards a radical change in the teaching of literature in the universities. Eric Bentley overemphasized the Kenyon's pedagogical side in describing this symposium as taking up a "central position" in The Kenyon Review, but "Literature and the Professors" did represent the

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

highpoint in the Kenyon's interest in education.³⁵

That Ransom set store by symposial possibilities for his magazine was already apparent from the Kenyon's second issue. This was largely devoted to the symposium "The New Encyclopedists" and reflected Ransom's and Rice's partiality for philosophy. They regarded "philosophy as a strong second fiddle to arts and letters;" and, indeed, at the end of the trial period discussed here Ransom had reason to feel that "we have been slightly overplaying the heavy philosophical and aesthetic side of the publication." Next to the symposiums on "The New Encyclopedists" and "Naturalism" we find philosophical articles by, for instance, Virgil C. Aldrich, one of Rice's friends, and Marten ten Hoor, who in 1941 exposed the "philosophy" of the Nazis, as well as contributions by well-known philosophers like Ernest Nagel, who in his "Recent Philosophies of Science" briefly discussed the theories of, among others, Whitehead, Eddington, Russell, and Carnap. Both Ransom and Rice wrote editorials on philosophy and contributed to the symposiums; and next to numerous reviews of books on philosophy Rice also published a lucid admiring article on Santayana, whose poetic theories he much preferred to Cleanth Brooks's. Ample and serious attention was also paid to philosophy in the book review section.³⁶

"The New Encyclopedists," which appeared in the Kenyon's second issue, exemplified its main philosophical interest: the opposition of poetry and science, or of a metaphysical versus a naturalistic philosophy. This symposium consisted of a discussion of The International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, a few volumes of which had just appeared under the editorship of Otto Neurath. The Encyclopedia was based on the belief that the physical sciences are fundamentally identical with biology, psychology, and the social sciences. Charles

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

W. Morris' Foundations of the Theory of Signs was the volume that the contributors scrutinized most sharply as it laid down the theoretical foundations of this naturalistic, in places positivistic movement. Eliseo Vivas, the advisory editor, was for the New Encyclopedists; Howard Dijkema Roelofs, the head of the philosophy department at the University of Cincinnati, which Rice had left for Kenyon College, was against them; Rice added "Considerations;" and Ransom devoted his "Editorial Notes" to his ideas on the opposition between poetry and science.

Vivas ends his extremely appreciative essay with a strong statement of faith: "if our civilization is to perdure, the movement must triumph. For in a world in which science is freely applied to the material aspects of living there can be no place, in the long run, for anti-naturalistic mysticism and for habits of mind which belong to an age of magic." Roelofs' attempt at popularization resulted in an atrociously written article in which he accuses the Encyclopedists of presenting "verbal manipulations for real solutions" and, worse, of supplying scientific so-called knowledge, which cannot lead to the "right moral choice, the personal character which resists evil and holds fast to liberty, justice and love," in short, does not lead to what Roelofs regards as genuine knowledge. Roelofs' conclusion: "Today we have science and scientists aplenty. We lack saints." Rice looks at the issue from both sides: he strongly approves of the Encyclopedists' efforts at a philosophical synthesis, but feels that its actual elaboration leaves much to be desired.³⁷

Although Ransom in his private correspondence with Tate mentions Roelofs' "injustice to Morris," and describes Morris' Foundation of the Theory of Signs as "really brilliant," his publicly expressed

sentiments are downright critical. His editorial "The Arts and the Philosophers" is a continuation of the main thesis of The World's Body. In his book Ransom argued that while science is generally regarded as providing real knowledge, it merely gives pragmatic, and consequently only partial knowledge of the world and that art, on the other hand, though considered to be decorative or cathartic at best, provides us with a detailed, concrete, complete knowledge, with "the world's body." In his editorial Ransom asserts that art "fixes a kind of knowledge of which science has no understanding, and which gentlemen too confined within the scientific habit cannot approach intelligently." However, it is apparent from his rebuttal, "Science, Art, and Technology," which appeared in the Autumn 1939 issue, that Charles Morris closely approximated Ransom's view of poetry as "the world's body." He argued that art "denotes the value properties [elsewhere in this essay defined as the "objectively relative properties of objects"] of actual situations," and that art "is a primary form of discourse, irreducible to the scientific." In contrast to Ransom, however, Morris emphasized that "the recognition that art has a semantical aspect need not make art a quasi-science, nor a metaphysical rival to scientific knowledge." He went on to describe a work of art as "an iconic sign, and not a statement, and this distinguishes . . . the aesthetic experience from scientific knowledge." Therefore, Morris argued, art as such cannot be included in The Encyclopedia of Unified Science, but aesthetics is scientific discourse and should be incorporated. In spite of his admiration for Morris, Ransom continued to wage a battle against the monopolistic position of science and, using his privilege as editor, in "The Pragmatics of Art," had the final, though rather ineffectual say in this controversy.³⁸

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

The general discussion of science versus poetry continued to fill the Kenyon's pages. In "On the Semantics of Poetry" Philip Wheelwright asserts that poetry consists of "plurisigns," connotative words that have more than one meaning, while science uses words that are denotative and invariant, "monosigns." In her first appearance in prose the young poet Josephine Miles contended that all words are plurisignificant and that science and poetry only differ in their selection from this plurisignificance; her contribution formed a useful complement to his otherwise excellent article.³⁹

Wheelwright also took part in a more direct debate about poetry and science; the ongoing controversy about naturalism. Rice described this topic as "inescapable for a magazine with this Review's commitments. Not only does it have a profound if indirect bearing upon the standards of aesthetic criticism; it is of special moment to all who are concerned with the general reorientation of our culture which is being forced upon us by the tragic events of our time." Rice proudly adds that because of the "basically philosophical" character of this issue, the editors had called upon professional philosophers instead of men of letters.⁴⁰

Eliseo Vivas opened the discussion with an essay in favour of the "New Naturalism" in the Autumn 1941 issue. Though he rejects the nineteenth-century materialistic version of naturalism, as well as the related positivistic and pragmatist philosophies, Vivas emphasizes the necessity of a scientific approach to philosophy. He sincerely believes that such a "new naturalistic" approach, "rather than killing or alienating our sense for conduct and for beauty, irrigates and fertilizes the soil in which these values germinate." At Ransom's request, Wheelwright belligerently replied in "The Failure of

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Naturalism." This theist philosopher points out that he is not against science, but against naturalism, which "declares scientific procedures to be the only ultimately valid means by which truth may be sought." Religion, he claims, is at least as legitimate an alternative in the search for truth. The controversy was continued by William Barrett's review of The Nature and Destiny of Man (Volume I) by Reinhold Niebuhr, which also reflects an anti-naturalistic point of view: Barrett regrets that Niebuhr has not tried to prove that naturalism is an incorrect philosophy, but only that the naturalistic view is less interesting and less emotionally significant than the Christian's. Then, in his "Reply to Mr. Wheelwright" published in the Winter 1942 issue, Vivas, his blood up, confronted Wheelwright with several misreadings and now spoke out even more boldly: "if the claim is made by poet and prophet that they possess methods of verification different from the empirical, these gentlemen must be pitilessly shown up as muddlers."⁴¹

Invited by the editors, Wheelwright duly submitted a rebuttal. But when Rice informed him that, on reflection, the editors preferred to pass it up as Vivas would insist on a counter-counter-reply, Wheelwright exploded: "Why the devil, if you didn't want me to reply to Vivas, did you announce at the end of his letter ["Reply to Mr. Wheelwright"] that I'd be invited to continue the discussion 'with' him in the next issue? . . . I wouldn't have cared a hang about continuing the I-didn't-say-you-said-what-I-said-was game, but now if I don't yap back people will think I wouldn't meet your challenge." He was somewhat cooled down by Rice's asking him to write a definite, constructive statement of his faith instead, but found the proposed length of four thousand words stingy: "You allowed me 6000 words or slightly more on poeto-semantics; can I deal with God in less?"⁴²

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

He evidently could, for the result was "the most important [essay] I have written." In "Religion and Social Grammar," which came to five thousand words in length, Wheelwright called for a reacquisition of the religious perspective; but Bertrand Russell's well-argued, crystal clear, counter-thrust "Non-Materialistic Naturalism," which appeared in the next issue, turned the scales so much in favour of the naturalists, that Ransom considered it necessary to balance it with an editorial. Russell disposes of God and religion by pointing out that cosmic history has shown that God "has purposes quite different from ours," and that therefore "His existence, if He does exist, should afford us no comfort."⁴³

Wheelwright found Russell's article "hackneyed and superficial," but Ransom wrote admiringly: "How that man can come to the point. But it needs offsets as he doesn't express our religio-aesthetic point of view at all. I'm getting down to a rather longish editorial, easy-chair-ish item which would go into that and other things and sort of define our attitude by implication. But it may not quite come off." As indeed it did not. In his shallow two-page editorial, which included a discussion of Mark Schorer's anti-naturalistic article, "Mythology (For the Study of William Blake)," Ransom did not get beyond such platitudes as "writers of opposing schools ought to learn from each other," and "when the total event of a sunrise is defined astronomically most of its phenomenal content is lost; when it is translated into myth it is defined very loosely, but the terms have a breadth of meaning proportionate to the object." Perhaps Ransom's gradual acceptance of naturalism was responsible for his inability to answer Russell effectively. For within a few months Ransom publicly acknowledged his new philosophical faith: "it has grown more and more

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

upon me, at the expense of the strong prejudices which my old-line education drilled into me, to conceive human activities naturalistically."⁴⁴ Ironically, Eliseo Vivas, who had been one of the staunchest defenders of naturalism in the early Kenyon, in 1950 completely reversed his position in his The Moral Life and the Ethical Life.

We noted earlier that Ransom had never been in favour of editing a general magazine including politics and that he had explicitly warned his friends that the Kenyon was not in the market for essays with an Agrarian bias. The veto on political issues naturally also applied to articles from Rice's friends, many of whom were politically to the left. A case in point is an early draft of Vivas' essay on D.H. Lawrence in which he had implied that the "Leftist position [was] . . . a sort of official one with the Review." Ransom fumed: "We are not in politics. And that I say with an easy conscience . . . art has no more to do with politics now than it ever had in its life." But history interfered with Ransom's nonpolitical stance. World War II made Ransom desire to have "K.R. . . . renounce its virginity and pitch into the world crisis." His momentary dissatisfaction with the anti-topicality of his magazine only led to the rather shallow symposium on American culture. The plans for this symposium probably sprang as much from the lecture committee at Kenyon College as from Ransom's desire to contribute to the war effort. The contributors were invited by the committee to read their papers at Gambier in the Spring of 1941 and the double pay which the combination of speech and paper would bring them was an added inducement to participate. In his editorial in the 1941 Spring issue Ransom explains that the "symposium on 'The American Culture' . . . is by way of tribute to a sense of a crisis imperilling all." Yet, Ransom, once again, warns against the danger of turning art

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

into propaganda. He emphasizes that The Kenyon Review will remain "constitutionally devoted to 'arts and letters,'" as "it is just as much a patriotic duty . . . to keep the arts going . . . as to attend to . . . the state of public opinion."⁴⁵

In their optimistic predictions for the post-war world, the historian Rushton Coulborn and the poet John Peale Bishop virtuously follow Ransom's suggestion that "our proceeding becomes pointless if the parts are turned over to pessimists who can't prove anything." The anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn is more realistic. He convincingly claims that the American frontier spirit has led to a "deification of selfishness," and regards "a scientific humanism . . . [as] the only hope for American culture," for "a society in which the lot of the common man will be made easier and his life enriched and ennobled." As Kluckhohn also speaks up for urban as opposed to Agrarian values, and for "assimilation . . . [as] the only solution to the Negro problem," viewpoints that must have seemed revolutionary to Ransom at that time, it is surprising to find Ransom define Kluckhohn as "a brilliant young chap."⁴⁶

Even before Ransom had expressed his ambition to "pitch into the world crisis," two articles dealing with the war and literature had appeared in The Kenyon Review. One was a succinct essay by Julian Symons in which he describes "The Wartime Literary Situation" in London and predicts an increase in bad, propagandist writing in accordance with the rise of emotional temperatures. The other was the lead essay of the 1940 Autumn issue, "Karl May: Hitler's Literary Mentor," in which Klaus Mann, Thomas Mann's son and the editor of the anti-Nazi magazine Dissension, contends that the brutal westerns of the "petty criminal" Karl May heavily influenced Adolf Hitler. This essay fitted

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

only uneasily in the Kenyon. An anonymous writer for the Ohioan Mount Vernon News was utterly surprised: "Kenyon Review Goes Tabloid in War Froth," he exclaimed. And though the philosopher Virgil Aldrich found "the content of the article . . . interesting and important and the general position of the author easily sympathized with," he was also shocked by the style of, especially, the last paragraph of the article, which runs: "The Third Reich is Karl May's ultimate triumph, the ghastly realization of his dreams . . . [Hitler's] murderous minions are perverted romanticists, infantile, criminal, irresponsible. They are hopelessly estranged from both reality and art, sacrificing all civilization and all common sense on the altar of a brutish 'heroism,' but stubbornly loyal, to the foul substitute for poetry and culture represented by Karl May." "[S]uch phrases may have a place in a pink-sheet bit of inflammatory recrimination, but not in the pages of literary construction and criticism," Aldrich wrote. His reaction indicates that the gravity of the situation in Europe had not yet sufficiently permeated America. "The Nazis Purge Philosophy" by Marten ten Hoor was the only other direct result of the Kenyon's renunciation of its political virginity.⁴⁷

The editors favourable attitude toward symposiums is also apparent from "The Present State of Poetry" and "The Legacy of Sigmund Freud." In the 1939 Autumn issue the state of poetry in Great Britain, France, and the United States was discussed by Herbert Read, Justin O'Brien, and Robert Penn Warren. Read had initially hesitated about submitting: "I tend to value personal relations more than critical forthrightness. I know most of our poets . . . but in some cases my estimate of the poetry has declined in inverse ratio to the increases of friendship. And I haven't been honest enough or brave enough to

confess it." As Read simultaneously felt "a need to clarify the situation . . . in general, aesthetic terms," and as Ransom had no objection to such an approach, Read contributed a very broad account. He detests the lax rhythms and poverty of texture he finds in Britain's most prominent poets, Auden, MacNeice, and Spender, who use poetry as a vehicle for the conveyance of their political beliefs; Dylan Thomas and George Barker are the country's only true poets. In his mainly informative, perhaps too didactic essay on French poetry, Justin O'Brien takes the opposite stand: he endorses the "move away from the hermetic and the gratuitous" towards a poetry that has "greater communicability" and comes "into closer contact with life." Warren, finally, felt "pretty bad" about his essay. Indeed, he tries to do too much: in his fifteen-page essay he discusses nearly every living American poet.⁴⁸ Clearly, "The Present State of Poetry" was not one of the Kenyon's most outstanding symposiums.

As a memorial to Freud, in whom the Kenyon maintained a lively interest through the years, the editors "set about on a symposium of pieces trying to give a ripe and finished estimate of his final achievement. We thought of a paper by a first-rate philosopher . . . a paper on his therapeutic; and a paper on the application of his doctrines to the arts and to aesthetics." Though the advisory editors were asked for suggestions, Ransom and Rice mainly pursued their own ideas. They initially selected either Lovejoy or Whitehead for the philosophical paper, but the former declined, while, on reflection, Ransom found "Whitehead . . . too old . . . from what I hear of his now doddering state."⁴⁹ Ernest Nagel also declined; and at long last Vivas accepted. Edmund Wilson, who was strongly favoured for the literary paper by both editors and advisory editors, begged off. As Ransom

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

feared that Joseph Wood Krutch would do the same, he reluctantly asked Lionel Trilling, who accepted eagerly. Karen Horney refused to write the therapeutic paper; so the editors had no choice but to accept Alexander Reid Martin, whom she had recommended. All this goes to show that it often is practically impossible for an editor to realize his image of the ideal symposium; even though in this case the contributors were to be handsomely paid, as the symposium was also sponsored by the lecture committee, not one of the initially invited scholars accepted.

Despite these difficulties, the Freud symposium was a resounding success. In his editorial Rice pinpoints Freud's main achievement by emphasizing that he "was more concerned with opening an unknown country to adventure than with . . . blueprinting it for future settlement." Rice regards Vivas' essay as "very nearly a pioneer effort" in that most "[p]rofessional philosophers to their great loss have almost entirely ignored the potential contributions of Freudism [sic] to the world-view which they are trying to construct." Vivas' essay is the least laudatory one. He grants the therapeutic value of Freud's doctrine, but denies a logical connection between clinical practice and theory. He regrets, though, that Freud's influence on philosophy has been nil: Freud's "conception of human nature is much more fruitful . . . than any other available at the moment. For all its defects it helps make sense of our experience in its private range."⁵⁰

Alexander Reid Martin, psychiatric head of the Children's Aid Society in New York City, first gives a clear survey of the history of psychoanalysis. He praises Freud for the discovery of the concept of the unconscious, the free association technique, and the importance of "transference" in the analyst-patient relationship. But after having paid his respects to Freud as the founding father of psychoanalysis,

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Martin pledges his allegiance to the new wave of culturally oriented analysts such as Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, and Abram Kardiner. Lionel Trilling's essay is a hymn devoted to Freud. He describes Freudian psychoanalysis as "one of the culminations of the romantic literature of the 19th Century," which was 'passionately devoted to . . . the knowledge of the self." In its turn, the influence of Freudian thought on modern literature has been "so pervasive that its extent is scarcely to be determined." Though not the symposium the editors had envisaged, "The Legacy of Sigmund Freud"--supported by a book review of his Moses and Monotheism and Auden's poem "For Sigmund Freud"--bears witness to not only Freud's, but also the Kenyon's great distinction.⁵¹

Poetry

The poetry section of the early Kenyon Review also significantly contributed to its distinction. In 1941 Ransom gave a sketch of the ideal poetry editor: "An editor who is reasonable is not pre-committed for or against a given mode or kind or style of poetry. On the contrary, he is wholly averse to giving advices which would try to shift the substance of a poet's own poetry; he conceives the poet's originality as a function of the substance, and he does not propose to play God, if he could, at that level of the undertaking." But Ransom himself did not quite fit this portrait and gave a much more realistic picture of his activities as a poetry editor when he wrote, rejecting poems by Charles Henri Ford, "I just have to publish that which comes up to my own taste." Indicative of Ransom's taste is his statement in the June 1939 issue of Poetry: "we take only work that seems to us very finished and rather intellectual."⁵² Ransom's rejection letters also

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

reflect his preferences. He often returns poems because they either are not lyrical enough, or too obscure, or too negative. In fact, the remainder of the 1941 editorial reinforces the impression that Ransom as a poetry editor was not without his prejudices; he was unfavourably disposed towards

the verse written upon burning contemporary issues, moral or political. Poetry with this substance is hardly eligible whether with connoisseurs or with aestheticians, the reason being that it does not seem to them to be exactly the poetic substance. It produces glowing moralisms, but moral glow is different from poetic illumination, and usually excludes it; or it produces satire, which is a negative thing and not really the creative art.

He told aspirant contributors that "poetic texture without logical structure" was "not the right strategy" and that the editors preferred "poems which are metrically proficient, that is, close and careful; and the adjectives do not necessarily indicate at all those metrical effects that are regimented into monotony."⁵³

Clearly, Ransom best liked the kind of poetry he wrote himself. This is not to say that he closed his eyes to young, original talent. On the contrary, as he wrote to the young poet Muriel Rukeyser, he rated it 'much better to find younger writers than to call on the old tired ones, and in fact there is no use in a journal that doesn't have a strong set of younger contributors.' Consequently, he created the "Younger Poets" series for poets who, usually, had not yet published

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

whole books of verse. And as these "Younger Poets" were paid at the prose rate--which was only half of the poetry rate--Ransom could publish a fair selection of new talents. No less than twenty-four pages of the Autumn 1941 issue are devoted to the first instalment of this series, where we find poems by Jean Garrigue, John Ciardi, John Nerber, Reed Whitemore, Howard Nemerov, Howard Moss, John Parker, Elizabeth Lee, and Ruth Herschberger. Herschberger's three poems were her first appearance in print, as was Nemerov's "Notes on a New England Winter." In general, the poems perhaps are "rather thin, though pretty sophisticated," but in selecting these very poets, most of whom became distinguished, Ransom had shown that he possessed a superior eye for poetic talent. The second instalment of the series substantiates this: the Autumn 1942 issue contains a second batch of poems by Jean Garrigue, as well as poems by John Thompson, a Kenyon College graduate, and Marguerite Young, a Kenyon Review discovery. The third instalment consists of Thompson's second contribution and Robert Lowell's "Satan's Confession," which Ransom found "awfully spirited, an unusual very real 'enthusiasm' for poetry in these days." The discussion of the remainder of this series in later chapters will further corroborate the Kenyon's significance as a discoverer of new talents and a place where promising poets were assured of repeated publication, and consequently could experiment and develop their talents.⁵⁴

Many young, but poetically more mature poets were published at the usual poetry rate. Although it was not until 1946 that Lowell reappeared in the Kenyon's pages, Jarrell remained one of its main poetry contributors from the first issue onwards.⁵⁵ His "The Long Vacation" and "The Skaters" appeared in the Winter 1942 issue; and the singling out of the Emigrant poems led Jarrell to jubilate:

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

this is overwhelmingly the best judgment any editors have ever had about my poems; I hope God rewards you. . . . I'm not being vain, but (I think) making an objective judgment when I say you're unlikely to get much poetry it would be better to use. After all the poetry I've been reviewing, mine seems charming. . . . Did you notice the way the Emigrants is written? Like an enormous rondo: there are several themes that keep coming round and round, to be treated differently, more seriously that is, each time. . . . It's the best constructed big poem I've done; I've never seen a poem constructed in at all the same way.⁵⁶

Although Jarrell cannot be called immoderately modest here, "For an Emigrant" is a splendid early war-poem indeed; it appeared in a subdued version in his Selected Poems (1955).⁵⁷

John Berryman's gifts were also recognized in an early stage of his poetic career. He contributed one of his more personal early poems, "Letter to His Brother," the extremely topical "Nineteen Thirty-Eight," and "At Chinese Checkers," which is partly about his friend Delmore Schwartz. All of these are preliminary exercises: Berryman had not found his true personal voice yet. A blossoming Marguerite Young contributed four more poems, and Josephine Miles three; Muriel Rukeyser published the longish title piece of her third volume of verse, "A Turning Wind;" Weldon Kees and Frederic Prokosch contributed two poems each; "Colorado" by Robert Fitzgerald appeared; and Peter Taylor, at that time still a student at Kenyon College, published one of his very

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

few poems, "The Furnishings of a House."⁵⁸

If most of these poems conformed to Ransom's preference for short, lyrical, technically proficient poems, his ability to recognize and his wholehearted willingness to publish great poems that did not, accounts for the appearance of Delmore Schwartz's verse play "Shenandoah, or, The Naming of the Child." Over twenty pages in length, half of the play—including all the action: finding a name for an infant that is to be circumcised—is in prose, the rest is in blank verse. "[I]t hit me so hard I wrote to see if we could get it. It's slated for [the] June number of Laughlin's Poet-a-Month; so Delmore's writing to see if Jay [Laughlin] could use it a little later and we use it first. Intensely appealing and amusing—a new sort of thing. . . . I think Delmore is giving us something here which is very original and our readers will lap up."⁵⁹ So highly did Ransom value this verse play that when it appeared that Laughlin's edition would either be out simultaneously, or even beat the Kenyon to it—which it did—he nevertheless decided to print "Shenandoah," even though this went very much against his usual policy of rejecting contributions that were to be published simultaneously elsewhere in the United States.

Naturally, not all poets published in The Kenyon Review were young and in need of editorial support: Mark Van Doren, Marianne Moore, and Wallace Stevens also appeared. Nor were all the poets Americans. At Eleanor Clark's suggestion Louis MacNeice submitted "Picture Galleries" and "The Dowser;" spurred by Allen Tate, Dylan Thomas sent his "If my head hurt a hair's foot. . . ." The publication of two poems by Federico García Lorca, translated by Rolfe Humphries with attendant commentary by William Carlos Williams also bears witness to the poetic range of the Kenyon.⁶⁰

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Ransom did not mindlessly favour everything his friends submitted, but he was naturally glad to publish their competent contributions. Tate's "first serious poem since 1935," the witty, metaphysical "Trout Map," appeared in the Autumn 1939 issue. Another metaphysical, conscious artifact is Robert Penn Warren's "Love Parable." "Original Sin: A Short Story," the "most signal example among the early poems that points to the possibility of development and continued risk-taking in Warren's work," appeared two years later, in 1942. Less successful were Richard Blackmur's too ingenious "Before Sentence Is Passed," and, especially, Ransom's own Harvard Phi Beta Kappa Poem, "Address to the Scholars of New England." He had first offered this poem to The Southern Review, which had provisionally accepted it, but he had it printed in his own Kenyon when it appeared that there were not enough poems for the Autumn 1939 issue. In asking Tate's reaction to the poem, Ransom remarked: "I enclose my PBK effort. I mean effort. What started out as a lark became a burden, and I could have written several free poems out of the energies I spent on this one occasional poem. . . . The way that . . . poem looks in print to me, perhaps even more to my friends, will determine my future avocations, pretty much." Though Ransom soon realized that it was only a poor poem, his not really returning to his poetry until his old age may perhaps be blamed on the Kenyon, which devoured his time and energy. Much the worst poem to appear during this period was Mrs. Chalmers' religious "To the Regent (On the Late Secessions);" it is only noteworthy as one of Ransom's very few attempts to ingratiate himself with the President.⁶¹

Altogether, though in these first years the editors often complained about the lack of good poetry, and consequently had actually to solicit it, the Kenyon's record is surprisingly good. Poems that were

not up to par, even if they were solicited or submitted by friends or established poets, were uncompromisingly rejected: "I should say that you don't let go enough, the poems lack exuberance; they have a good deal of depth certainly for poems which start out like trifles." More often, the rejections were worded in a typically Ransomian manner: "I like the occasion, and the feel, of the poem on the old church; but I'm [not] taken with it quite enough, and I don't know why," or "Probably a man just married is in no shape to write poetry; they don't (I mean the poems don't) come out of his deep places."⁶²

Not all editorial plans worked out. There was, for instance, the failure to execute Jarrell's "best suggestion of his whole career. We [Ransom and Jarrell] were talking of Nobel and Pulitzer literary awards. He says: Why not have the Kenyon Review crown the best book of poetry annually? . . . We are feeling out the advisability of setting up a Poet's Prize (not a big one in money, say \$100) and a Committee to consist of Tate, Blackmur, Marianne Moore, Burke, and the Editor."⁶³ Although Ransom and Jarrell intended this award to become a permanent feature of the The Kenyon Review the plan did not materialize.

Fiction and the Fine Arts

Another plan that misfired was a 'fiction (or at least fiction-ish) number . . . to include Tate on critique, [the American female writer of well-known mystery novels, Ruby Lorraine] Radford on detective fiction, [Robert Penn] Warren on the American short story, and two short stories or at any rate one (since we have one by [Paul] Goodman and will have one by Delmore)." The stories by Goodman, 'Frances,' and Schwartz, 'An Argument in 1934,' were indeed published, but the

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

promised essays were not handed in. Only one other story, "The Ball," by Eleanor Clark, had appeared earlier in the Kenyon. For next to Ransom's limited interest in fiction, the scanty size of the magazine had initially prohibited the publication of short stories. But in 1940, in order to "have the 'rich variety' of the Southern Review," Ransom asked President Chalmers' permission to enlarge The Kenyon Review from 128 to 144 pages, so that "we could carry one or two more essays, or . . . some piece of fiction having both technical and imaginative distinction." At about the same time Ransom told Tate: "You know we officially want to print an occasional story: if it is experimental in technique at all, seems to extend the possibilities of fiction. We've had fine reactions on the Clark story in the summer. Have you any stories doing? Or can you direct us to stories of our sort? (Caroline [Tate Gordon], Katherine Anne [Porter], Andrew [Lytle].)" So, in spite of the fact that Ransom did not think fiction to be "our forte as editorial critics," he did realize that short stories would enliven his compact and complex magazine. As the Kenyon was not enlarged until Volume Five, it only added "Give Me Time" by Walter Southard to the fiction department of this period.⁶⁴

The selection of these stories shows a much better editorial judgment with respect to fiction than Ransom thought. All four of them are technically indeed out of the common run: Clark's story is surrealist, Goodman's a mixture of interior monologue and plain narration, and Southard's a child's interior monologue. "An Argument in 1934," "[o]ne of Delmore's best stories," gives a good portrait of the intellectual climate of its time in "the grandiose style [Delmore] and his friends affected, in what he called 'Biblical prose.'"⁶⁵ However, as one of the main functions of a literary magazine is to discover and

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

publish new material, the fact that Schwartz's story had already been published in the 1937 New Directions anthology is not to the Kenyon's credit. Four stories in four years is not enough to go by and the further history of The Kenyon Review will better show the editorial sensitivity to fiction.

Although The Kenyon Review was subtitled "A Quarterly of Arts and Letters," it only paid marginal attention to film, dance, and drama in the early years. Gilbert Seldes reviewed two books on the American theatre and the movies in the second issue and three years later Arthur Mizener discussed "The Elizabethan Art of Our Movies." In this essay Mizener points out that it is shameful that movies are not being criticized seriously; by way of example he himself gives an excellent analysis of several scripts. Ransom found Mizener's essay "good not only in itself but as varying our ordinary literary diet; it's as hard as it's desirable to get off the beaten track in our subject matter, style of presentation, and point of view." Even less attention was paid to dance. For seven years Lincoln Kirstein's superficial review of Lillian Moore, Artists of the Dance, constituted the sole contribution. As for the theatre, we find an unremarkable review by Francis Fergusson of Joseph Wood Krutch's The American Drama Since 1918, and George Beiswanger's first "Broadway Letter," in which he labelled 1941 as "the least productive [year] since American playwriting got under way some twenty years ago."⁶⁶

While these arts would receive far more attention later on, music and the visual arts were featured prominently during the Kenyon's first years. In spite of Ransom's dislike of Paul Rosenfeld's style, Rosenfeld was allowed to write a regular "Music Chronicle" for The Kenyon Review for as long as he was one of its advisory editors.⁶⁷

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Another regular music critic was the young American composer Henry Woodward, whose way of criticizing music--in contrast to Rosenfeld's--corresponded very well with the New Critical way of analysing poetry:

One cannot extract the 'content' of a piece of music anymore than one can extract the 'meaning' of a poem. This is not to say that it is futile to discuss the meaning of a work of art; it is only to remind us that the content or meaning of a piece of music or a poem can only be expressed adequately and completely by the work itself; that any attempt to convey that meaning through another medium must proceed in a sort of paraphrase or parable, and must be inadequate and incomplete.⁶⁸

It is remarkable that the British music and literary critic W.H. Mellers also recurrently appeared in the Kenyon in the forties. For Mellers' theories differed so much from Ransom's that the latter felt called upon to devote an editorial to Mellers' first contribution in order to refute his unsuitable assertions that "[n]o one can claim to be 'musically' educated who is not emotionally educated as well," and that the "cult of objectivity in music criticism . . . too often amounts to a refusal . . . to make first-hand judgments at all." The Kenyon Review paid considerable attention to music, but there is some justice in Eric Bentley's remark that Ransom accepted "poor stuff in fields he is little acquainted with especially politics, music, and painting."⁶⁹

With regard to the visual arts Bentley's judgment was too severe.

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

The articles by the main contributors to this department, James Johnson Sweeney, Jerome Mellquist, and Nicolas Dorantes, who was specialized in Mexican art, were usually sensible and solid. Much more brilliant, however, were the essays by occasional contributors. Dazzling, stimulating, if fundamentally wrong is Wyndham Lewis' illustrated article on Picasso, which was solicited by Ransom on the occasion of the November 1939 Picasso exhibition in New York City. Lewis regards Picasso as an "interpretative executant musician as opposed to the creator, or original composer," as "nothing but periods," and "a destructive force . . . a 'decadent' principle, to promote decay," by whom he is "[b]ored--but nicely, amusingly, bored." It was not until the Autumn of 1941 that Fairfield Porter's letter protesting this article was published. Porter tries to dispose of Lewis' article by characterizing it as "very bad" and "ignorant," and Lewis' "boredom with abstraction . . . [as] a boredom with the limitations of his own impotence." Porter may be generally right; still, Lewis on Picasso is much more engaging than Porter on Lewis.⁷⁰

Beaumont Newhall's article on "The Photography of Moholy-Nagy" called forth a reaction from Ransom himself. While in 1938, in "The Mimetic Principle," Ransom had still regarded the photograph as a "mechanical imitation," and photographing as a "characterless" action, Newhall's article and the accompanying examples made him realize the art of these photographs: "The functional use disappears; they become at once remarkable, in shape, in light-effect, and even in texture; they are pure particularity now, not function. This is one answer to the useful or non-aesthetic aspect of machinery, of which we are all terrified."⁷¹ Moholy-Nagy soon designed the Kenyon's characteristic cover, and Ransom eventually lost his fear of the functional aspects of

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

the machine.

Paul and Percival Goodman published a lavishly illustrated article on Frank Lloyd Wright in which they trace both the principles of and contradictions in his theories on architecture. In this well written leading article the Goodmans compare Wright's "Organic Architecture" to Le Corbusier's "International Style" and conclude that these two strong and original architects are complementary adversaries.⁷²

Finances, World War II, and The Southern Review

As in the case of the Kenyon's early criticism, the Kenyon's symposiums, its philosophical interests, the kind of poetry published, and the relatively moderate interest in the other arts during these early years indicated the editorial lines of its first decade. And again, many of its early contributors in these fields such as Eliseo Vivas, Philip Wheelwright, John Berryman, Robert Lowell, Josephine Miles, Delmore Schwartz, and Marguerite Young continued to be familiar presences. Conspicuous by his absence is Allen Tate. In spite of Ransom's constant clamouring for contributions, Tate contributed only three times to the poetry section, and his first article appeared in 1949, while his discussion of Whicher's biography of Emily Dickinson remained his only review.⁷³ Not unwillingness to write for the Kenyon, but dilatoriness and unforeseen circumstances usually kept Tate from actually delivering the promised contributions. It must have broken Ransom's editorial heart that the contributor he coveted most so often let him down; still, he never held it against Tate, who remained his close friend and literary confidant.

Press and private reactions show that the Kenyon's excellence did

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

not go unnoticed, and that within these four years The Kenyon Review had procured for itself a prominent place in literary circles at home and abroad. Howard Nemerov recalled that from "the first of my wish to write, my interest in writing, The Kenyon Review was there--so solidly there, in fact, that when I turned up at Harvard College I easily assumed it had been publishing since at least the Civil War; it was maybe twenty years before I learned the Review began only the year before I saw my first copy." In 1947 George Dillon, editor of Poetry: A Magazine of Verse, observed that "[d]uring the war . . . the American reviews that were read ragged by the young writers in England and Europe were the Kenyon and Partisan and Poetry." As early as 1941 Justin O'Brien wrote to Ransom that the Kenyon had "made a place for itself in our literature that is not challenged by any other publication. For the first time since the death of the Dial, I feel that its job is again being done." He added that André Maurois and Paul Hazard, who were in exile in America, "were planning to launch here a quarterly in French and . . . they wanted to approximate your achievement both for content and for physical appearance." But not everybody held so high an opinion of The Kenyon Review: Jarrell reported with glee to Ransom that the other members of the English department at the University of Texas regarded the magazine as "popularization. There, that will put you in your place."⁷⁴

More predictable was the reaction of R.A. Weaver, one of Kenyon's Trustees, who found the Kenyon "entirely too 'highbrow.'" Weaver's reaction was typical of the answers Chalmers received when he asked the Trustees to sponsor the magazine privately. For the initial \$15,000.00 had nearly been used up, and though there existed no direct threat to the Kenyon, as its earnings from subscriptions and advertising sales

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

had totalled over \$5,000.00, new outside support was needed for long-term survival. In fact, Weaver regarded the Kenyon's weak financial situation in war-time as "a good excuse for dropping the Review," and most of the other Trustees also refused financial support.⁷⁵

Chalmers also approached the Carnegie Foundation again, asked for \$25,000.00, but was refused. Somewhat earlier Blackmur, on his own initiative, had approached his friend John Marshall, Associate Director of the Humanities Section of the Rockefeller Foundation. Blackmur was turned down too: "we seldom if ever can consider support for a magazine. . . . Certainly there would be no chance of our considering help for a magazine of this type no matter how meritorious." Ransom "had not attached much weight" to Blackmur's writing to the Rockefeller Foundation, but when about three years later the Rockefeller Foundation made a complete turnabout and became the Kenyon's mainstay until Ransom's retirement, Ransom wrote Tate that Blackmur's early letter "must have been the prime cause of our success."⁷⁶

In November 1941 the future of The Kenyon Review still seemed relatively safe, even if the contributors' prose rate had to be cut back from \$5.00 to \$4.00. Two months later, however, the war had caught up with it:

There is . . . a possibility that we have to discontinue. . . . President Chalmers . . . has invited the faculty to elect a committee to study the actual college budget with him. . . . So a committee is doing that, and inevitably they will come to the question whether the Review--which no one at all ventures to oppose openly--is not a luxury rather than an

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

"educational necessity" and might not be cut off "for the duration." Faculty men whom I have talked with about the matter are opposed to such a stand, and I don't really expect such a thing. But the President, who seems to be behind us with all his might, has said that he doesn't know whether he could afford to go against a powerful faculty opinion in the matter; and that's the possibility of our discontinuing, right there.

I am sure that presently we'll have a little card for use with our contributors . . . to the effect that we'll pay just half of what we formerly did. And we'll shorten our office expenses, and after this spring go along on a student secretary rather than a graduate secretary. And I believe we'd better come down to an "occasional" publication, which in fact would mean three times a year, rather than a quarterly.⁷⁷

Ransom actually had to carry out all of these economy measures. That the Summer 1942 issue was skipped was not only directly due to lack of money, but also to the fact that Ransom had no time and energy left for editorial tasks, as he had to devote himself totally to the hateful job of serious and active campaigning. The Spring 1942 editorial informed its readers that "the Kenyon Review very soon will have to find outside patronage to the amount of about \$2,500.00 annually. The alternative is to suspend publication. Meanwhile we shall be grateful if we may hear from our readers of anything that would seem to our interest."⁷⁸ Form letters were sent to contributors, who were asked whether they knew of

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

likely patrons. Lists were made of possible angels. These were written to, telephoned, and visited, either by Ransom himself or by Robert A. Weaver Jr., student at Kenyon College and son of the stone-hearted Trustee, who also secured \$300.00 in publishers' advertisements.

In February 1942 the situation had become "worse than ever." Ransom feared "that we can't last beyond the fiscal year without outside aid." In desperation he turned to Henry Church. Church had financed and edited the magazine Mesures in France before he returned to the United States at the outbreak of the war. Ransom now offered him a stake in The Kenyon Review and laid at his feet "a 12-page department of FOREIGN LETTERS or FOREIGN LITERATURE in each number," as Ransom wrote to Tate, adding in the margin "more space if [Church] can put in more money."⁷⁹ As Church had--temporarily--lost his editorial enthusiasm, this plan failed; Church eventually gave \$500.00 with no strings attached. Altogether, the actual results of the extensive fund-raising campaign were very poor. The editors had aimed at ensnaring a small number of angels who would each donate at least \$500.00 annually. In effect, they found only one new patron, Henry Church, while one of the old-time supporters of the Kenyon, a Trustee of Kenyon College, George Frazer, now contributed \$1,000.00.

Another rash proposal that foundered, in spite of much initial excitement, was Ransom's suggestion to the New Directions publisher James Laughlin: "Why not subsidize us (in part if not altogether) and in return have the right to a running commentary on New Direction books regularly, the exclusive right to our advertising pages: with some nomenclature or some acknowledgment to the effect that you were as a publishing house behind the periodical. You couldn't possibly get to a

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

better audience for your own sales." Realizing that this was not a very attractive offer from Laughlin's point of view, Ransom threw himself into the bargain: "I would personally work for you: I'd read for you or write (anonymously) for you. While I couldn't take a job with you for my own gain, I can do it for the mag To make it go I'd be glad to hire myself out in some special manner if it would do any good."⁸⁰

But it was the demise of The Southern Review that turned the financial scales in favour of the junior magazine. The considerable anti-Southern Review faction at Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge had seized upon the war to point out that at a time when severe economies were required, this expensive magazine was an extravagance. Cleanth Brooks recalls:

It was devastating because we knew that the real reason we were being suspended was not lack of money, was not the war. That was a pretence. I found out later . . . that the Louisiana State University had made over a million dollars . . . from government contracts of teaching students for the army. They had a pet tiger for the football team to live in a steam-heated cage. What happened was that we had angered most of the powers in the administration of the university. . . . They could not understand the poetry we were printing. They could not understand the fiction. They did not know what the essays were talking about. To them it was purely a waste of money and . . . a way for these two young men to build up their own careers.⁸¹

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

Though Brooks and Warren did their utmost to save The Southern Review by suggesting extensive cuts, and by applying to every possible foundation, they met with refusals all around. On December 20, 1941 the decision was made to suspend The Southern Review indefinitely.

When Ransom heard "about that momentous and heroic casualty," he immediately made a "lurid suggestion" and proposed a merger which, he thought, might be the saving of both magazines. His plan came down to a review with combined contents, with both names on the cover, financed mainly by Kenyon College, based at Gambier, and staffed by Kenyon and Southern Review editors. A "noble" proposal indeed, as Warren and Brooks wrote to Tate, "noble because it is one-sided with John giving nearly everything and LSU getting full share of the credit merely by giving some editorial time. We have felt that he was largely swayed by personal friendship in making us the offer." But Tate was not so sure. Though he saw Ransom's proposal partly as a friendly gesture to perpetuate the name of The Southern Review, he also regarded it 'as a way of boosting the subscription list of the KR by about 1000 and as also a talking point to raise money. All of which is perfectly legitimate, but there's no reason not to see it realistically.'⁸²

Though Tate exaggerated the number of eventual subscribers, which actually came to about 300, he was right about Ransom's interest in the Southern's subscription list. But, then, Ransom had never denied or concealed his wish to gather the Southern Review readers into the Kenyon fold. It would then seem that self-interest rather than a laudable concern for The Southern Review may have been at the bottom of Tate's insinuating remarks. For Tate had been asked to become the editor of a new quarterly which was to take over the name and the

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

subscription list of The Southern Review, to be subsidized by Agnes Scott College and the University of Georgia and Emory University. As Brooks and Warren feared that the L.S.U. administration would block a merger with The Kenyon Review, they wrote Tate that they "would be proud and happy . . . to see the name carried on under your editorship," and were "anxious to see your proposition at Georgia go through." But although initially the money for the Georgia magazine had seemed "virtually secure," on March 2, 1942 Tate had to inform The Southern Review editors that the "magazine is not going through. Money, of course; and beyond that I don't know much."⁸³

The Kenyon and Southern Review editors then worked out a detailed merger plan very favourable for L.S.U., but even when its Board "unaccountably refused to sanction the merger," Ransom was not inconsolable. Brooks had telegraphed him, as he told Tate, that "he was still sure we could have the official right to take over their subscription list and fill it out, also take over their remainder money for the expense of doing so." Consequently, Ransom felt entitled to call the Kenyon the "literary heir" to the prestigious Southern Review, which he had described in 1940 as "close to being the best thing in the history of American letters."⁸⁴

Though Ransom was genuinely distressed about the demise of The Southern Review, the nearly \$600.00 L.S.U. paid for the completion of its subscriptions, together with the gifts by Frazer and Church, and small ones by some 130 Kenyon Review readers brought the total budget for 1943 just below the \$2,500.00 minimum which was necessary to continue publication.⁸⁵ This minimal deficit was amply made up for by the \$300.00 in publishers' advertisements secured by Robert Weaver Jr. for the Autumn 1942 issue. And so the Kenyon's first, and perhaps most

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

severe financial crisis had been successfully weathered.

The tragic demise of The Southern Review not only entailed both cash and subscribers for the Kenyon, it also meant the eclipse of its main competitor. "With the So. Rev. gone," Kenneth Burke noted, "the importance of the Kenyon's function was proportionately increased." The Southern and Kenyon had had so many interests in common that though the editors had agreed upon "steering stuff to each other," Ransom had also admitted to Warren that "[o]ne of our embarrassments is not too obviously following in the footsteps of the Southern Review."⁸⁶ Many of the contributors to The Southern Review also wrote for the Kenyon. But it was true, too, that The Southern Review was a broad quarterly, both physically and figuratively, with political and regional articles, and a generous amount of fiction, features lacking in the Kenyon. With The Southern Review out of the way, the Kenyon did not lose those readers who might otherwise have opted for its more comprehensive and perhaps more controversial competitor.

At the end of March, the influential, prestigious New York Herald Tribune, which mistakenly assumed that both magazines had suspended publication, had put its finger on the importance of these two "highly respected and highly literary publications:'

The value and the influence of both these magazines were not to be measured by numbers. Their circulation was, by any standard, small. What made them important was that they reached a new group of readers. They had a real following among writers, teachers and humanistic scholars. They combined the erudition and literary excellence of the best of the older English quarter-

2. A Multiplicity of Interests (1939-1942)

lies. They had, in addition, a sharp eye to the fresh, the experimental, the significant novel movements in literature and art, and a genuine sense of basic ideas and of traditional values.⁸⁷

It was not until the middle of July that a relieved Ransom could inform the Herald Tribune that "the report of our demise is 'exaggerated,'" and that The Kenyon Review "hope[d] to survive even the present war." In his letter Ransom also mentioned the defunct Southern's bequest of its subscription list and goodwill, honours which he felt obliged him to "enlarge our periodical somewhat. We are planning a department of fiction, a larger coverage of important current books in our review section and something like a coverage of the several arts in departmental commentaries." The Kenyon's readers were assured of its continuation in the Autumn 1942 editorial which was succinctly entitled "We Resume." Ransom confessed that "[i]t was altogether likely that a discontinuation would have been permanent and would have amounted to not merely a war casualty but a mortality, and a kind of victory for the enemy," but now he felt "as secure in the prospect of entering upon and completing another volume . . . as a merely literary enterprise has the right to feel in these times. Nor do we expect to discontinue after that." And, in fact, in the first few years following this severe crisis, by adopting some of the Southern's characteristics, The Kenyon Review was to become, in Ransom's own words, "better as well as bigger."⁸⁸

3. A FLOWERING OF CRITICISM (1942-1947)

Philip Blair Rice, Advisory Editors, Rockefeller Fellows

Even during the Kenyon's trial years Rice had played a larger part than had been anticipated at its founding. Initially, the managing editor had been characterized by Chalmers as "the man who does the routine work of considering manuscripts, who cultivates new writers, and carries on the correspondence." As Ransom very soon came to respect Rice highly, the latter never had to restrict himself to mere "routine work." As early as September 1938 Ransom described Rice as "a natural-born editor . . . [who] knows all the young writers and has executive force." Ransom reaffirmed this when he found Rice "entirely capable of carrying on" while he was deliberating the Greensboro offer. And in early 1943, in a letter to Tate, he ranked Rice "almost Joint Editor, not Managing Editor," adding that "[w]e both together perform about every editorial action that takes place in our office." Indeed, their editorial relationship was one of co-operation rather than of subordination. This is further substantiated by the numerous letters in which Ransom makes remarks such as "we conferred ceaselessly," "I want to argue that with Mr. Rice," and "Rice and I have deliberated a lot about the . . . essay."¹

Rice brought some important writers to The Kenyon Review, though David McDowell somewhat overstated the case in remarking that "that thing that changed the literary climate . . . on . . . particularly the critical level was that odd merger [of New York intellectuals and New Critics] that would never have happened if Rice had not come." Still, it was Rice who made the actual connection between his friend Lionel

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Trilling and the Kenyon. And in Trilling's wake came most of the other intellectuals, though it must be added in fairness that Allen Tate's friendship with Philip Rahv was an important connection, too. Anyway, once enticed by Rice, Trilling soon became such "a tremendously ardent friend of the Review" that when Rice wrote him about its probable demise Trilling grieved: "To me it's a great personal loss not to have the Kenyon to write for . . . I felt as if I had a personal part in it; when your letter came I was . . . planning to write you some ideas I had for the improvement of the magazine."² Yet, understandably, he was not interested in Rice's ill-considered plan to found a new kind of Kenyon Review at Columbia University with Trilling at its head.

Rice also brought in Eliseo Vivas. Vivas was one of the Kenyon's most enthusiastic advisory editors during its pre-merger period and held naturalistic philosophical views that were quite close to Rice's. It should also be taken into account that Rice kept abreast of both national and international developments in philosophy; had a wide circle of philosopher friends—from H.D. Aiken, Charles Morris, and Van Meter Ames to Jean Wahl and Jean-Paul Sartre—; was acquainted with many young American poets; and had a lively interest in French literature and modern art. These qualities supplemented Ransom's and broadened the Kenyon's horizon.

Not only Rice's views and interests, but also his temperament differed from Ransom's. Rice was extrovert, rash, emotional, and capable of great outbursts, while Ransom remained a "mystery" to many of his friends. Though Tate detected "[u]nder [his] surface of moderation and urbanity . . . about the completest violence I've seen in human nature," outwardly Ransom always was calm and collected. But Ransom's love of a good argument and his "valu[ing] and even

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

relish[ing] the differences of temperament" between him and his friends, made for a continuous discussion of problems at the editorial offices that was all to the good of the Kenyon.³

Ransom's confidence in Rice came to the fore in early 1944, when the renewal of Rice's Kenyon contract came up for discussion. Ransom wholeheartedly seconded Rice's request for a continuation of his contractually devoting one quarter of his time to Kenyon matters and explained why Rice was indispensable: "At the present time I am doing without him, and finding the going pretty heavy at times. . . . Where I need Rice the most is in constantly having his literary impression to compare with mine. . . . Beyond that, however, he is peculiarly valuable in being better posted than I in current literary discussion, and especially in that which concerns the foreign writers." Rice's contract was renewed on the old basis. Ransom proved his "perfect confidence" in Rice's editorial qualities when he gave him "the sole charge" for the Spring 1945 issue before leaving Gambier for a brief sabbatical from October 1944 to mid-February 1945. Rice did not let Ransom down: with contributions by Eric Bentley, Bertolt Brecht, Richard Chase, Philip Rahv, Arthur Mizener, and Richard Blackmur this issue certainly was up to par and paved the way for Rice's editing The Kenyon Review on his own during the academic year 1949-1950 when Ransom taught at Indiana University at Bloomington.⁴

After the demise of The Southern Review Ransom had taken on Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren as advisory editors partly "for political reasons:" the presence of their names on the masthead would confirm that the Southern's goodwill had gone to the The Kenyon Review. But as was the case with Rice, they too came to influence the Kenyon's editorial line because of the high opinion Ransom had of them. Cleanth

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Brooks now views Rice's relationship to Ransom in the same light as he does his own to Warren during their joint editorship of The Southern Review: that of a respected and admired working partner to a genius.⁵ But Brooks is overly modest. His careful editing alone of the Hopkins issues for the sixth volume of the Kenyon convincingly shows that he is not a mere plodder. Another first-rate special issue which will be extensively discussed later on is the one on Henry James, guest edited by Warren. Had Brooks and Warren only edited these two specials, they would have amply shown their value as advisory editors. But we shall see that their advice did not remain thus restricted; Warren's intimate knowledge of modern short stories, for instance, helped make the Kenyon's turn to fiction, which Ransom had chosen to inherit from The Southern Review, a propitious one.

Taking on Brooks and Warren made the list of advisory editors too long and therefore seemed to Ransom a great opportunity to "make a clean sweep, have about five names new altogether--not to hurt the feelings of Rosenfeld and probably Vivas." Trilling, Burke, and Jarrell were "pretty good persons," Ransom thought; and he wanted Thomas Munro of the Cleveland Art Institute, Philip R. Adams, or Jerome Mellquist to represent painting. Most members of the first board easily acquiesced in their dismissal; Eliseo Vivas, for instance, was "sensitive of the fact that my connection with Kenyon Review has all been to my advantage." As Ransom soon came to prefer a few advisory editors to a mere list of impressive names, only Brooks and Warren appear as advisory editors on the masthead of the Autumn 1942 issue. When Rice strongly urged Ransom to add Trilling to the list, Ransom yielded easily. He admired Trilling as a critic and realized that the addition of an energetic New York editor might bring in a whole range

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

of new writers and manuscripts. Trilling took his advisory editorship so seriously that he actually felt hurt and worried when the editors did not consult him continually.⁶ Finally, though Tate's name was struck from the list, Ransom continued to seek his support and advice.

Another important influence on The Kenyon Review was a consequence of an initiative of the Rockefeller Foundation, which, in spite of its earlier firm refusal to support the Kenyon, had gradually become interested in literary magazines. In December 1943 David Stevens, Director of the Humanities Section informed Chalmers of his plan to appoint young critics as Rockefeller Fellows to The Kenyon Review. Sounding Paul Engle whether he was interested in such a position, Ransom described Stevens' portrait of a Fellow as follows: "the Fellow to assist editorially; and the Fellow to confer endlessly with the Editor about Poetry & Criticism, etc . . . to their mutual advantage; and the Fellow then to go away to spread light in darkness." As Ransom preferred a meeting of minds to assistance with routine editorial jobs he suggested that the Foundation send short-term but "mature" Fellows, 'so that the Editor may receive great benefit from the association and improve his own critical foundations.'⁷ But Engle had to decline because he could not disentangle himself from earlier engagements. Other names that ran through the editors' heads were Cleanth Brooks, Kenneth Burke, Lionel Trilling, Meyer Schapiro, and Jacques Barzun.

Harold Whitehall, a British critic who had come to the United States to take his doctor's degree at Iowa State University and who had gone on to teach at Indiana University became the Kenyon's first Rockefeller Fellow, from May to August 1944. His stipend of \$185.00 a month was the first money ever to be--indirectly--paid by the Rockefeller Foundation to a literary magazine. Ransom was not

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

particularly impressed by Whitehall's gift for writing, but found him "a fine linguistic and phonetic scholar, not a dry crabbed one, and the best prosodist I know," and labelled his first contribution to the Review a "bang-up article." Ransom, who had expected to "exchange . . . mental wares [with Whitehall] . . . to my advantage," actually found him "adaptable . . . [and] good company" but rather lacking in initiative. Whitehall hardly influenced the Kenyon's editorial line.⁸

The second Fellow, Eric Bentley, was a man of different stature. Like Whitehall, Bentley was born in Great Britain, but was being naturalized at the time of his application. He went to Oxford, procured a Yale Ph. D., taught English at U.C.L.A., and spent two years teaching cultural history at Black Mountain College. Though still young—he was born in 1916—Bentley had written two books and published numerous articles in such prominent literary magazines as The Nation, Antioch Review, and Partisan Review. He had come to Ransom's attention "through the kind offices of Lionel Trilling . . . who was so enthusiastic about him that he called . . . up from New York . . . to talk about him."⁹ Ransom recommended him for an appointment, but Bentley failed the Foundation's obligatory medical examinations. At Ransom's insistence, however, Kenyon College was given a "Grant-in-Aid" of \$1,000.00 which was to be paid to Bentley for four months' assistance with the Kenyon.

A letter by Bentley written to his friend and advisor Jacques Barzun soon after his arrival at Gambier in September 1944 shows that he already identified himself with The Kenyon Review and testifies to his intelligence, energy, and imagination. Even though Bentley warned Barzun that he "should not imagine that I am very important here," Bentley's "pushing the things I believe in" often bore fruit. "I have

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

suggested that the KR run two series of articles each of which would be a book later. The first is a survey of the liberal arts at the moment: The Present State of Poetry, Drama, Fiction, Music etc. The second is a series of Reconsiderations of classics I am also trying to make our book reviews come out more promptly."¹⁰ The surveys of the liberal arts eventually appeared as a series entitled "Post-War Stock Taking;" and "Reconsiderations' became a very successful series of high quality articles which continued into 1949 with contributions by, among others, F.R. Leavis, R.P. Warren, Richard Chase, and Bentley himself.

Ransom "found him so useful" that he made Bentley an advisory editor, and as from the Summer 1945 issue Bentley's name adorns the masthead. Soon, he became, in Ransom's words, 'the most active member of our Advisory staff.'¹¹ Bentley's interest in Bertolt Brecht and in drama in general, and his many suggestions for contributors and books he thought should be reviewed, all left their mark on the Kenyon. As an advisory editor Bentley continued to feel close to the magazine and, until the early fifties, submitted most of his usually first-rate articles and book reviews to its editors, who almost invariably published them. Ransom's report on Bentley for the Rockefeller Foundation demonstrates both Bentley's special gifts and Ransom's keen eye for young talent:

Bentley is a brilliant specimen of a certain tough-minded sector of the younger generation which is likely to play an important part in our future culture. He is learned academically but scornful of the academic style; he is capable of most intensive thinking but determined not to inhabit an ivory tower; and

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

incidentally, or rather significantly, he is in politics decidedly to the left. So thorough is his political commitment that it gives him this advantage: he does not bother much about the current political issues but can put his whole energy into literature. His principal literary interests do not involve any political bias. In the discussion of drama, for example, his interest is very pure, and his intelligence and information are alike most unusual. . . .

[H]e writes with exceptional clarity and force. . . . I might remark that he has also a keen interest in music. He is going to produce many vital books, on a variety of subjects, if I am any prophet; his energy and facility seem to make that inevitable.¹²

In his turn Bentley wrote the Foundation that he had gone "daily to the Review office . . . to help with editorial work. This consisted chiefly of two things: the consideration of such MSS. as had come in and discussions of plans for the future. . . . I helped in preparing the Winter and Spring [1945] issues. . . . I was especially eager to help the editors find contributors outside the field where the Review already excels. Accordingly I suggested the names of certain music, art, and foreign literature critics."¹³ It may seem as if the Kenyon had much more to gain by its association with Bentley than vice versa, but it must be kept in mind that Bentley still was a relatively unknown critic, whose career was decidedly fostered by his connection with the prestigious Kenyon Review.

David Stevens, who had become more and more interested in the

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Kenyon asked Bentley for information and recommendations and Bentley came up with some large-scale plans for the magazine. He aimed "at 10,000 readers," at a Kenyon with "musical, artistic, linguistic, political . . . as well as literary interests" with "representatives in New York, London, and Paris." He thought "commercial slickness was required" to beat the Partisan and Sewanee reviews, edited by "very canny slicksters like . . . Tate and . . . Rahv." Hearing of Bentley's suggestions, Ransom wrote to the Rockefeller Foundation that he "felt morally impelled" to dissociate himself from these "high-powered plans" and, particularly, from Bentley's commercialism. He preferred "making the Review good" to going to any length to increase circulation, "otherwise we are just journalists." Ransom need not have worried about the impact of Bentley's remarks, for R.P. Blackmur's findings in his "Little Magazines Study" for the Foundation supported his views. Ransom's tolerance for and confidence in talented, if dissentient newcomers is indicated by the fact that in spite of his horror at Bentley's wild plans he subsequently made him an advisory editor.¹⁴

Much less influential was the next fellow, Charles Riker, who had graduated from Kenyon College in 1927. Riker, who taught at the Eastman School of Music at Rochester, New York, was chosen in order to stimulate the arts section of the Kenyon, and he spent the summer of 1945 at Gambier. He did not bring in any new, valuable, regular contributors; at his suggestion Roger Sessions was made an advisory editor, but since Sessions never advised, his name was soon struck off the masthead. Riker's bringing together of Robert Penn Warren and Alexander Calder by getting Calder to illustrate Warren's revaluation of The Ancient Mariner for the Kenyon may have been his best venture.¹⁵

Robert Penn Warren was the Foundation's fourth and final grantee.

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Like Bentley, Warren did not receive the title of Rockefeller Fellow, but the lump sum of \$1,000.00. In Warren's case, however, the sum was meant for three months, as opposed to Bentley's four; and the Foundation's reason was flattering. "[A]ssistance in some other form than a fellowship' was considered to be "more appropriate . . . since Warren is a . . . more mature and established scholar than candidates for fellowship appointments usually are." It is hard to point to directly demonstrable results of the summer of 1946 which Warren and his wife spent at Gambier. But in Ransom's eyes Warren had been the ideal Fellow: they had "an almost continuous literary conversation," a true meeting of minds, refreshing and stimulating to both of them. And, of course, as Ransom reported to Chalmers, Warren "advised us editorially, and it is public knowledge that he is an able and veteran editor."¹⁶ Finally, it must be emphasized that Warren's editorial suggestions never took the form of cut-and-dried advice, but, rather, were part of his personal, informal conversation and correspondence with Ransom.

So Rice, who became associate editor in 1945, the advisory editors, and the Rockefeller Fellows, crucially influenced The Kenyon Review in all its aspects. From fiction to philosophy, and especially in literary criticism, they made their presence felt. Criticism was definitely the Kenyon's most prominent department and its main claim to a much deserved distinction during these years. It drew especial attention in the Kenyon's special issues; in The Republic of Letters (1979) Grant Webster regards the Kenyon's issues on Henry James, Gerard Manley Hopkins, Dante, and "English Verse and What It Sounds Like" as "Ransom's central achievements," but Ransom himself actually edited only the issue on prosody. The others were edited, at the editors'

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

request, by Robert Penn Warren, Cleanth Brooks, and Francis Fergusson respectively.¹⁷

Special Issues, "Reconsiderations," New Critical Articles

Commemorating James's hundredth birthday, the Henry James issue also marked the end of the Kenyon's fifth year of publication, a feat which was "a little bit exhilarating" to Ransom, who felt that The Kenyon Review now had "got safely by [its] most infant and most mortal years." Though Ransom had been "growing steadily in the opinion that James was pretty near the principal literary figure in the language for the latter half of the 19th century," it is possible that the Henry James issue had been indirectly suggested to him by Warren. Although the idea had originally come from Morton Dauwen Zabel, it was Warren who had proposed a 1943 centenary special on Henry James for The Southern Review as early as April 1941 as "such issues may easily take a year or a year and a half to prepare properly."¹⁸ So, in this very particular respect too, the Kenyon was the "literary heir" to the shelved Southern.

Though both The Little Review and The Hound & Horn had paid homage to Henry James in 1918 and 1933 respectively, Warren felt that this subject had not yet been worn out, especially since "we have a lot of new critics about these days." In September 1942 Robert Penn Warren reluctantly--"I'm certainly not a James expert"--agreed to become guest editor for the Kenyon James issue and "to take over the correspondence on the subject." He drew up a tentative list of contributors including Tate, Burke, Blackmur, F.O. Matthiessen, Edmund Wilson, David Daiches, Joseph Warren Beach, and Howard Baker. Beach and Baker are not on a

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

later list made in collaboration with Ransom and Rice on which the names of Francis Fergusson, Katherine Anne Porter, Lionel Trilling, Eliseo Vivas, and Austin Warren also appear. Warren asked these twelve to write for the James issue and to send him statements about the subjects they were interested in in order to avoid duplication. In due course, other possible contributors were mentioned. Trilling, for instance, proposed Jacques Barzun and Andrew Chiappe. Warren threw himself into an extensive and convoluted correspondence and on December 15, 1942 blithely reported to Ransom: "The people now signed up are Austin Warren, Zabel, K.A. Porter, Kazin, Matt[h]iessen, Trilling, Daiches, Vivas, Blackmur, Fergusson, Tate, and Rahv. That makes twelve. Would it be possible to stretch things a little more? At 5000 words a head, this would account for 60,000 words. But Schwartz would be good, and I would like to see Marianne Moore represented and Edel (the man who is editing the James plays)."¹⁹

But two months later Warren had to inform Ransom that Kazin had had to welsh on his acceptance because the army wanted him and that, because of a misunderstanding, Trilling had dropped off the list too. When by the end of May Porter, Tate, and Zabel had still not sent him the subjects of their essays Warren became worried and wrote letters in the following vein: "And what has happened to your James piece? . . . Two people have already dropped off the list and we couldn't stand another piece of perfidy." They seem to have had some effect, for both Zabel and Porter hurriedly sent in their titles. But at the last moment not only Zabel and Tate, but Rahv, too, let Warren down. Rahv was afraid that Ransom would be "fuming," as he wrote his fellow-shirker Zabel, but he had been unable to finish his essay as "the departure of the Macdonalds (male & female) has put the magazine

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

[Partisan Review] into a phase of convulsive reorganization."²⁰ And Warren himself was also too busy to fall in with Ransom's suggestion that he write an over-view essay.

In spite of these disappointments, the James issue was outstanding and diversified, though perhaps somewhat heavy.²¹ Its density may be partly due to the fact that many of the contributors concentrated on James's less accessible novels The Golden Bowl and The Ambassadors. The lead essay was an exception: Porter's "magnificent James piece" dealt with "James as a child and boy . . . almost altogether notes on his autobiographies, with side glances at the children in his works." Fergusson wrote "James's Idea of Dramatic Form" and pointed out that James's "ideas of form and of techniques of presentation throw at least as much light upon drama as upon fiction."²²

His article links up nicely with Barzun's, which contends that James "is a writer of melodrama," which he defines as "the endless battle of God and Satan." The writer of the illustrated article which follows Barzun's, John L. Sweeney, is not mentioned at all in Warren's letters to Ransom about this issue; so Sweeney must have been brought in by Ransom or Rice. Dealing only indirectly with James, Sweeney discusses in detail a group of water colours painted by Charles Demuth under the literary spell of The Beast in the Jungle. The careful editing of this issue appears not only from its minimal overlap, but also from the arrangement of the articles: Sweeney's is followed by Matthiessen's article on the influence of the plastic arts on James.²³

Austin Warren's article "Myth and Dialectic in the Later Novels" was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics. In this intricate essay Warren claims that James distinguished between a dialectic and a mythic way of knowing. Dialectic knowledge is a conscious, social, and cerebral

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

process, while the mythic truth can only be arrived at intuitively, subjectively, through images and symbols. The doubts Robert Penn Warren had had about Daiches, whose critical articles at that time often dealt with social or socialist concerns, proved to be wholly unnecessary. Daiches argues that with James, "unless one begins a study of any individual work with an examination of the technique . . . one will run the danger either of interpreting the novel in too limited and specific a manner, or of misinterpreting it completely." Vivas uses the philosophical-biographical approach: he first contrasts Henry's and William's "moral conceptions" of the world, which he defines as principle against expedience, but then points to "the resemblance . . . in which they conceive . . . the process . . . through which the mind enters into relations with its world." Blackmur brings up the rear with "In the Country of the Blue" in which he points to still another aspect of James, discussing those tales in which the protagonist or narrator is an artist and claiming that these tales "look both ways, to the social novels that preceded them and to the fiction of fate that came after them."²⁴

Though not exactly pioneering, the issue certainly was timely: it helped launch the James revival of the forties and stimulated critical concentration on James's final period. That this special James number was not superfluous appears from, ironically, some remarks made by Ransom in this very issue. He writes shortsightedly that James merely recorded "the fastidious transactions of . . . the finished and Olympian society." And although he acknowledges that James "came to this stock fiction with an improved technical facility," Ransom thinks that "the modernity of his methods and the obsolence of his materials are ironically at odds."²⁵

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Most reactions to the James issue were favourable. Marianne Moore, for instance, felt under "deep obligation" to the editors "for the good it does me to have . . . the Anniversary Number of THE KENYON REVIEW," and spoke of its "vivid and absorbing presentation." John Marshall was bowled over and wrote to David Stevens: "This certainly sets a high standard for contemporary criticism. If we can somehow help . . . I'm for it"--which led to the Rockefeller Foundation's first direct gift of \$7,500.00 to The Kenyon Review. But, of course, not everybody was pleased. Edmund Wilson, who had contributed to The Hound & Horn James number, fretted: "It does seem to me an extraordinary lack of something or other on Ransom's part to get up these symposia on these very subjects such as Henry James and Symbolism which have already been written to death, and induce a lot of writers, most of them mediocre, who have really nothing to say on the subject, to contribute articles about them--instead of finding out what people who are worth reading have written or want to write."²⁶ Wilson did not know that he was on the list of possible contributors, and this comment may be seen in the light of the strange hostility Wilson always felt towards the Kenyon, a hostility that was probably fed by his unjustified feeling that its editors regarded him as merely a journalist.

Though the editors had hoped to persuade a publisher to print the James issue in book form, their efforts failed. They were more successful with Hopkins when in 1945 James Laughlin's New Directions published Gerard Manley Hopkins by the Kenyon Critics. As early as the autumn of 1942, that is, at about the same time that Ransom had asked Warren to edit the James number, Cleanth Brooks had agreed to guest edit a Hopkins centennial issue. Approximately one year later Brooks set to work in earnest. He told Ransom: "I am writing at once to line

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

up Hopkins essays. (I shall certainly write [Harold] Whitehall and should like to have more suggestions from you.) I agree that it is better to plan four or five papers rather than more. . . . [T]he smaller number certainly seems the sensible thing, and I heartily concur in that view."²⁷ It is clear from this letter and from further correspondence with Ransom that, although Ransom had given him a free hand, Brooks deferred much more to Ransom than Warren had done. Brooks's first choices were rather obvious ones, although not very likely to work out as he himself realized: "I should like to have Red [Robert Penn Warren] in the number, and shall ask him, though I fear he is too busy to contribute. Blackmur is, of course, an excellent choice, and so, I think, would be Allen [Tate]--though here again I imagine that he is too busy to contribute." But by 10 December Brooks already had acceptances from four of the six eventual contributors: Josephine Miles, Arthur Mizener, Austin Warren, and Harold Whitehall. He had also received an analysis of "The Windhover" by a Father Schoder, S.J., about which he was none too enthusiastic, even though he thought it "well to have a piece . . . by one of the brethren."²⁸ But the Jesuits were not to be represented.

Jean Garrigue did not reply to Brooks's letters, but Brooks was cheered by Robert Lowell's promise to write on Hopkins after March 16, 1944 when he would be released from the penitentiary where he was serving his sentence as a conscientious objector. In May, however, it appeared that neither Lowell nor Mizener could make the Summer 1944 Hopkins issue. Next to a brief editorial by Brooks the issue therefore features only four Hopkins articles. But, as he wrote to Mizener, Ransom saw "a fine way out:"

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

We are going to press with four (4) pretty good Hopkins pieces. Now suppose we have a follow-up in the Autumn number, of which deadline will be August 1: featured by your "letter" or 'essay" . . . supplementing, perhaps also criticizing, the original papers. . . . I've often thought any symposium needed a follow-up, to fill in the gaps, and record the objections. I know this: What a symposium on a poet will generally lack most is the general reader's essay on the total impact of the poet; the less specialized, pure belles-lettres effect. So what about that? A piece positive or a piece negative, or both. I thought of you all along as the man who would be most likely to give the general effect of an unusual poet.²⁹

Mizener accepted this new deadline, Lowell again promised an essay, and Austin Warren gladly agreed to review Gerard Manley Hopkins' A Life by Eleanor Ruggles, which had been advertized in the Summer issue. These three made up the Autumn 1944 Hopkins number.³⁰ Clearly, it had been altogether much easier to compile the Hopkins issues than the one on James.

Brooks's editorial to the first Hopkins issue merely mentioned that its essays were a centennial tribute to Hopkins, and that Mizener and others would continue the discussion in the Autumn issue. He also invited reactions from readers, but as usual, if these arrived at all at the editorial offices they were not considered good enough to be published. In "The Analogical Mirrors," one of his first published articles, the converted Catholic Herbert Marshall McLuhan--whose name

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

is not mentioned in Brooks's letters about the issue to Ransom—defends his thesis that "Hopkins is not a nature mystic at all, nor a religious mystic either but an analogist. By stress and instress, by intensity and precision of perception, by analogical analysis and meditation he achieves all his effects." In a letter commenting on this issue Lowell observed that McLuhan's essay was "good . . . but perhaps more an example of how critical analysis is improving than a brilliant essay." Whitehall contends that Hopkins' sprung rhythm is to be found in medieval dipodic poetry and that Hopkins, in order to "write sprung rhythm . . . was obliged to use alliteration, internal rhyme, assonance, and word repetition. . . . [and that to] use these devices, he needed new compounds and syntactic shortcuts." Mizener, however, put his finger on the sore spot when he remarked that "[i]t seems to me an open question whether the necessities of Hopkins' sensibility, with its need for repetition, led to his adoption of Sprung Rhythm or the necessities of Sprung Rhythm, as Mr. Whitehall suggests, led to the repetitions."³¹

Josephine Miles looks at Hopkins from yet another angle. On the basis of many examples of Hopkins' favourite diction she emphatically does not group Hopkins, as F.R. Leavis had done, with the metaphysicals, but with Milton and "the wordpainting poets" such as Keats. In his "Instress of Inscape," Austin Warren disagrees with both Miles and Whitehall. He points out that the early Hopkins indeed follows Keats but that the nearest parallel to the Hopkins of the terrible sonnets is Donne; and though he acknowledges Hopkins' acquaintance with Anglo-Saxon, Warren emphasizes that the poet was mainly influenced by Welsh poetry. Although Warren had written to Brooks about the "protruding 'facts'" of his essay, "its shaky

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

hypotheses, its bad proportions, its incoherence," Brooks, in sending it on to Ransom, proclaimed it "one of the best pieces on Hopkins that I have seen in a long time." Warren's second contribution on Hopkins, a brief review of the Ruggles biography, was less sparkling and wide-ranging, but it affirmed the Kenyon's line that it "is through literary studies like his own, not through more biographical detail, that we come to a richer understanding of his work."³²

Lowell's note on Hopkins is not very valuable in itself and is mainly worth mentioning for its being one of the first and one of the very few pieces of criticism he ever published. In its emphasis on Hopkins' "heroic sanctity," the article is perhaps as much a portrait of Lowell's own preoccupations at that time--he had become a passionate Roman Catholic convert in 1940--as a note on Hopkins. Mizener had seen proofs of the first batch of Hopkins essays and he explicitly referred to some of them, but was mainly concerned to write the suggested general survey of Hopkins and his times. In this "masterpiece" as Ransom termed it, Mizener reasons with reference to specific poems that Hopkins does not belong with the modern poets at all, but is a true exponent of tradition and obviously Victorian."³³

In contrast to the James issue, the Hopkins issues, which total nearly ninety pages, are partly contradictory, but each separate essay is written so convincingly, alluringly even, that the reader's mind at times gets quite confused. Next to using Hopkins' own pronouncements on his poems most of the symposiasts closely analysed the prosodic, textural, and structural elements of Hopkins' poems, and quoted extensively. In short, they criticized him in New Critical fashion. The symposium was well-timed since not many full-fledged articles on Hopkins had yet appeared, Hopkins criticism having so far been mainly

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

restricted to reviews. Therefore, the symposium and its appearance in book form considerably contributed towards a serious placing of this poet. The editors, rightly considering that The Kenyon Review had given Hopkins his due, published only one more review on Hopkins in the magazine during its long life.³⁴

Though most of the separate critical articles during this period dealt with modern, mainly American writers, Eric Bentley's suggestion—probably inspired by the "Revaluations" which had been appearing in F.R. Leavis' Scrutiny since 1933—to publish "Reconsiderations," "a series of fresh estimates of old authors by living critics," fell on fertile ground. Bentley unofficially opened this series in the Autumn 1944 issue with "The Theatres of Wagner and Ibsen" and closed it with his "Chekhov as Playwright" in the Spring 1949 issue. Most of the twelve "Reconsiderations" came up to the high standards Ransom set for this series. On April 18, 1945 he wrote to Mizener: "I think we have a big chance by planning to make something really good out of RECON.'s. Something perfect in its concision, overwhelming show of authority, and easy balance of learning and critical reaction. And the more balls there have been written about the man, the more importance the RECON. will have." A week later he added: "they ought to leave the common thing and the academic thing unsaid, and fix and focus on the bright meaning which makes the vision.... What we need very much is a new statement . . . and not a synthesis of [earlier] statements."³⁵

Bentley's contributions concentrated on international drama, which he considered to have been sorely neglected: "Look through any good critical journal and you will find stringent, zealous, and expert criticism of all the arts with the single exception of drama, for there is at present no significant theatre, and even the better dramatists of

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

yesterday--Strindberg, Chekhov, and Synge--are to a large extent forgotten, while their contemporaries in the novel and poetry--James, Proust, the Symbolists--maintain and even enhance their reputation." Bentley's own outstanding drama criticism, much of which appeared in The Kenyon Review, was soon to fill at least part of this critical void. Although Bentley himself argued that "[e]ven more directly than the other arts . . . drama is a chronicle and brief abstract of time . . . hence the necessity of historical criticism," history is only one of Bentley's critical tools. Each of his essays bears witness to his wide reading, not only in drama, but also in literature in general, in philosophy, and in psychology. Bentley both places his dramatists in their times and traditions, and analyses particular plays in detail by paying attention to their theatrical conventions, structure, character development, language, and stage directions. Both "The Theatres of Wagner and Ibsen" and "Chekhov as Playwright" and particularly "August Strindberg" are cases in point.³⁶

Volume seven of The Kenyon Review (1945) is adorned with three more "Reconsiderations." John Edward Hardy, a graduate student at the State University of Iowa, takes issue with Ransom's "A Poem Nearly Anonymous"--Milton's Lycidas--and contends, by means of detailed textual analysis, that "Lycidas is a poem wholly anonymous." Julian Symons' exploration of "Restoration Comedy" led Bentley, although he was not uncritical, to comment that "much of the essay gives the lie to my statement . . . that the literary magazines do not publish dramatic criticism on the level of their poetic criticism." The third "Reconsideration" in this volume is by Wylie Sypher. Although he finds "Pope . . . superficial," this "superficiality is of a very special and significant kind' and is analogous to rococo architecture. He finds

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Pope a master of the "Arabesque in Verse."³⁷

It is in the eighth volume of The Kenyon Review (1946) that the series reaches its culmination: Cleanth Brooks discusses Wordsworth's "Intimations Ode," Robert Penn Warren analyses The Ancient Mariner, and F.R. Leavis examines Doctor Johnson. Brooks's contribution was reprinted as "Wordsworth and the Paradox of the Imagination" in his well-known The Well Wrought Urn and may be considered characteristic of his brand of New Criticism. Brooks considers the Ode "as an independent poetic structure, even to the point of forfeiting the light which his letters, his notes, and his other poems throw on difficult points. (That forfeiture, one may hasten to advise the cautious readers, need not . . . be permanent.)" As Brooks himself had feared, many readers found this article "an attempt to fit the poem to a Procrustean bed---in fine, the bed in which John Donne slept comfortably enough but in which a Romantic poet can hardly be supposed to find any ease." In reviewing The Well Wrought Urn even Ransom felt constrained to point out that Brooks had overemphasized the importance of paradox, perhaps because he realized that in the hands of lesser men Brooks's methodology would lead to word-juggling.³⁸

In June 1945 Warren had sent Ransom an eighty-page draft essay on The Ancient Mariner. Warren realized that with respect to publication in the Kenyon there would be "a real problem in length," but begged Ransom to "hold off a final decision," as he intended to visit Gambier in September. "Then we could take a look together and work the thing out. And . . . I think I might want to do some dickering and juggling there on the spot with you at my side."³⁹ Ransom decided to publish three of the seven sections that eventually appeared as the introduction to the 1946 Reynal and Hitchcock publication of The Rime

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

of the Ancient Mariner. These three central sections could well stand on their own; they were also delivered as a lecture at Yale University. They still ran to a respectable length by Kenyon standards: thirty-seven pages, not including the eight fascinating illustrations by Alexander Calder.

However, the essay was not a drain on the Kenyon's budget. Reynal and Hitchcock paid the magazine a share of Warren's royalties "to amount at least to the cost of payments-to-contributors for critique and drawings," because of the editors' "equity in the matter, in the drawings which we secured, even in the critique which we accepted," as Ransom told Rice. In the Kenyon version Warren heavily emphasizes Coleridge's use of symbolism in The Ancient Mariner and finds that "the poem is, in general, about the unity of mind and the final unity of values, and in particular about poetry itself." The complete version of this "famous and controversial" essay displays "one of the few demonstrable principles of [Warren's] criticism: that every conceivable resource available to the critic is potentially a useful tool."⁴⁰

Although F.R. Leavis had been asked to review Joseph Wood Krutch's Samuel Johnson in 1945, it was not until the end of April 1946 that he sent "instead of a review, an article you probably wouldn't find room for." Krutch's book had seemed to Leavis "surprisingly good." Consequently, Leavis apologized, he had found himself "committed to an article" as he had not wanted to "merely assert or imply." But Ransom was only too delighted to be able to publish an article by F.R. Leavis at long last. Moreover, this "fresh statement of Johnson's whole achievement" perfectly fitted the "Reconsiderations" series. In his belligerent essay Leavis labels Johnson "the supreme Augustan writer" who "discriminates with something approaching infallibility between

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

what is strong and what is weak in the eighteenth century." But, Leavis argues, Johnson's limitations, such as his failure to understand Shakespeare's genius, also follow from his being so wholly a man of his time.⁴¹

The careful composition of the Kenyon is once more demonstrated by the publication in this same issue of a review of Explorations by L.C. Knights, one of Leavis' "most intimate collaborators" on the critical magazine Scrutiny. Eric Bentley, Knights's reviewer, who was to edit The Importance of Scrutiny in 1948, described this magazine as "one of the best literary journals of today." In his turn, Leavis reviewed this very issue of The Kenyon Review in Scrutiny. He argued with Bentley's reservations about Scrutiny, but returned the compliment by calling the Kenyon "the best of those American reviews which, published from universities, give American criticism so marked an advantage over British."⁴²

"[T]he most exciting of Victorian novels," Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights, both published in 1847, were discussed in Richard Chase's "Centennial Observance," a "Reconsideration" on the Brontës. In this early article Chase already quests for myth, regarding the "Brontë culture heroine as a mythical being" who fails in her purpose "to transform primeval society into a humane and noble order of civilization." In "Flaubert: Portrait of the Artist as a Saint," the only "Reconsideration" of a French novelist, Harry Levin approaches his subject in a much more traditional, mainly biographical way.⁴³

In sum, the distinguished sequence of "Reconsiderations" showed a wide variety of critical approaches and concerned, especially, British authors and foreign drama. Whether they were mainly biographical, formalistic, mythical or mixed critiques, most of these always well

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

written articles succeeded in their purpose to shed new light on the authors discussed, or even to rescue them from oblivion.

There is one "Reconsideration" that must still be discussed, Ransom's own "The Literary Criticism of Aristotle." This essay, which was also read as an independent paper at a symposium entitled "The Great Critics" at Johns Hopkins University on April 13, 1948, is the continuation and the conclusion of two earlier articles which had appeared in the Kenyon nearly a year before. The first article in this sequence, "The Formal Analysis," has already been briefly mentioned as it consists partly of a review of Brooks's The Well Wrought Urn.⁴⁴ Further discussion of this essay is essential as it is of supreme importance in the history of The Kenyon Review. It is here, for the first time, that Ransom publicly dissociates himself from the New Criticism:

For twenty or twenty-five years we have lived with a kind of literary criticism more intensive than a language has ever known. But a revulsion is setting in against it. The new criticism probably is most at home today in the academy, where it flourishes as a lively "minority" movement. The literary enthusiasms of the academy are sometimes tardy, however, and it is common for a given taste to have run through its period among professional men of letters at about the time it establishes itself among the students and instructors. From these it receives a second start in life, and if the taste is an intelligent one this will doubtless be a long life. But at the moment the new criticism

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

appears to have been slightly disappointing to the expectations it had aroused.

It has achieved a linguistic revolution in its reading of poetry. Its emphasis is upon the total connotation of words. . . . So poetry has waited for our age to recognize and publish a sort of irresponsible exuberance in the energy of its materials, which constantly imperils its sober order. In fact the new critics, careless of the theoretical constitution of poetry, have contrived to create a sense of its disorder. But at last this has become embarrassing. We have grown familiar with many exciting turns of poetic language, but we begin to wonder if we are able to define a poem.⁴⁵

Ransom then calls for a new theory of poetry which includes psychology to determine poetry's use and motive as well as formal analysis. These two approaches, Ransom cautions, "have to be in consultation together at every step." Indeed, Ransom has come a long way from "Criticism, Inc.:" psychology is not a subsidiary method any longer but at least as important as unravelling a poem's texture. Ransom's change of heart can easily be accounted for. At a time when hardly any attention was paid to texture, Ransom had found it "tactical" to emphasize that aspect of poetry; but now that a mechanical, narrow kind of formal analysis threatened to become prevalent in the academy, he felt that the scales had to be tipped again to create the necessary balance.⁴⁶

So, in his second, rather vague essay "The Final Cause," Ransom looks anew at poetry with the help of the Freudian terms Ego and Id.

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Theoretically, this essay only obfuscates his earlier statements on poetry, but the excellent practical analysis of, among other things, a scene from Hamlet is very much to Ransom's credit. Ransom announced that he would continue this discussion in the Winter 1947 issue, but it was not until the summer of 1948 that his third and concluding article appeared as a "Reconsideration." In late April John Palmer had asked Ransom to submit his lecture on Aristotle to The Sewanee Review. But Ransom refused and explained that "[w]e are overdue with Ransom's instalment, and this is it." His main reason was not that "the item is . . . publicly called for," but that "[w]hat goes in the KR of mine is without 'payment to contributor.'" This meant a "saving of \$65 or \$75 to the budget." The mediocre quality of the essay cannot account for Palmer's interest. Ransom's outright declaring himself to be an Aristotelian naturalist who is "[n]ot for one minute . . . tempted . . . to 'reject' the scientific achievement" may have been shocking to some, but there is nothing new in his discussion of Aristotle's treatment of mimesis and katharsis. Robert Fitzgerald found that Ransom sometimes was "carrying [his] courtesy to positivism too far," and described the essay as "patient and charming."⁴⁷

As for the New Criticism, although Ransom in "The Formal Analysis" lashed out at an academic, narrow conception of it, it was to a large extent his own publication of brilliant practical New Critical articles in The Kenyon Review which had made this kind of criticism so popular in the universities. Robert Penn Warren's lucid essays on, for instance, Eudora Welty and "Melville the Poet" again stand out, as does his essay on Hemingway, which served as the introduction to Scribners' 1949 edition of A Farewell to Arms. More theoretical, but still firmly embedded in practical criticism, is Warren's classic, widely

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

anthologized, "Pure and Impure Poetry." In this essay, which appeared in the Spring 1943 issue, he attacks the notion that poems should be exclusive of certain areas of experience and, particularly, should not contain anything that seemingly contradicts the poet's main purpose. Ransom's reactions to "Pure and Impure Poetry" reflected both his personal intolerance of critical theories that differed from his own and his editorial acumen. On the one hand, he reprimanded Warren for not recognizing "that not all the relationships between items in the poems are structural ones;" on the other hand, he included this essay in The Kenyon Critics.⁴⁸

A survey of the Kenyon's important book review section during this period displays R.P. Blackmur's best and main contributions. Delmore Schwartz, for instance, regarded Blackmur's--admittedly somewhat too laudatory--discussion of his long poem Genesis (1943) as one of the few intelligent reviews of the book. Appearing two years later in the Spring 1945 issue, Blackmur's "Notes on Eleven Poets," however stimulating, was too severe at points. In particular, his opinion of Lowell's first volume of verse, Land of Unlikeness, was too low, although perhaps a good counterpoise to the overenthusiastic reviews it generally received. "In Lowell's Land of Unlikeness there is nothing loved unless it be its repellence; and there is not a loving metre in the book," Blackmur wrote. This led Ransom to confess to Lowell that he "felt violently let down by Blackmur's patronizing and superior remarks." Blackmur himself realized "that what I had to say about Robert Lowell may be too wide," but, as he told Tate, Lowell "had . . . invited it by publishing so much anathema himself." Yet, if this review shows Blackmur's inability to treasure poetry that was technically very different from his own, such as H.D.'s or William

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

Carlos Williams', or his lack of charity towards poets, such as Lowell, with whose ideas he disagreed, it also shows his perfect phrasing with respect to poetry he felt empathy with, such as Tate's. Moreover, Blackmur stayed close to the texts he discussed; he had not yet yielded to the flights of critical fancy of his later years.⁴⁹

Marianne Moore was particularly pleased with Randall Jarrell's review of her What Are Years (1941). Included in The Kenyon Critics, this essay acclaims Moore as "the greatest living woman poet," as "Henry James in pure crystalline form." No wonder that Moore felt "under a heavy debt to Randall Jarrell." Jarrell's own Blood for a Stranger came in for praise in an omnibus review by Arthur Mizener which appeared in the Winter 1943 issue. "[I]n desperation' Mizener had ranged his eleven poets--'a random selection made by [t]ime alone --'from right to left, according as they were more or less conventional in manner." He found Jarrell's first solo volume "the most exciting of th[e] whole collection" and recognized in Berryman's Poems 'a writer of considerable natural talent.' Mizener's remarking upon Blackmur's "incredible ingenuity," upon Mark Van Doren as "one of the most attractive poets . . . unpretentious and expert," his waving aside of Hans Zinsser as "an example too derivative and insensitive to be of interest,' all this and more made Ransom exclaim that the Kenyon had "never had a neater & more discriminating job."⁵⁰

L.O. Matthiessen's omnibus review "American Poetry Now," which appeared about two years later was equally excellent. His condemnatory phrase about E.E. Cummings as "the experimentalist of one experiment" is memorable, but Matthiessen is quite as perceptive when he praises. He rightly notes, for instance, that with his "Ballad of Billie Potts" Robert Penn Warren has entered "quite a new realm by accomplishing the

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

fusion . . . between the poetry of the coteries and the poetry of the folk." Matthiessen's Spring 1943 article on "Eliot's Quartets," which he analysed in New Critical detail, is as penetrating. But Ransom disagreed with Matthiessen's admiration for Eliot's poetry and in an editorial entitled "The Inorganic Muses" used Matthiessen's article as a starting point for an attack on The Waste Land, the "structural unity [of which] . . . has been sought by ablest and most generous scholars without conspicuous success." In the Autumn 1947 issue Mark Schorer discussed no fewer than fourteen novels by mainly minor talents in his omnibus review "The American Novel." This was a precursor of his more theoretical critical classic "Technique as Discovery," which appeared in The Hudson Review's maiden issue. In "The American Novel" Schorer proves himself a New Critic in arguing that fiction deserves the same scrutiny that had been lavished on poetry. Contradicting the notion that the New Criticism had stunted the growth of young poets, Schorer suggests that it is just because "poetry has had the advantage of a large and excellent accompaniment in criticism" that for "every six or seven men and women now writing distinguished poetry, one can name perhaps one man or woman who is writing distinguished fiction."⁵¹

Three years earlier, one of those excellent technical analysts of poetry, Cleanth Brooks, had extensively discussed The Anatomy of Nonsense by Yvor Winters, whom he described as "perhaps our most logically rigorous critic; . . . certainly one of the most intelligent; and . . . undoubtedly the most cantankerous." Winters had certainly been cantankerous in his condemnation of Ransom's essay on him in The New Criticism, which, as Brooks pointed out, actually "was characterized by critical sympathy." But Brooks was not blinded by his being "deeply indebted" to Ransom's criticism and argued that Winters

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

'searches some of the weaknesses in Ransom's position.' Brooks wrote to Ransom that he wished that he "had been able to take more time for the discussion of Winters' chapter on you" and "were surer of my own position in relation to his and yours," but Ransom quite liked the review. Ransom was pleased too, with Harold Whitehall's very flattering review--written in only four hours--of H.L. Mencken, The American Language: Supplement One (1945). He included this review in The Kenyon Critics. As a professional linguist and an Englishman who had been living in the United States for many years Whitehall proved to be eminently suited for the job of reviewing the amateur Mencken on the differences between British and American English.⁵²

Finally, among Eric Bentley's many excellent reviews in fields as diverse as drama, psychology, and architecture, his discussion of The Little Magazine (1947) by Frederick J. Hoffman, et al. is, by its nature, of particular interest. Somewhat unfairly, Bentley compares this historical and bibliographical work, which he regards as "superficial and erratic," to the Accent and Partisan anthologies, which give a "much better notion of little magazines." In discussing the Partisan Reader (1946) Bentley remarks that it "is in spite of the big political talk, and in spite of the bad manners and ugly cruelties that mark its controversies, that Partisan Review earns our admiration.' He turns the commonest charge against Partisan, namely that it is journalistic, into praise: "The interest in the new is legitimate and necessary." Moreover, Bentley observes, "each magazine has the right to choose its own site and stick to it." He continues: "If Partisan . . . is to rid the word Journalism of its pejorative overtones, KR is to perform the same office for the word Academic." The function of the "'academic' Little Magazine" is "to show that all

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

the past is 'usable'," Bentley argues, rather overemphasizing the Kenyon's interest in the past.⁵³

Conspicuously absent in this presentation of excellent contributions by practical New Critics are Ransom and Rice. Although they often contributed to the book review section, their reviews are not so outstanding as to merit special attention. During the period under discussion their main achievements are to be found in the fields of aesthetics and philosophy which will be dealt with later on.⁵⁴

The New York Intellectuals, Kenneth Burke

In these years the New York intellectuals are not at all as prominently represented as they were during the earlier period and pale into insignificance beside the New Critics. Of the New York intellectuals Lionel Trilling, the advisory editor, acquitted himself best. He, for instance, reviewed—and demolished—Theodore Reik's Psychology of Sex Relations. He also disagreed with Maxwell Geismar's main thesis in Writers in Crisis, that the function of the writer is to "provide the stipulated salvation of the moment." Although Ransom had initially credited only Kenneth Burke with the "necessary perspective" to handle both Writers in Crisis and two other books dealing with the same theme "coolly and ad[e]quately," Ransom was impressed with Trilling's treatment.⁵⁵

Trilling also reviewed the English translation of Denis de Rougemont, La Parte Du Diable, but as more than a year earlier, in the Winter 1944 issue, Charles Glenn Wallis had already discussed the original so admirably that this review was included in The Kenyon Critics, Trilling's was redundant. (Ransom had eagerly published

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

absolutely everything Wallis, "one of the most brilliant of the young critics," ever submitted when Wallis died in an accident in the spring of 1944.) Trilling "didn't quite like" his one full-scale contribution during this period, a long review of The Bitter Box, Eleanor Clark's first novel, which appeared in the Autumn 1946 issue. This piece is mainly remarkable in that in praising Clark for dealing with the Communist Party, "this subject that properly should have attracted many novelists before," Trilling is, in effect, praising himself: he was writing The Middle of the Journey (1947) at that time. The main thesis of this review was worked out to perfection in his famous "Manners, Morals, and the Novel," which appeared about a year later in The Kenyon Review; here he describes the ideal novel as "a perpetual quest for reality, the field of its research being always the social world, the material of its analysis being always manners as the indication of the direction of man's soul."⁵⁶

One of the very few remaining full-fledged articles by a writer whom Irving Howe grouped with the New York intellectuals was John Berryman's "F. Scott Fitzgerald." For some years Fitzgerald had been buried in oblivion and, as Ransom wrote Berryman, never had "had an adequate highbrow treatment" anyway. So, on the occasion of the publication of The Crack-up (1945), edited by Edmund Wilson, Berryman undertook to rescue Fitzgerald from such an undeserved fate. His discriminating essay heralded the Fitzgerald revival. In it Berryman looks at Fitzgerald's background and argues that his living among "the well-heeled infantile world of American popular writing," among "the formula boys," "cost him . . . the criticism that might have saved him," "his sense of reality," and "his faith in art."⁵⁷

Philip Rahv reviewed relatively often for The Kenyon Review. His

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

most controversial contribution appeared in the Spring 1944 issue and dealt with Arrival and Departure by Arthur Koestler. Ransom wholly disagreed with Rahv's exhortation to Koestler and his hero, a disillusioned political revolutionist, "to go on with the fight," and in his editorial "Artists, Soldiers, Positivists," stressed once again that propaganda is inimical to art. A collection of essays by Koestler, The Yogi and the Commissar, was the subject of the only review William Phillips, Rahv's fellow editor at Partisan Review, wrote for the Kenyon. In this review Phillips shows up Koestler's "odd mixture of penetrating observation and glib generalization, of unusually perceptive writing and flashy, upper-case rhetoric."⁵⁸

Koestler was the intellectuals' pet subject at that time. His Insight and Outlook was condemned by Isaac Rosenfeld in Kenyon's Spring 1949 issue. For some of the radiance of Partisan's "golden boy," as Irving Howe dubbed Rosenfeld, was reflected in the Kenyon, where he reviewed fairly often, too. Most important is Rosenfeld's treatment of Kenneth Burke's A Grammar of Motives in 1946. In this essay, which was included in The Kenyon Critics, Rosenfeld claims that A Grammar of Motives is "not a grammar at all, but a mixture of formal and material elements, comprising a metaphysics," and points out that metaphysics is particularly "ill-suited to the analysis of language." Burke's thought is "linguistic solipsism." Naturally, this angered Burke. He wrote to Allen Tate: "Ransom put me up to bat in Kenyon with two out, two strikes, and nobody on base (in giving the book to one of the stinks of the Phartisan [sic], and a positivist)." ⁵⁹

Part of the final chapter of A Grammar of Motives entitled "The Temporizing of Essence" had appeared in the Autumn 1945 issue of the Review. Ransom had called this part "simply first-rate," "[c]lean and

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

clear," and Burke's "books . . . evidence that no living critic has made steadier or further progress in the theory of literature." But added to Rosenfeld's offensive review in the Kenyon was the insult, as Burke saw it, of Ransom's unexpectedly condemnatory discussion of A Grammar of Motives in The New Republic. Here Ransom suddenly describes Burke's dialectic as cold, verbal manipulation. Moreover, he berates Burke for speaking disparagingly about "scientism," and even speaks up for behaviourism.⁶⁰

A long and convoluted correspondence followed. Burke, who in December 1945 had written to Ransom that he was "delighted to learn that you intend inspecting the Grammar," was bitterly and furiously disappointed. Referring to Ransom's New Republic review, his own reaction, and Ransom's counter-reply--both of which this weekly had promised to publish--Burke wrote:

You may manage in your letter to kick up a cloud of dust in the hopes of escaping before it settles. And you may succeed because, as you know, I will not have the opportunity to answer you publicly, unless you gallantly offer me the chance to do so in you own pages I am not asking for gentleness from anybody. I am asking only for a right to make my position clear, asking it of an opponent who has the space to offer me if he will. I won't get it.⁶¹

Ransom tried to conciliate Burke and asked The New Republic to return his own letter. In the end, however, The New Republic did not publish Burke's protest either, probably considering this controversy a storm

3. A Flowering of Criticism (1942-1947)

in a teacup. Ransom then chivalrously offered to print a reply by Burke to Isaac Rosenfeld in the Kenyon. But by that time, May 1946, Burke had cooled down a bit and answered that he would "be happy, wholly happy, if you would merely give [Rosenfeld] [Charles] Morris's new book to review. Let him show how and why it is so good."⁶²

Whether it was because not Rosenfeld but Rice eventually reviewed Morris' Signs, Language and Behavior, or because Ransom finally got fed up with Burke's dictatorial, multi-paged missives, or both, it was not until late 1948 that Ransom and Burke were on good terms again. After a long silence Ransom wrote to Burke on August 25, 1948 "to propose that you keep a steady place on our list of contributors; not to have Burke is to argue ourselves out of the running; and personally you always exhilarate me and instruct me." By this mollifying letter, but even more by its enclosure, Ransom's admiring review of Burke's "The Imagery of Killing," Burke was wholly won round. Ransom had called his expository style, if cold, "a masterpiece of language" and suggested that "the kind of critic we need now is the synthesis of a Blackmur and a Burke." Burke then became a regular contributor to The Kenyon Review again.⁶³

4. POETRY, FICTION, AND OTHER INTERESTS (1942-1947)

Other Critics, Philosophy, Politics

The Kenyon Review's main editorial line during its first decade was clearly represented by the New Critics, while the New York intellectuals played a supporting role. Of course, contributions from outside these critical circles also appeared, and, moreover, room was made for philosophy, creative writing, and the visual arts as before. The gifted Walter Southard, one of Ransom's protégés, published critical essays only during this period of the magazine's history. Southard's method is not the New Critical one. In his most important article, "The Religious Poetry of Robert Penn Warren," which appeared in the Autumn 1945 issue, Southard does not closely analyse Warren's poems: he quotes selectively and perspicaciously, and speculates about those themes of Warren's poems that interest him. And Southard's style is not the usual, formal Kenyon Review one: "Negro jazz is a real recovery, because it's a medium you can't kid yourself in . . . you've got to put out. Warren usually puts out." The final pages of his essay constitute a passionate plea for Agrarianism. His detecting an Agrarian ethos in The Kenyon Review, however, touched a raw nerve and led to Ransom's first public recantation of his Agrarian principles.¹

One article and two book reviews published during this period were reprinted in The Kenyon Critics and consequently deserve brief mention. In the Summer 1947 issue the young Irish critic Donat O'Donnell, pseudonym for Conor Cruise O'Brien, admirably discusses Evelyn Waugh's Catholicism, his snobbery, his adolescent cruelty, and his preoccupation with youth. Martin Lebowitz, one of Lionel Trilling's

students, reviews Aldous Huxley's Time Must Have a Stop in the Winter 1945 number; Lebowitz points out that the amusing substance of the novel and its message are never properly integrated. Dudley Fitts argues that Robinson Jeffers' adaptation of Euripides' Medea "lacks insight and control" and that Jeffers is "in this poem incapable of tragic force."²

It is noteworthy that most of the articles by critics who do not fit into the New Critical or New York intellectual ranks are either about or written by French authors. "Three Portraits from Gide's Journal," for instance, selected, translated, and introduced by F.W. Dupee, and dealing with Paul Valéry, Paul Claudel, and Marcel Proust appeared in the Winter 1944 issue. And in the Spring issue of that same year we find Malcolm Cowley's translation of Gide's "Introduction to Goethe's Theatre." This lead essay, in which Gide explains Goethe's key-words Entwicklung and Entsagung, was described by Ransom in his letter of February 22, 1945 to Cowley as "one of the very best things we have published." In the same letter Ransom asked Cowley to "let us have some other translation from the French. . . . I am convinced that there is a big field of interest there. I recall your talking about Valéry, for instance, and I wonder if you have tran[s]lated any of his recent things." But it was only at the end of Ransom's editorship that a Cowley translation of an article by Paul Valéry appeared.³

Soon after Valéry's death in 1945, Gide's classic funeral tribute to his friend appeared in The Kenyon Review. Ransom explained to his readers that Gide's "stature as a prose stylist leads us to break precedent and publish the present essay in the original [French];" "Paul Valéry" was to remain the only article in a foreign language to appear in the Kenyon. Gide's moving memoir was accompanied,

redundantly, by Jean Hytier's official funeral oration, which was translated by Jackson Mathews. Another Valéry feature in this issue was by Lawrence Leighton, who in a rather rambling essay mainly shows that he himself is in favour of politically engaged writing: he can only honour Valéry as "the highest poet" after he has emphasized that Valéry was not as "remote from actuality" as is commonly assumed. Two years earlier Edouard Roditi had also discussed Valéry's poetry and poetics, but without reference to Valéry's political engagement.⁴

The prolific French Catholic writer François Mauriac was discussed by Wallace Fowlie in the Spring 1943 issue. Fowlie assigned Mauriac "the first place of importance" among his generation, but only three years later Mauriac was described as a "[f]ormer great writer" by Jean Guiget. Writing his "Des Revues Françaises Après la Libération" under the pseudonym of Jean Isère, Guiget briefly discusses the post-war literary situation in France, paying special attention to Existentialism and the growing interest in la littérature engagée. Guiget also supplies an annotated bibliography of some twenty-five French reviews. In the same Summer 1946 issue, Adrienne Monnier, the first publisher of the French translation of James Joyce's Ulysses, gives "some of the essential summings-up of Ulysses by its French readers" and adds "a few personal views." Conspicuously clear and succinct, this appreciative essay found its place in The Kenyon Critics.⁵

The aforementioned articles constitute only a small selection from the many critical essays dealing with French literature in the broadest sense that were published in the Kenyon during this period. It should be noted that not Ransom—who had never felt much affinity for France—but Rice was responsible for the publication of most of them. Rice's

4. Poetry, Fiction, and Other Interests (1942-1947)

six-months sojourn in Paris in the late twenties had turned him into a Francophile, and, as he wrote to John Marshall in 1947, "French philosophy and French literature have continued to be among my chief sources of intellectual nourishment." Rice's letter to Marshall was in reply to the latter's asking him whether he was interested in going to France on a Rockefeller grant. Rice jumped at the chance, and spent September till December 1947 in that country; the very palpable consequences for the Kenyon of this second visit will be dealt with in a later chapter.⁶

The high quality of the magazine during this period was only rarely marred by editorial mistakes. The two most prominent ones are John Rodell's "Maxwell Anderson: A Criticism," which appeared in the Spring 1943 issue, and D.S. Savage's "The Aestheticism of W.B. Yeats" in the Winter 1945 issue. Rodell does little more than harp on the fact that Maxwell Anderson does not face and solve the problems he poses, and he finds him "neither poet nor dramatist." As Ransom thought that this article needed offsetting, he promised the Kenyon's readers more views on Anderson in the Summer issue; a promise he did not keep, probably because the articles he had solicited were never actually submitted. The English poet and critic D.S. Savage dealt so sternly with Yeats that Ransom felt obliged to write a three-page editorial to temper Savage's severity. Contrary to custom, instead of being placed just before the book reviews towards the end of each issue, this editorial directly preceded Savage's essay, so that the reader would come upon Savage's strictures after Ransom's "protest against the attack upon a poet who seems to me more than any other to have recovered the old magnificence to the art in our bad time."⁷

Another serious editorial mistake of greater consequence was the

4. Poetry, Fiction, and Other Interests (1942-1947)

introduction of short reviews. The editors' intention was to have a few regular reviewers such as Eric Bentley, Robert Lowell, and Robert Penn Warren send "a steady stream of 250 word reviews to the Kenyon Review." These very short reviews, nevertheless, had to be "equal in quality and authority to the longs."⁸ Ransom and Rice had wanted to start this new addition to the book review section in the 1943 Winter issue, but in spite of their exertions hardly any shorts were submitted. So they decided to put the "Brief Comment"--or, as it was also called, "Brief Notices," or "Short Notices"--section off for a while. It was not until the Spring 1945 issue that the first short reviews were published. And it turned out that Ransom and Rice themselves, together with Arthur Mizener and Eric Bentley, had to write most of them. More importantly, it proved to be impossible to review other than journalistically in 250 words. This department was, therefore, dropped after five consecutive issues and was not taken up again until Robie Macauley became editor.

Failures too were the three planned special issues on Melville, on Symbolism, and on Faulkner, due not so much to editorial incompetence as to the failure of contributors to produce the promised articles. "I wonder what you would think about our having a special exhibit of Melville pieces; and about your assuming editorial responsibility for it," Ransom wrote to Trilling in April 1944. It is likely that Trilling refused to act as the guest editor; at any rate, the Melville feature never got beyond this embryonic stage. Much energy, however, was devoted to the other two issues by their guest editor Allen Tate. In September 1943 Ransom had asked Tate to edit a special issue on the French Symbolist poets as well as to write an essay, preferably on Baudelaire. Ransom added that this issue was intended to please Henry

Church, the Mesures editor, who by then had donated \$1,250.00 to The Kenyon Review. Tate consented to guest edit the issue, but did not care to write on Baudelaire. He immediately sent off letters to, among others, T.S. Eliot, R.P. Blackmur, Delmore Schwartz, and Edmund Wilson. He explained that it seemed to him that the Symbolist movement was "about over" and that this was "a good chance to see it as a whole;" he also suggested to each of them a particular subject.⁹

Contrary to Tate's expectations, however, Blackmur had not been "pining away to write a big essay on Baudelaire:" he suggested Joseph Bennett instead and proposed Kenneth Burke on Rémy de Gourmont. Eliot simply wired Tate that he was too busy to write on Mallarmé. Edmund Wilson's rejection was downright rude: "It is difficult for me to think of anything that I should be less likely to write than an essay on the influence of Symbolist poetry. I will go even further and say that it seems to me absurd in the extreme for The Kenyon Review at this time of day to devote a special number to the subject. And I will even go on to explain that I would not write anything whatever at the request of The Kenyon Review. The dullness and sterility and pretentiousness of the Kenyon, under the editorship of Ransom, has really been a literary crime in this period when the market for serious work has been so limited." Delmore Schwartz wrote the only positive reply; he would "be delighted to write an essay for the Symbolist number," and proposed either to write on Joyce "as the logical conclusion to the movement," or to "use . . . [C.M.] Bowra's book, 'The Heritage of Symbolism.'" The correspondence between Tate and prospective contributors to the Symbolist issue dragged on, but the results were meagre. Lawrence Leighton's reviews of C.M. Bowra and of two other Symbolist books are the only indications in the Kenyon that a Symbolist issue was ever

considered.¹⁰

The proposed Faulkner issue, if it had succeeded according to plan, would have been a pioneering tribute to a writer who had not nearly had the critical recognition he deserved. Again, Ransom asked Tate--who had just been obliged to give up the editorship of The Sewanee Review and now worked as an editor at the publishing house Henry Holt--either to guest edit or to contribute an essay to this special issue. "Apparently F's litterature is not engagee enough for the New York critics," Ransom shrewdly remarked, "so that he is in the position of a prophet who will not be honored at home till the visible honors come from abroad." As Ransom wanted to avoid parochialism he told Tate that he "wouldn't want too many Southerners to contribute" and greatly preferred an international tribute. Robert Penn Warren, who spent the Summer of 1946 with the Ransoms at Gambier as a Fellow was also very much involved in this project, which, indeed, had been partly his idea. On July 18, 1946 Warren wrote to Malcolm Cowley, whose Portable Faulkner (1946) had just come out, that The Kenyon Review intended to publish a Faulkner issue "as a kind of present for the gent's fiftieth birthday, which comes next year." He asked Cowley to contribute an essay, to suggest French and English critics, and, as Cowley knew Faulkner personally, to help procure a new Faulkner story "to lead off the issue."¹¹

Meanwhile, Tate had written to Ransom that he was "all for the Faulkner number," but preferred to share the editorship with Warren, as he doubted his own "ability to do a good job." He was soon dissuaded, and hardly had he agreed to be the sole guest editor after all, when, at the end of August, Ransom sent him a letter packed with suggestions, which "were just that--you have the final decision at every point.

4. Poetry, Fiction, and Other Interests (1942-1947)

We'll even splurge, spend money, as you require, in order to do . . . something of unusual distinction; though naturally I hope we can get out without shedding too much blood."¹² Ransom suggested the following contributors:

For American writers who ought to be in the issue there are Red [Robert Penn Warren], Caroline [Gordon, Tate's wife], Cowley, Katherine Anne Porter, [Francis] Fergusson, [William] Troy, and [F.O.] Matthiessen . . . all would be good. . . . Cowley we are pretty well committed to, and he has written about a piece he wants to do. . . . Then . . . there would need to be a biographical-bibliographical piece, for which you mentioned [Robert?] Daniel, and there is always Robert Stallman if we need him. . . .

For French critics . . . Red and I both think there would be some advantage in getting either Camus or Sartre: though [Jean] Hytier is a more catholic critic and a very fine one. . . .

For Italian critics there are [Elio] Vittorini (I think that's right) the novelist and translator of Faulkner, and also Mario Praz. . . . Incidentally, Auden might be considered as one of the English critics.¹³

Although Tate doubted that "Auden would write an article . . . for less than five hundred dollars," felt "some mild opposition to both Camus and Sartre who would certainly try to make an Existentialist party man

4. Poetry, Fiction, and Other Interests (1942-1947)

out of Faulkner," and preferred Luigi Berti, "one of the editors of the excellent new magazine INVENTARIO," to the Italians Ransom had mentioned, he was in general agreement with Ransom's suggestions and acted accordingly. Warren remained interested and in October proposed a few more names: Warren Beck, Rene Wellek, and [Abram] Fiskin, a Canadian instructor at Northwestern.¹⁴

In spite of these combined efforts not one of their ideas came to fruition, and Tate gave up. On September 12, 1947 Ransom concurred with Tate's "view that the Faulkner number is off; no use doing it with second rate critics." But he had not yet completely lost heart, having received a "very good" essay on Faulkner's technique by Lawrence Bowling. Accompanied by a new short story, a drawing, and a study of Faulkner's "poetic and philosophical attitudes," preferably written by Tate, "a very good Faulkner feature" might yet be had, Ransom wrote. But not even a second letter in this vein could break down Tate's resistance: he had definitely washed his hands of the issue. Ransom tried to enlist Cowley's help once more. But in vain. So, after two years of planning, the Autumn 1948 Faulkner feature came down to Bowling's "Faulkner: Technique of The Sound and the Fury" supplemented with an essay Ransom had solicited from Richard Chase. Chase's essay discussed the "symbolic texture" of Light in August and was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics.¹⁵

Ransom's interest in pedagogical effects had considerably waned after the 1940 symposium "Literature and the Professors." The almost immediate success of this symposium, and of Cleanth Brooks's and Robert Penn Warren's textbook Understanding Poetry (1938), may well account for this diminished interest. As early as February 1942 Lionel Trilling noted "with satisfaction" that "although the archaeological

4. Poetry, Fiction, and Other Interests (1942-1947)

and quasi-scientific and documentary study of literature is still the dominant one in our universities, it is clear to everyone that scholarship is on the defensive and is ready to share the rule with its antagonist." In this period of the magazine's history we find no main articles on this issue, but only a few reviews--of F.R. Leavis' Education and the University, for instance, and of Jacques Barzun's Teacher in America--, and a few shorts, such as the ones by Ransom on Mission of the University by José Ortega y Gasset and The Rebirth of Liberal Education by Fred B. Millett.¹⁶

Philosophy, on the other hand, remained very dear to both Ransom and Rice. So dear, in fact, that in 1944 Allen Tate told R.P. Blackmur that The Kenyon Review was "pretty dull and hopeless, most of the contributors being semi-philosophers whom John uses every quarter as an excuse for one of his little homilies."¹⁷ As Tate had just become the editor of The Sewanee Review and was piqued that only the Kenyon had received a Rockefeller grant this remark should not be taken at face value.

The controversy about naturalism simmered on, and Ransom's editorials confirmed the earlier indications of his gradual acceptance of this philosophy. In the Spring 1943 editorial, "The Inorganic Muses," Ransom still calls himself "an objector" against the positivist-naturalist civilization he finds himself part of. Even so, he admits that "it has grown more and more upon me . . . to conceive human activities naturalistically." Sooner than Ransom himself it was Tate who realized that his friend was close to embracing naturalism wholly. Tate was very much upset by "The Inorganic Muses" and "let [Ransom] have it in the strongest terms." But Ransom was not to be moved. In his four-page reply to Tate's volley he assured Tate that

his editorial had been "thoroughly in tune" with The World's Body, and suggested that Tate's needless distress was based on Ransom's having "acquired a more flexible and accurate vocabulary."¹⁸

But Tate was proved right. Two years later, in his awkwardly titled editorial Art Worries the Naturalists: Who in Turn Worry the Arts with Organism, Fusion, Funding,¹ Ransom remarks that "[i]f there is anywhere a philosophy indigenous to our local climate, it is naturalism." Although he "used to regard naturalism as a specially malignant heresy, if not an abomination onto the Lord," Ransom now convicts it "at most of an immaturity." And by the time Ransom wrote his "Reconsideration" on Aristotle, he had definitely become a naturalist. In this essay Ransom traces his own development when he describes Aristotle, whose "theory of poetry when completed is my theory," as "a man of letters who had become a pedagogue, and . . . an idealist who had become a naturalist."¹⁹

Of course, Ransom was not the only one to write on naturalism and its subsumed philosophies pragmatism and positivism.²⁰ Nevertheless, in all, naturalism and related problems now were discussed less often and less heatedly than during the earlier period of the magazine's history. And once Ransom had settled the controversy in favour of naturalism in his own mind, the issue almost completely disappeared from the Kenyon's pages.

Unlike Ransom, Rice did not need to write out his thoughts on this issue in order to clear his mind: he had always been, and remained, a convinced non-materialistic naturalist. Rice's intense interest in France made him follow the development of Existentialism both early and closely. Even before his trip to France at the end of 1947, Rice was the chief force behind the Kenyon's publications about this movement.

This is not to say that Rice ever enthusiastically advocated Existentialism: he sympathized cautiously, with reservations. As in most matters of philosophy, Ransom followed suit slowly. Although he was initially wary of Existentialism, he came to share Rice's open-mindedness towards it. True, unlike Partisan Review, the Kenyon hardly ever published the actual writings of French Existentialists, but the Kenyon was one of the first American magazines to analyse the origins and principles of their philosophy.

Some attention was paid to Existentialist philosophy as embedded in novels and plays in essays and reviews by Eleanor Clark and Eric Bentley--but the Kenyon's main interest was in explicit Existentialist theories. There were two articles on Søren Kierkegaard, one of them written by Marjorie Grene. One of the very few female critics in the Kenyon, Grene published two more expositions of Existentialist philosophers, one on Heidegger and Sartre and one on Karl Jaspers and Gabriel Marcel. As Grene was essentially critical of this movement, the editors would have done well to counterbalance her articles with a pro-Existentialist view. But it was not until after Rice's sojourn in France that he took it upon himself to remedy this omission. In "L'Homme Est une Passion Inutile" Grene criticizes Sartre for being too cold, too loveless, too nihilistic, and concludes: "If existentialism suits us, it is as much our failure as existentialism's success." For R.W. Flint, who regularly sent Ransom very welcome critiques, and who had actively disliked Grene's essay on Kierkegaard, this was the last straw. "Existentialism is not a synthetic philosophy of being; it is a way of reviving an awareness of the essential difficulty of existence so that life may resume on a deeper level than heretofore," Flint wrote, and accused Grene of being "vulgar" and 'making a game out of

serious matters."²¹

Next to the articles dealing with arguments for and against naturalism and Existentialism, there are some incidental articles on aesthetics, the particular branch of philosophy closest to Ransom's heart. But, of course, there is a considerable overlap between the two. Ransom's laborious "The Inorganic Muses," for instance, which Tate had attacked for its naturalism, was also the starting point for the poet Ruth Herschberger's "The Structure of Metaphor" in which she took issue with Ransom's terms "structure" and "texture." Her essay, in turn, led to Ransom's Summer 1943 reply "Positive and Near-Positive Aesthetics," in which, ironically, he accused Herschberger of selling poetry out to the positivists. In the same issue Ransom's theory of poetry as "the world's body," as cognition, came under fire from Rice's philosopher-friend Virgil C. Aldrich, who cleverly and convincingly differentiated between pictorial and cognitive aspects of (poetic) utterances. Next to these and other articles on the aesthetics of language and literature, we also find essays on the aesthetics of music, for instance by Arnold M. Walter and George Hemphill, a Kenyon graduate. Helen Ransom Forman remembers that her father was "enormously impressed" by Hemphill's article, which is not surprising, as Hemphill calls for a kind of New Critical approach to music. Finally, in the Spring 1946 issue we find a comprehensive but not very convincing article on the past, present, and future of the study of aesthetics by Stephen C. Pepper.²²

Pepper's essay was part of the "Post-War Stock-Taking" series initiated by Eric Bentley. Only four out of seven commissioned (and a larger number of planned) articles appeared in this series: neither Randall Jarrell, nor Walter Gropius, nor Roger Sessions, the advisory editor on music, submitted the promised articles on poetry,

architecture, and music. The first contribution to this series of essays "taking stock of the human condition in various fields of activity in a post-war time" was by Bentley himself on his favourite subject drama. In "The Drama at Ebb" Bentley remarks with great regret that "[t]oday it is almost inconceivable that any drama could satisfy the canons of the most exigent criticism and also be popular." But at the end of his long lament Bentley neutralizes his own argument by standing up for the universally favoured Bertolt Brecht, "young, definitely original. . . . one . . . to keep your eye on." Taking stock of "The Importance of Religion" in the Autumn 1946 issue Horace L. Friess, a progressive professor of philosophy at Columbia and editor of The Review of Religion, points out that religious enlightenment "can be better served if sciences continually collaborate in trying to understand the significance of specific religious developments." After a one-year interruption the series was concluded with a rather dull and vague article on political theory by Paul A. Palmer, teacher of political science at Kenyon College, who during these years wrote most of the sporadic papers on political issues in The Kenyon Review.²³

The only political essay of consequence is Robert Foxx's solicited, searching "China Letter," which lovingly and poetically depicts the China scene. Foxx was the pseudonym for Walter Southard, who had left for China in 1945 as a naval intelligence officer, and who, of course, could not write under his own name for fear he would get "the bloodhounds" after him. "[I]n this sailorsuit I'm too easy game," Southard told Ransom, adding that he did not want to be paid for his contribution, that all he cared about was "to have somebody publish the truth about what is happening here, and best it should be you."²⁴ William Carlos Williams' reaction to Southard's timely "China letter"

is representative of the enthusiasm with which it was received:

Who is this person, Robert Foxx, of whom you say next to nothing in your "Contributors" notes? . . . I am floored by the quality and the revelations of his writing. . . . Everything I know about prose, especially everything I know as rare and superlatively worth while about prose is at least indicated somewhere in this piece of work and most of it is shown in full. Add to this the critical quality of the thing in a connotative manner, it's a scythe in the grass of ordinary writing. . . . [I]t roars with an authority of expression nowhere forced but of that convincing finality of statement which leaves the mind satisfied and at rest after it: nothing more to be said.²⁵

Publishers swarmed around Southard: Pelligrini & Cudahy, the Pilot Press, and Henry Holt were eager to publish this letter together with two promised ones on the Chinese people and the current head-on collision of the Chinese, American, and Russian world-views in China. But this was not to be: China had taken so much out of Southard, mentally and physically, that he had to return to America to recuperate.

With the exception of a few reviews, the subject of the war was infrequently broached. Some stir was caused by Ransom's own "Artists, Soldiers, Positivists," which appeared in the Spring 1944 issue. Ransom quoted a letter sent by a soldier who found "the poetry in Kenyon Review lamentable in many ways because it is cut off from pain," and

who called for a poetry promising "survival" and communicating "an overwhelming desire to go on." Ransom evaded answering this soldier's questions about the importance and usefulness of art in war and discussed the state of the arts in peace time, complaining that even then "the arts are often held to account as if in war."²⁶

Poetry and Fiction

The soldier, who remains unnamed, had attacked Wallace Stevens because he, though of "charming distemper," did not transcend "the aesthetic of poetry." Replying to Ransom's request for poetry--"I'd rather have you than anybody"--Stevens wrote that he had been "particularly interested" in the soldier's letter "about the relation between poetry and what he called pain." He was not quite sure what the soldier had meant by that, but thought that "it might be interesting to try to do an *esthétique du mal*. It is the kind of idea that it is difficult to shake off. Perhaps that would be my subject in one form or another." So, the soldier's dissatisfaction was the direct impulse to what Randall Jarrell called "the best of [Stevens'] later poems," "*Esthétique du Mal*," which appeared as the lead of the Autumn 1944 issue of The Kenyon Review. Ransom, too, thought it "truly magnificent." He wrote to Stevens that as "a sort of trustee of the interests of this Review," he could not "pass up" his generous offer to waive payment for the poem. "But we would have paid double or triple for it if we had had to, and thought it sound business."²⁷

It may seem as if Ransom had decided to give the soldier no more cause for complaint, for in contrast to the nearly complete disregard of World War II in the Kenyon's critical department, many of the poems

which appeared from about the summer of 1944 onwards dealt with the war. This was not so much a result of a conscious shift in editorial policy, as of the many excellent unsolicited war poems which now came to crowd the Kenyon's mailbox. And truly creative non-propagandist writing dealing with the war had never met with editorial objections. It was only that Ransom, his personal involvement and earlier rash resolutions "to pitch into the world crisis" notwithstanding, basically wanted the Kenyon to remain a literary, and not a political review. Randall Jarrell submitted his war poems "The Germans Are Lunatics" and "Losses," both of which were accepted and appeared in the Summer 1945 instalment of the "Younger Poets" series. Samuel French Morse also contributed two war poems to this instalment, to which were added poems by Reed Whittemore and David Cornel DeJong. Ransom's editorial intentions with respect to poetry are reflected in his comment about this collection: 'It may not be immortal verse but it's live and I'd rather have it than poor stuff by the big names.' But even though Ransom preferred fostering future "big names," he was not prepared to pass up good poetry by contemporary bigwigs and accepted, for instance, Mark Van Doren's "extremely fine" war poem April, 1942."²⁸

Randall Jarrell was the Kenyon's most frequently published poet during this period: he appeared at least once a year, usually with a small group of poems. The Kenyon's hospitality and confidence were mainly instrumental in gaining for Jarrell high stature as a poet by the end of the forties. Particularly impressive was his "The Rising Sun," another of his moving, unsentimental, sophisticated war poems, which appeared in the Spring 1947 issue. Its subject matter is very unusual and complex: the protagonist is a Japanese boy who has to learn how to fight and die according to his country's traditions. Another

young poet who was cherished by the editors was Jarrell's Kenyon College companion Robert Lowell. After Lowell's first appearance in the Kenyon's maiden issue, Ransom had refused his submissions for four years, but then found Lowell ready for a further unfolding of his gifts in the magazine. We have already mentioned Lowell's repeated appearance in the "Younger Poets" series, but in the Autumn 1946 issue three of Lowell's poems were especially honoured by their publication as a separate group. "Mary Winslow," "At a Bible House," and "The First Sunday in Lent" were reprinted in Lowell's second book of verse, Lord Weary's Castle (1946), which received the Pulitzer Prize for poetry and which placed him among the "few excellent contemporary poets America has produced," as Howard Moss pointed out in his Kenyon review of this book. Ransom could not agree more. As early as October 1945 he had acutely observed the remarkable development of Lowell's poetry since Land of Unlikeness (1944). He wrote to Lowell: "I don't know who has grown up in verse more than you, these last few years; mostly, I think by way of giving up the effort to communicate more than was communicable, and by consulting the gentle reader's traditional range of intelligence rather than your own private article."²⁹

Another poet who had been given an early chance in the "Younger Poets" series and who rose to independent publication during this period was Jean Garrigue. Ransom grew to appreciate her poems so highly that soon he "could not forbear inserting two of yours in order to improve the general impression [of the Winter 1944 "Younger Poets" section]." In this particular case, however, the "Younger Poets" instalment which included Jarrell's "The Carnegie Library, Juvenile Division" and Muriel Rukeyser's excellent "Dream-singing Elegy" needed no strengthening. The publication of Garrigue's longish poem "False

Country of the Zoo," though, deservedly constituted her solo appearance in the Autumn 1946 issue: less complicated and more concrete than her former poems, it is her finest achievement in The Kenyon Review during this period. Josephine Miles, whom Ransom had called "a sister of Laura Riding" and who had found her first Kenyon appearance "breathtaking," remained a favourite, too. In the Summer 1944 and the Autumn 1947 issues altogether fifteen of her very short sophisticated poems were published.³⁰

Although both Delmore Schwartz and Karl Shapiro appeared only once, Schwartz's "The Starlight's Intuitions Pierced the Twelve" and Shapiro's "Essay on Rime: Confusion of Personal Systems (From Part III)" were highlights in the Kenyon's history. Schwartz's biographer James Atlas regards the often anthologized "The Starlight's Intuitions Pierced the Twelve" as "Delmore's most accomplished poem since the work collected in In Dreams [Begin Responsibilities (1938)]." It remained Schwartz's own favourite poem—"the best lyric I've written"—till the end of his life. As for Shapiro's "Essay on Rime," when Ransom saw a small part of this long poem, he found it so "th{o}roughly up to my expectations" that he suggested to the author that the Kenyon publish "twice or three times the number of lines you have sent us, provided of course that they all make a single unit or series of units, as do those of 'Personal Systems.'"³¹

At long last, in the Spring 1943 issue, Allen Tate appeared again with "Jubilo" and "More Sonnets at Christmas"—additions to the "Sonnets at Christmas" which he had written in 1934. The absence of Tate from his friend's magazine was definitely not due to Ransom's reluctance to publish him, nor to Tate's reluctance to be published there. But these poems were the first ones Tate had written "off the

top of his mind in six years." Tate had given Ransom first refusal even though he was sure that his metres would "drive him wild:" Tate thought Ransom had "become a perfect neo-classicist and will have nothing to do with accentual versification." But even though Tate had submitted these poems too late for inclusion in the Winter, Christmas issue, Ransom was so taken with them that he was "not being diverted too much by the seasonal title," and accepted them for the spring. If Tate insisted on early publication, however, Ransom wrote to him, he would "get them off at once" to The Nation, The New Republic, or "anywhere you say." But, Ransom emphasized, "I don't like to get them out of sight." Tate was thrilled by Ransom's enthusiasm and vastly preferred publication in the Kenyon.³²

Tate's classic "Seasons of the Soul" made an even deeper impression. Ransom thought it Tate's "best yet with the possible exception of Confederate Dead" and called it "mighty fine," about the highest praise to be found in his vocabulary. He remarked on its "perfection," "cleanness," and its "finished" quality. The only thing he did not like was Tate's title "Seasonal Confessions;" he therefore suggested "something bigger, statelier," like "The Soul Amidst the Elemental Seasons," or "Annus Miserabilis." Ransom soon decided that these were not simple enough and he came up with, among others, "The Soul to the Seasons," all but the eventual title. He told Tate that this poem "ought to lead off" the Winter 1944 number, that "the other poetry look[ed] slight and tame . . . after yours," and would therefore "be lumped together." Indeed, "Seasons of the Soul" stands head and shoulders above Jean Garrigue's "Conjectural Domain" and "Discourse," and, too, above Jarrell's "The Carnegie Library, Juvenile Division." It led Robert Penn Warren to write to Tate: "You've never done better,

nor has anybody else writing today." Wallace Stevens was one of the very few competent readers to voice dissatisfaction with the poem: he pointed out that it was "like poetry written under glass," adding, though, that the "Kenyon group doesn't in the least impair one's sense of Tate's power."³³

So we see that during this period The Kenyon Review published the best poems by some of America's best poets--Stevens, Tate, Jarrell--as well as excellent poems by poets who would soon find wide recognition: Lowell, Shapiro, and perhaps Miles. Add to this the publication of work by promising poets such as John Malcolm Brinnin, Jean Garrigue, and Marguerite Young, as well as the--sporadic--translations of important foreign poets such as Louis Aragon and Bertolt Brecht, and the conclusion is clear. Even if it has had little critical attention, the Kenyon's poetry section was well-matched with its famous critical department.³⁴

It was inevitable that some poets who may be regarded as belonging to the Ransom-Kenyon circle were published elsewhere. Robert Penn Warren's famous "Ballad of Billie Potts," for instance, appeared in the Winter 1944 issue of Partisan Review. There is some evidence that Warren submitted this poem to the Kenyon, but that Ransom turned it down because of its naturalism. More to Ransom's discredit is his rejection of Robert Duncan's "Sections toward an African Elegy." Initially, Ransom had accepted this "very brilliant" poem, intending it to lead off the 1945 Winter issue. However, after Ransom had read Duncan's article "The Homosexual in Society" in Dwight Macdonald's Politics, the poem suddenly seemed "to have an obvious homosexual advertisement, and for that reason not to be eligible for publication." Duncan pointed out to Ransom that "once the aesthetic choice had been

made," an editor is morally obliged to accept a poem "regardless of its agreement or opposition to one's own convictions." Though this was an article of editorial faith Ransom had always subscribed to, he nevertheless returned Duncan's poem because of its homosexual overtones, with his "deepest apologies."³⁵ Finally, two other promising poets who had been given a chance during the Kenyon trial period, Howard Nemerov and John Berryman, now were not published either, for the simple reason that Ransom did not think their present poems merited publication.

However, John Berryman's talent for fiction was recognized and rewarded by the publication of two of his short stories. This was not so much thanks to Ransom, but mainly to Rice and Robert Penn Warren, on whose judgment with regard to fiction Ransom strongly depended. Anyway, Ransom's "considered determination . . . to strive for a greater warmth in the content. . . . [which] would take the form of giving more space to creative work," bore fruit. If during the first three and a half years of the Kenyon's existence only four stories were published, from the demise of The Southern Review up to 1947 the amount of space devoted to fiction increased seven-fold: over forty stories appeared. And the increase in quantity was not at the expense of quality. On the contrary: as Paul Robert Stewart, chronicler of the Prairie Schooner, remarked: this little magazine, which was best known for its fiction, 'was shaded . . . in the '40's by Story, the Kenyon Review, and the Partisan Review."³⁶

Yet, even more than with its poetry, the bold fighting spirit of the Kenyon's criticism obscured its very real achievement in fiction, namely its introduction of unknown writers of merit to publisher and public. But if the Kenyon's competent and finished fiction cut a fine

figure in comparison to that of other little--and not so little--magazines, technically it was not very innovative or spectacular. This was because the few technically innovative stories that were submitted were not to Ransom's liking. "A story has to have a meaning, I believe--unless it's for the New Yorker," he wrote in 1953. His preference for traditional forms is also illustrated by the terms of his rejection of three stories solicited from William Carlos Williams. "The stories you sent us I admire very much in their method--absolutely clean, stripped and adequate," Ransom explained, "but I don't think they are stories, but rather episodes or anecdotes, if there is such a distinction."³⁷ It was the absence of plot that he objected to. Still, Ransom's lack of understanding of experimental fiction was not really damaging: the majority of submitted stories were traditional anyway--and he had Rice and Warren to advise him.

The "greater warmth of content," which was to be ensured by the increase of fiction in The Kenyon Review, did not come about effortlessly. For one thing, it was necessary to spread the word that the Kenyon was now in the market for creative as well as for critical writing; for another, the editors did "not wish to sacrifice too much of our critical staple in order to publish creative work more fully" and therefore had to "increase the size of the periodical as a standard thing." It was Rice who solved both mainly pecuniary problems with one blow. He made a deal with the New York publisher Doubleday, Doran, and Company, whereby, beginning with the Winter 1944 issue, as Ransom told Tate, "each year for three years we hold a SS [short story] contest for \$750.00 of prizes, which they pay, and whereby also we receive \$500.00 worth of annual advertising by DD in KR." In return, the Kenyon happily committed itself to judge the manuscripts, "fix the

number and value of the prizes . . . and publish the prize stories." Only authors who had never published a book of fiction were eligible, and Doubleday and Doran acquired the exclusive "privilege of reading in advance of publication any manuscript . . . submitted for the contest."³⁸

So The Kenyon Review came to be "very much in the SS game," so much so, that the announcement of "The 1944 Short Story Prizes" in the Winter issue brought forth an avalanche of over 1100 manuscripts between April and June of that year. Ransom, Robert Penn Warren, who visited Gambier during the first week of June, and Harold Whitehall, the Rockefeller Fellow at that time, judged these entries and "arrived at some pretty fine ones though not world classics." The first prize went to Jean Garrigue. "Robert Penn Warren was particularly enthusiastic about your story," Ransom told Garrigue, "though hardly more than the other two of us:" it had been a "unanimous" decision. Nevertheless, Ransom suggested some revisions, and off his own bat substituted "The Snowfall" for Garrigue's proposed titles "The Dead" and "Choice of Loss." Garrigue gladly acquiesced, set to work, made many minor revisions, and even completely altered the conclusion, which Ransom had disliked. Ransom, however, "went into a huddle over the revised story:" many of the revisions were much too "literary," the new conclusion was "just naturalism." As Whitehall agreed that the original story was better, the first version went to the printer. "The Snowfall," a story about a woman painter who is loved by several men, and falls in love with the most superficial, egotistical of them all is indeed rich, poetic, and perhaps even "Jamesean" as Ransom had it, yet technically it is rather conventional.³⁹

Subtle, Southern, competent, but also conventional was the second

4. Poetry, Fiction, and Other Interests (1942-1947)

prize story, "A Piece of Bread" by Frances Gray Patton, another promising newcomer to the field of fiction. John Berryman's partly autobiographical unprized entry "Lovers," which appeared in the Winter 1945 issue, was as finished as both prize-winning stories, but more moving and involved without becoming sentimental. In a letter almost begging Berryman to participate again in the 1945 contest, Ransom admitted that "[s]ome people have said that your story . . . was better than our Prize 1944 story. Maybe it was." Berryman's "The Imaginary Jew" deservedly won the 1945 First Prize. Initially, though, the prize had been awarded to an--unnamed--author who, as it appeared later, had already published a book of fiction and consequently had to be disqualified. Annoyed, the editors sent out a circular letter on May 12, 1945 in which they announced that after having read the 600 entries, they were "not satisfied as to having two stories of sufficient distinction to secure the prizes."⁴⁰ With the consent of Doubleday and Doran they therefore decided to hold the contest open, for new entrants only, for three more months.

Mona Van Duyn, whom Ransom had informed that her sensitive story about a young girl who is introduced to sin and sex had won second prize on May 7, 1945, received this form letter, too. In a covering note Ransom hastened to assure her that her award was "in no way imperilled," and that she even might win the First Prize if no "bigger" stories came in. But Berryman's affecting story, sent in in the second round, based on a street brawl which had badly shaken him four years earlier (and which he had unsuccessfully tried to render in poetry at that time) won hands down. "The Imaginary Jew" deals with a Catholic who protests against a half-drunk Irishman's fascist pronouncements. In spite of the protagonist's vehement if clumsy denials, he is taken

for a Jew, jeered at and hunted down. Only much later does he realize: "My prosecutors were right: I was a Jew. The imaginary Jew I was was as real as the imaginary Jew hunted down, on other nights and days, in a real Jew." The Jewish refugee Erich Kahler was so moved by this story that he translated it for Die Neue Rundschau: this marked Berryman's first appearance abroad. In her memoir Poets in their Youth Eileen Simpson, Berryman's first wife, mentions that others who were as impressed, urged Berryman to continue writing stories, but that Berryman felt that his talent was for poetry, not for fiction. So, "The Imaginary Jew," "The Lovers," and a late story, "Thursday Out," were the only stories to be published during Berryman's lifetime.⁴¹

The 1946 Short Story Prize Contest ended in a tie between "You Can Wreck It," a story about double morals and racial discrimination in a "liberal" town by Walter Elder, a Kenyon graduate studying philosophy at Harvard, and Arthur Mizener's too academic, too Fitzgeraldian "You Never Go Back to Sleep." Ransom wrote to Mizener that the judges--Ransom, Rice, and Robert Penn Warren--"thought one story (yours) excelled in form and quality of style. . . . The other story does not excel in that way . . . and rather is a powerful story on the prime (maybe primitive) human level, it excels in the appeal of the content, we think. And for a prize story we don't want to put one of these requirements above the other." Both stories had to be substantially revised. Elder simply "followed Red's suggestions to the letter," but Mizener struggled with Ransom's foolish advice of introducing plot and external action into a story which showed a young man's awakening to the reality of an adored, formerly legendary writer. (Of course, the parallel with Mizener and Fitzgerald leaps to mind.) In the end, the published version of Mizener's story was only slightly different from

the original one.⁴²

Walter Elder's and Arthur Mizener's prize-winning stories marked the end of the Doubleday and Doran deal which Ransom, for reasons unknown, was "loath to renew. His attempts to interest Henry Holt or the Cleveland World Publishing Company in a similar arrangement failed. Though the loss of a sponsor was unfortunate, the editors decided to continue to publish at least one story per year. And since the short story contest had definitely put The Kenyon Review on the map as a market for fiction, unsolicited stories kept coming in in droves.⁴³

Looking at the fiction the Kenyon published during this period we find that the magazine cuts a fine figure. Stories by Southern writers such as Andrew Lytle's long, mysterious "Alchemy" and Peter Taylor's subtle, impressive "Allegiance" appeared side by side with Boris Pasternak's early "Aerial Ways" and Mary Lavin's "A Wet Day;" the latter two stories were included by Robie Macauley in his Kenyon Review anthology, Gallery of Modern Fiction (1966). Women were not as badly represented in the Kenyon's creative departments as in its critical and philosophic sections. Over one-third of the stories published during this period were written by women; Olivia Manning's "A Visit" and Anais Nin's almost feminist "The Mouse" are cases in point.⁴⁴

It is apparent from the foregoing that the wide-spread belief that Southern writers dominated the Kenyon's fiction department is at least partly untrue. New York intellectual fictionists alone appeared nearly as frequently as their Southern colleagues. Isaac Rosenfeld, for instance, appeared with as many as three stories: "The New Egypt," "The Railroad," and his extremely clever "The Party." Ransom preferred "The Party," which he described as "a gentle but satirical and delicious account of the human insides of a Communist local" by 'our very good

man Isaac Rosenfeld," to part of Katherine Anne Porter's novel in the making, Ship of Fools (1962), as well as to Arthur Mizener's "Discard" as the Autumn 1947 fiction selection. Delmore Schwartz's attempt to come at least to fictional terms with anti-Semitism is expressed in "A Bitter Farce," "the only thing [he had] brought to a successful conclusion in almost a year of trying." It appeared in the Spring 1946 issue. Ransom admired its "true tone" and "the casual development of the very real topics." Although Elaine Gottlieb did not belong to the New York intellectuals proper, she was a New York based Jewish writer who contributed two stories, "Where Are You Roaming" and "The Norm."⁴⁵ These and other non-Southerners such as Jean Stafford, Sidney Sulkin, Meridel Le Sueur, and David Cornel DeJong made up the varied roster of mostly young, technically proficient fiction writers in The Kenyon Review.

Drama and the Fine Arts

An entirely new venture in creative writing was the publication in the Kenyon of the Spanish refugee Ramon J. Sender's short tragedy "The Key" and of Act Five of the German refugee Bertolt Brecht's classic "The Caucasian Circle of Chalk." These two pieces were eminently suited for magazine publication: they are both poetic and rich in action. Such a happy combination is hard to find and so Sender's and Brecht's plays remained the only drama contributions to the Kenyon for a long time to come.⁴⁶

Drama criticism continued to flourish thanks to Eric Bentley. Besides the drama criticism in the "Reconsiderations" department, we find, for instance, the distinguished drama critic Francis Fergusson

reviewing H. Granville-Barker's The Use of Drama as well as comparing Richard Wagner's Tristan und Isolde and T.S. Eliot's Murder in the Cathedral. At Bentley's request Berthold Viertel, another refugee from Nazi Germany, contributed two discerning articles on Bertolt Brecht, and a review of The fervent Years by Harold Clurman. Bentley and Jacques Barzun, whom he much admired, paid tribute to George Bernard Shaw. Barzun concentrated on defending Shaw as a dramatist—"He is in the great tradition, not in the little routine"—Bentley on discussing him as a propagandizing socialist. Barzun's 1943 tribute was timely, lucid, and well written. Still, Ransom's effusive "we have never been more grateful to a contributor than we were to you when you delivered the very fine critique upon Shaw at our request" must be seen as a diplomatic prelude to his rejection, in the same letter, of Barzun's article on education solicited by Bentley.⁴⁷

Starting in 1942, George Beiswanger contributed three annual letters bemoaning Broadway, until his replacement by Quentin Anderson in the summer of 1946. Anderson was a better critic, but in the eyes of the Kenyon editors still too pessimistic about the state of the theatre, so his letters appeared only twice. After an interval tided over by Bentley's brilliant "Monsieur Verdoux as 'Theatre,'" George Nubbe was given an opportunity to become the Kenyon's regular theatre critic in the Summer 1949 issue. But his sloppily written, inordinately laudatory letter failed to please the editors; and he was not given a second chance.⁴⁸ The editors' efforts to enliven their magazine by means of a regular theatre chronicle had failed signally so far.

As for the remaining performing arts: dance was hardly mentioned during this period, but music received some attention. The Kenyon's

coup in this field was T.W. Adorno's prescient "Social Critique of Radio Music." Roger Sessions contributed a laudatory review of two books by D.F. Tovey to the Summer 1945 issue. In the same issue Leo Balet published an article on "The Nuisance of Music 'Re-Creations,'" such as Walt Disney's Fantasia, and a badly reasoned review of Mozart, His Character and Work by Alfred Einstein. In his regular music column for The Nation B.H. Haggin wrote about this review: "What I think of the method, the purpose, the complete, detailed piece of writing, I have not been able to find polite language for." Bentley wrote to Barzun that he thought Haggin had "Balet looking more of an ass than he really is" and that he had consequently written "to both gents on KR notepaper asking why they don't write something further explaining their points of view." Bentley enclosed their answers as "Literary Documents of Our Time." Haggin, who was under the false impression that he would not be paid for his contribution, had refused angrily:

Believing as I do that editors publish what they think worthy of publication, I was amazed that Kenyon Review published Balet's pieces, but am even more amazed that after their publication an outsider should be invited [quoting Bentley] "to send a communication about Balet's strange article on re-creations." I don't think "strange" is the word I would use about Balet's writing; but I certainly would apply it to Kenyon Review's procedure in connection with that writing. . . . I do no unpaid speaking at all. I can't afford it; and I disapprove of it, and in particular of solicited unpaid "communications."

Balet simply remarked that Haggin's "'attack' was such as not deserving further thought."⁴⁹ So Bentley's attempt at stirring up a spicy controversy went up in smoke. But this episode shows that Bentley was given rather a free hand and that he made enthusiastic use of it.

As before, architecture, sculpture, and especially painting took up the bulk of the art section, which continued even though the Kenyon's subtitle, "A Quarterly of Arts and Letters," had been dropped. Remarkable in all respects are "Cities' Renaissance," a combined effort by Walter Gropius and Martin Wagner, and "Renaissance and Renascences" by Erwin Panofsky, articles which appeared in the Winter 1943 and Spring 1944 issues. Walter Gropius, Bauhaus founder working at Harvard, had responded warmly to Rice's request to contribute an article, "partly," as Rice wrote, "because we are very much in need of a feature on one of the non-literary arts in the Winter issue, but mainly because we are especially eager to number you among our contributors." The gist of this article, written in collaboration with another refugee, Martin Wagner, professor of regional planning at Harvard, was given in Gropius' answer: "My opinion is that the future of the Architectural Profession will greatly depend on the ability of the architects to handle planning problems, for every house and building is part of a larger unit, the town."⁵⁰

Erwin Panofsky was concerned with the Italian Renaissance, which he lucidly compared and contrasted to renascences that had come before, such as the Carolingian renaissance of the eighth, or the Ottonian renaissance of the tenth century. The correspondence between Panofsky and Pansom about this lavishly illustrated essay was most gentlemanly: they seem to try to outdo each other in politeness. When Panofsky

hesitantly inquired whether the Kenyon might be interested in his writing up an address he had given to students at the Graduate School of Fine Arts at New York University, Ransom assured him that he would accept such an essay unseen, a gesture far from his common practice. Panofsky soon sent the essay, but feared that Ransom would regret his confidence in him as "it is not overwhelmingly interesting." He gave Ransom "carte blanche" "in matters of phrasing, spelling and punctuation," and added that he was "still free to return it." Ransom, however, was so impressed that he spontaneously placed at Panofsky's disposal twelve pages to be filled with expensive illustrations instead of the eight agreed on, an offer which Panofsky snapped up. Ransom had another pleasant surprise in store: the Rockefeller Foundation had hinted that they would subsidize the Kenyon and Ransom intended to step up the contributors' rates to what they had been before the war had forced the editors to halve them to about \$2.50 per page. As Panofsky was extremely pleased with his four extra pages, he renounced the extra Rockefeller money "so as to lessen the expense for the plates."⁵¹

About a year later, Panofsky wrote "Dear Mr. Blair:" "Surprisingly, I have received a request for my article . . . from the Warburg Institute of London University . . . and you would greatly oblige me by sending them the number of the Kenyon Review . . . at my expense." The Kenyon Review's reputation had indeed spread worldwide. Partly as a consequence, probably, of the post-war export of and international interest in American culture, soon after the war about 130 of its 2400 copies went to foreigners. International, too, was the Kenyon's coverage with respect to the fine arts. To name a few examples: the all-knowledgeable Walter Southard reviewed Paul Klee edited by Karl Nierendorf; in his Summer 1943 "Art Letter" Philip R. Adams tellingly

described Salvador Dali as "one of the most curious mixtures of charlatan and authentic craftsman that the arts have ever produced;" Jean Charlot wrote a timely article on Mexican murals; and Louis Graff misapplied Hegelian philosophy to Van Gogh's "Ravens Flying Over Cornfield."⁵²

Finances and the Rockefeller Foundation

In spite of the Kenyon's high standing, its circulation had dropped considerably during the war. The rise in the price of annual subscriptions from \$2.00 to \$3.00 annually, the "many . . . subscribers . . . in the services," and the Kenyon's "white-collar constituency" being "the class hardest hit by war finance" caused a drop in sales from about 1400 in the autumn of 1942 to about 1100 in the autumn of 1944. And there were other items on the debit side of the Kenyon's budget: the gradual enlargement from about 140 pages per issue in 1942 to approximately 175 by 1944 also unbalanced the budget. Then there was the falling away of private sponsors: George Frazer and Henry Church were still good for \$1,750.00 during the budget year 1942-1943, but the year after only Frazer was left, Church having become an advisory editor and sponsor of The Sewanee Review, now edited by his friend Allen Tate. After July 1944, Frazer backed out, too. Only a year after the demise of The Southern Review the Kenyon was in financial straits again. Although the Doubleday and Doran deal, which was to become effective in 1944, would clear up some clouds, the editors took such a bleak view of the Kenyon's future at Gambier that Rice went prospecting for other sites.⁵³

But Rockefeller Foundation money rendered further searching

redundant. For not only did the Foundation provide stipends for the Fellows Harold Whitehall, Eric Bentley, Charles Riker, and Robert Penn Warren, who came to The Kenyon Review "on a basis of mutual service through literary and editorial associations," it also gave the Kenyon a three-year grant of \$7,500.00 in total, beginning January 1944. Even if this was only a fraction of the rather outrageous sum of about \$9,000.00 per year Ransom had applied for at Chalmers' insistence, Ransom was thoroughly satisfied. His August 1947 report to the Foundation shows that Ransom made excellent use of their grant. Though this report is dressed up a bit and should be read in the light of the fact that Ransom was trying to obtain a new Rockefeller grant, its basis is sound. Indeed, without this foundation's "generous benefactions" the magazine might have folded. Ransom wrote:

The addition of \$2,500.00 to our annual revenue for three years made a great difference in the magazine. We employed a professional secretary and put our business office in order. We paid a little better rates to our contributors. We increased the size of the issues, so that they might have a more rounded content. We brought up to the highest current standard, as I have been pretty well informed, our department of original fiction, and we printed new verse on a more liberal scale. As for the critical essays which are our staple, I am confident that we raised our standard steadily, and at the end of the period had come to be accepted in the academic world, and with some outside readers, as perhaps offering the best examples of what literary

4. Poetry, Fiction, and Other Interests (1942-1947)

criticism should be. . . . But all these scattering items come to saying that with your help the Review made a great qualitative improvement within the three years.⁵⁴

In a letter to Chalmers amplifying this statement, Ransom emphasized the link between a rise in standards and a raise in the rate of payment to contributors: "It is obviously a great advantage for a periodical to be able to pay its contributors decently; the existing contributors work for us the more cheerfully and punctually, and new contributors volunteer (or can be successfully solicited) who might not previously have cared to write for us." In an earlier interim report to the Foundation Ransom had diplomatically pointed to another "great but intangible benefit:" "You came to us saying that you thought we were 'educationally important' with what we were doing as a critical organ. You restored our courage when we must have been conscious that we were fighting a losing battle. I am not prepared to say that we were operating 'weakly' in our shaky financial condition, but I [am] sure that knowing our lack of capital we lacked the editorial incentive, since we could not make the improvements that were most obviously called for. You placed a responsibility upon us, and at the same time gave us the means to discharge it; the combination being a wonderful morale-builder."⁵⁵

By the mid-forties the confidence the Rockefeller Foundation had shown in The Kenyon Review—which was described as "virtually the only critical journal of first quality under control of a college or university" in its report of January 10, 1944--was shared by almost the entire American literary community. The Kenyon's fame had even come

home to popular weeklies such as Time and Newsweek which paid tribute to the Kenyon as "one of the most distinguished of U.S. little magazines," and "one of the most revered in that esoteric field." "Esoteric" perhaps to their millions of readers, yet within ten years of its inception, The Kenyon Review with its circulation of less than 2,500 had managed to become "virtually required reading for everyone concerned with contemporary literature who knows it."⁵⁶

Academic Influence, the Bollingen Prize, the Rockefeller Foundation

The subsidy given by the Rockefeller Foundation, that bulwark of respectability, put the seal of approbation of the literary establishment on The Kenyon Review. The Foundation's action reflected the high standing which the magazine and the New Criticism, the kind of criticism most consistently represented therein, had obtained in the literary and academic world. It simultaneously paved the way for the New Criticism in those institutions that still regarded this kind of criticism as verbal jugglery or unscholarly impressionism. Prestigious universities such as Princeton and Yale were among those already won over to the New Criticism. Richard Blackmur, for instance, was the most influential critic at Princeton, and Cleanth Brooks expounded his branch of the New Criticism at Yale, where, in his own words, a "palace-revolution" had taken place.¹

The enormous influence on the academy of The Kenyon Review and of other literary quarterlies emphasizing serious criticism, such as The Sewanee Review, Partisan Review, and, from its founding in 1948, The Hudson Review, is also apparent from the very number of articles about these magazines appearing in the periodical press in the late forties and early fifties. In most of these articles the links between magazine and academy are very explicitly and positively mentioned. The subsidies given by academic institutions are seen to account for, or at least to contribute to, the longevity of the magazines, to their handsome appearance, and to the securing of excellent contributions. Moreover, most of the contributors to and readers of these magazines were in the

university. In Theodore Peterson's words: "literary quarterlies . . . huddle in the warmth of academic shelter." Meanwhile, the fame of the American literary reviews had spread to Europe. In Great Britain especially, many articles appeared on their influence and importance, often revealing a certain jealousy with respect to the encouragement given to them by the academy. A 1954 British article on "The American Literary Reviews" noted enviously that the "close connection with the universities . . . is one reason why these periodicals present such a glossy surface to the world. . . . They have kept a place for the intellectual to talk about his problems; they have preserved a sphere for free discussion."²

In a letter to Edward D'Arms of the Rockefeller Foundation, Ransom himself emphasized that "some 90 per cent of our contributors depend for their livelihood upon the academic economy," and described The Kenyon Review as "very largely an academic product."³ He realized that such a close academic association also had its dangers and disadvantages. But whether for better or worse, the tide could not be turned. By the fifties the critical quarterlies had become institutionalized, had lost much of their fighting spirit because they needed it less, and had become legislators in the university.

A telling indication of the influence of--and the growing antagonism against--the critics who appeared regularly in the literary reviews was the battle about the 1948 Bollingen Prize which divided the literary world into two fiercely hostile camps and in which The Kenyon Review became closely involved. In 1948 the Library of Congress received from the Bollingen Foundation a sum of \$10,000.00 which was to be used for an annual award of \$1,000.00 for the best book of verse by an American author. The Fellows in American Letters of the Library,

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

a body which advised the Library on the development of its collection of American literature, were to be the jury of selection. Serving on the jury in 1948 were Conrad Aiken, W.H. Auden, Louise Bogan, Katherine Garrison Chapin, the 1948 Nobel laureate T.S. Eliot, Paul Green, Robert Lowell, Katherine Anne Porter, Karl Shapiro, Theodore Spencer, Allen Tate, Willard Thorp, and Robert Penn Warren, as well as Leonie Adams, the Library's Consultant in Poetry in English for that year. As the committee's secretary, Leonie Adams received from the jury members the preliminary letters of nomination which clearly foreshadowed the final ballot in which eleven out of the fourteen Fellows cast their votes for Ezra Pound's Pisan Cantos.

Ezra Pound was at that time at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington D.C., the federal asylum for the insane, where he had been committed before he could stand trial for the treasonable, fascist radiobroadcasts he had made in Italy during World War II. The Pisan Cantos, the first draft of which Pound had written when he was kept as an American prisoner of war near Pisa, contained pronounced anti-Semitic statements. The Fellows, of course, knew that awarding the first Bollingen Prize to such a clearly controversial poet would, to say the least, raise a storm. The announcement of the award, therefore, was accompanied by a very diplomatically worded statement by Shapiro (who had in fact voted against Pound), Adams, and Lowell:

The Fellows are aware that objections may be made to awarding a prize to a man situated as is Mr. Pound. In their view, however, the possibility of such objection did not alter the responsibility assumed by the Jury of Selection. This was to make a choice for the award

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

among the eligible books, provided any one merited such recognition, according to the stated terms of the Bollingen Prize. To permit other considerations than that of poetic achievement to sway the decision would destroy the significance of the award and would in principle deny the validity of that objective perception of value on which any civilized society must rest.⁴

At first there was only relatively mild opposition against the award. One of the most violent reactions was by William Barrett, who in an editorial in Partisan Review accused the jury of a nearly inhuman insensitivity and suggested that, as no other book of verse had met their critical standards, they should have decided not to award the 1948 Bollingen Prize in consideration of the feelings of the Jews and other victims of fascism.⁵ Allen Tate read into this editorial the accusation that the jury had been swayed by anti-Semitism and, characteristically, challenged Barrett to a duel, a challenge which Barrett refused. In the national press, too, the exchange of enmities was moderate until suddenly, in June, Robert Hillyer reopened the controversy with two devastating attacks on the award in the Saturday Review of Literature. Hillyer's assaults had been engineered by the editors of the Saturday Review, who through an intermediary, A.D. Parelhoff, had first vainly tried to get the dissenter Karl Shapiro to denounce the award. The editors then approached Hillyer, who had jumped at the chance.

In his long, demagogic articles "Treason's Strange Fruit" and "Poetry's New Priesthood," by perverting facts and violating the truth,

and by means of the "guilt by association" technique, Hillyer attacked C.G. Jung, the Bollingen Foundation, Eliot, and indeed all advocates of modernist poetry and the New Criticism. He denounced them, in the first place, as agents of a fascist conspiracy, and in the second place, paradoxically, as politically naive, irresponsible aestheticists:

An uncompromising assault on this new estheticism is long overdue. The award to Pound made it inevitable. In a spiritual morass where language, ethics, literature, and personal courage melt into something obscure and formless, a guided impulse has stirred the amorphous haze into something approaching form, something shaped out of stagnant art by Fascism.⁶

It is easy to find the reasons for Hillyer's antipathy against modernist poetry and the New Criticism. A writer of romantic, pastoral poetry, such as The Death of Captain Nemo (1949), Hillyer found himself outside the mainline Pound-Eliot tradition of American poetry. Moreover, John Marshall had just refused to fund "The Poetry Society of America" of which Hillyer was President. Hillyer attributed Marshall's refusal to the fact that Marshall "pours money into those wretched New Criticism publications, probably because of his friendship with Dick Blackmore [sic]."⁷ While the award to Pound was made to measure for a controversy involving questions about the relation between art and moral values, Hillyer's vicious, false, personal attacks were surely contemptible. And cowardly, too. For Hillyer had been Ransom's colleague as a visiting professor of English at Kenyon College for the last term of the academic year 1948-1949. He had been highhandedly and

underhandedly reappointed for a two-year period by President Chalmers to serve as a corrective of Ransom's literary opinions. Cunningly, Hillyer had planned his attacks during the summer holidays of 1949; that is, before his return to Kenyon College in October 1949, which he had timed just after Ransom's departure for Indiana University at Bloomington where he had been invited to spend the academic year 1949-1950.

Hillyer's assaults caused a violent outbreak of hostilities at the local as well as at the national level. At Gambier, Rice led the troops against "Nemo" and company. Nationally, Tate, who this time had reason to feel provoked, took command. Part of the local battle was fought in the Kenyon Collegian. A Kenyon College sophomore, D.H. Lobdell, clearly in Hillyer's camp, set off a bomb by denouncing not only "mad Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot and other high priests of incomprehensibility worshipped by the 'new critics,'" but also "John Crowe Ransom, archdeacon in Poetry's New Priesthood, and home bailiwick for the ultra avant-garde Kenyon Review." The blast was felt all over Gambier. "We did everything . . . but dig trenches," George Lanning, in those days a student at Kenyon College, remembers. Vituperative letters writing Lobdell's article down as "muddled," "hysterical," "sordid," and even "fascistic" poured into the Collegian's editorial office. Chalmers tried to pacify both parties by emphasizing on the one hand Ransom's "honored place among us," but conceding on the other that the "explicit intention of [Lobdell's] article--to rehearse and summarize a current dispute among the critics--is of course a proper one." Chalmers concluded this letter to the Collegian with a paean to free speech. Chalmers' statement was partly written under pressure from Rice and Charles Coffin and Denham Sutcliffe of the English department. Somewhat

appeased by Chalmers' letter, they decided to hold their fire for the time being and "not [to] publish anything except in event of further aggression by the other side," as Rice wrote to Ransom at Bloomington, adding with glee that Hillyer was "almost completely ostracized." Almost, for Roberta Chalmers, who guided her husband's thinking in literary matters as before, still cherished and defended Hillyer, whose ideas about poetry were much closer to hers than Ransom's had ever been.⁸

Meanwhile, Tate had rallied his troops. With the help of John Berryman and others Tate had drafted a letter which was to be sent to the editors of the Saturday Review. This letter protested against their sanctioning and guiding "a prepared attack on modern poetry and criticism, impugning not only the literary reputations but the personal characters of some of its foremost writers" as well as "the methods of [their] attack, which . . . has violated the standards of responsible literary controversy, and thus has dealt a blow to American culture."⁹ About eighty out of the hundred writers asked to sign this letter did so gladly. Among them were Philip Rahv, Clement Greenberg, and Arthur Mizener. These writers had violently disagreed with the awarding of the Bollingen Prize to Pound, but found Hillyer's charges sickening. Many of America's preeminent writers, including James Agee, R.P. Blackmur, Cleanth Brooks, Malcolm Cowley, E.E. Cummings, Randall Jarrell, Alfred Kazin, Howard Nemerov, J.F. Powers, Mark Schorer, Delmore Schwartz, Peter Taylor, Diana Trilling, Lionel Trilling, and Mark Van Doren signed the group statement. Others, such as John Doe Passos and Katherine Anne Porter sent their own letters of protest. But the editors of the Saturday Review, who had backed up Hillyer's attacks in flaming editorials, refused to print the group-protest, arguing

interestingly if not convincingly that the controversy had long since been brought to a close. John Berryman then sent the statement on to the editors of The Nation, who published it in their December 17 issue.

In the meantime, at Tate's suggestion, Poetry magazine, edited by Hayden Carruth, had published a far pamphlet, The Case Against the Saturday Review of Literature, which contained, among other things, letters criticizing Hillyer's position, reprints of denunciatory articles by Malcolm Cowley, the editors of The Hudson Review, Aline B. Louchheim, and Hayden Carruth himself, as well as explanatory statements by the Fellows of the Library of Congress, including a well-considered point by point refutation of the "facts" in Hillyer's articles. Less cool and collected, but nonetheless noteworthy as they reflect the heat of the battle, were Yvor Winters' and Robert Penn Warren's reactions. Winters wrote to the editors of the Saturday Review: "Your group is the lowest group of cheap punks I have ever seen in action; to save my soul I cannot imagine your motives.... To hell with all of you." And Warren hoped Rice would give Hillyer "whack for whack" at Gambier.¹⁰

Although Rice, Coffin, and Sutcliffe did nothing to hide their disgust of "Nemo" in private, Chalmers pressured them not to vent their anger in print. About the only thing Rice could do without fear of repercussion was to ask Pound to contribute poetry to The Kenyon Review in order "to show that the opinion of Pound's poetry expressed by our new colleague, Mr. Hillyer, does not represent the attitude of Kenyon as a whole toward Pound, and particularly not the attitude of the Kenyon Review," as Rice informed William Carlos Williams, whom he had asked to act as an intermediary. But Pound had to refuse: "Yr. sentimungs, sir, as forwarded by . . . B. Willyums do you credit. But

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

after more than 4 years, cage-birdee no sing." So Rice's covert gesture of rebellion came to nothing, but Tate's resounding national campaign--the multi-signed letter to the Saturday Review and the Poetry pamphlet--reverberated on the local front and made Chalmers "sit up and take notice." Rice kept Tate posted: "A violent reaction of some sort is going on in the presidential--should I say mind?--but the outcome as always is totally unpredictable."¹¹

Chalmers vacillated indeed. Ransom, who had met him at a conference in Chicago, in December, wrote to Rice that though Chalmers seemed "deeply committed to Hillyer," he had told Ransom "almost with tears that Hillyer felt no opposition to me or the KR at all. . . . I think [Chalmers] is so blind . . . that he may believe that. . . . Of course in every general meeting he shows his deep ignorance about literary matters and contemporary attitudes." Ransom concluded: "Let Hillyer dry up in his own ineptitude, or float and bloat in his own romantic stew, or whatever figure is appropriate." But within a week it became clear that there was "no peace at Gambier" yet, and in January 1950 Chalmers was again making "wild charges" against Ransom, Rice, and Sutcliffe. From Bloomington Ransom could suggest conciliatorily to let the issue "just wear itself out," but it is clear from Rice's letters that it was not until April that the battle at Gambier more or less definitely died down: "Locally, Hillyer's influence has been nullified, [and] Chalmers is on the defensive, though we haven't won a total victory yet."¹²

All in all, however, Hillyer and his fellow-Philistines had lost the war: the congressional investigation that Hillyer and the Saturday Review of Literature had tried to instigate misfired; Hillyer did not get tenure at Kenyon College, and, even though the Library of Congress barred the Bollingen Prize, the funds were transferred to the Yale

University Library, and in 1951 they awarded the Bollingen Prize to Ransom. In 1951 Ransom was also asked to become the Library's consultant in poetry, an honour and a mark of confidence which he had to decline for financial reasons. The officers of the Bollingen Foundation itself reaffirmed their confidence in Ransom and company, too: in 1951 Rice received a two-year Bollingen grant to relieve him from summer teaching, and when the Carnegie funds for Ransom's Kenyon Chair of Poetry had been used up, Paul Mellon, founder of the Bollingen Foundation, donated \$8,000.00 towards this Chair. Of course, there were also a few losses to be chalked up. Hayden Carruth was forced to resign as editor of Poetry and Karl Shapiro succeeded him, most likely because of their respective involvement with the prize to Pound. The last shot--and the one that perhaps hit Tate hardest as he had always championed and cherished him--was fired by Shapiro about ten years after the hostilities had ceased: "I voted against giving Pound that prize, but I believed all the same that the jurors acted in good faith. The methods used by the Saturday Review were unspeakable (calling the prize a Fascist plot), but now it seems to me that the jurors, led by Eliot himself, acted in a distinctly underhanded manner."¹³

The battle about the Bollingen Prize had in no way daunted the Rockefeller Foundation. It remained a staunch supporter of Ransom and The Kenyon Review and, as a matter of fact, gradually extended its philanthropic activities to other critical reviews, thereby strengthening their joint position in the literary world. Richard Blackmur's 1944 study of literary magazines had shown that no highbrow magazine could operate without a large deficit and had resulted in the Foundation's first direct gift of \$7,500.00 to the Kenyon, mainly thanks to John Marshall's exertions. Whereas Marshall initially had not

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

been convinced by Blackmur of the necessity of financial assistance to non-commercial magazines, and had been inclined to impute their deficits to the total absence of business acumen on the part of their editors, interviews he conducted with editors, publishers, and writers made him change his mind. It seemed "evident" to him that, besides rendering a great service by the publication of new and non-commercial writing, the literary magazines were "representative of the most advanced critical thinking in the country." In a memo of September 11, 1946 he therefore pointed out that assisting these reviews financially would "constitute an opportunity for the RF to encourage further literary growth," and recommended grants to provide for "more adequate payment" to contributors.¹⁴

Marshall's memo found favour with the Foundation, and Richard Blackmur, Malcolm Cowley, and Lionel Trilling were appointed as members of an advisory committee which was to review the whole field of magazines, their problems and their potentialities, and to submit recommendations. This triumvirate drafted a form letter inviting suggestions and recommendations and asking for a comparative rating of the literary reviews. The letter was sent to nineteen eminent writers, half of whom, to be sure, had almost exclusively published their work in little and literary magazines: W.H. Auden, E. Bentley, L. Bogan, V.W. Brooks, K. Burke, G. Hicks, F.T. Hoffman, A. Kazin, R. Jarrell, F.O. Matthiessen, G. Mayberry, Marianne Moore, W. Stevens, A. Tate, R.P. Warren, W.C. Williams, E. Wilson, Y. Winters, and M.D. Zabel. No wonder, then, that nearly all of them greeted the announcement of possible support for these reviews with enthusiasm.

William Carlos Williams was the only one to react almost wholly contrarily:

To hell with them all with their scholarly editors each with his prejudices and predilections, Kenyon, Sewanee and Partisan: each with some sort of axe to grind. . . . A magazine of the arts cannot be confined by juvenilia, by region, by politics or philosophic fencing. . . .

I used to be for a Little Magazine Clearing House with a banking and clerical center in say, St. Louis or if you prefer, Colorado Springs--provided the climate wasn't TOO salubrious to make us all over sanguine. Any mag that wanted any money . . . could present its case and ask for support. But who, in God's name would be the judges? There is no one, including myself, that I'd trust. . . .

I give it up.¹⁵

Williams did not quite "give it up," though, for he went on for two more pages, inveighing against committees, colleges, and commercialism. Edmund Wilson was more selectively antagonistic. Although he regarded the extinct Dial and Little Review, as well as the still bouncing Partisan Review as "immensely valuable," he wrote off The Kenyon Review as "indescribably awful," and was, if possible, even more offensive about The Sewanee Review: "All[e]n Tate, before he left the Sewanee, never succeeded in lifting the shadow of the influence of J.C. Ransom or being able to refuse filling its space with the writings of his cousins and aunts." Accent was "perfectly piffling," and Poetry "as dead as Hull House." What Wilson did want was "a new first-rate

magazine that would serve both as a critical review and as a vehicle for new creative writing."¹⁶

But the others were perfectly satisfied with the existing possibilities and were only too glad to give their preferences and advice. On the basis of their answers the advisory committee concluded that Partisan Review was most deserving of Foundation support, that The Kenyon Review came a close second, that The Sewanee Review came third, followed at a distance by Accent, Poetry, Western Review, and a few others. Partisan took pride of place because Hoffman, Jarrell, Kazin, and Stevens, while emphasizing the incontestable importance of the Kenyon, had nevertheless put Partisan first, whereas most of the others had found these two reviews equally indispensable. But Bentley voted unqualifiedly for the Kenyon: "Being one of the editors [*sic*] of the Kenyon Review I am prejudiced as a witness."¹⁷ Finally, those who gave advice about specific methods of financing the literary reviews agreed with Marshall, perhaps not wholly altruistically, that a substantial increase in their payments to contributors would increase their services to literature. This suggestion was endorsed by the committee.

The Partisan, Kenyon, and Sewanee reviews, then, clearly had a headstart on the others and were consequently recommended by Marshall for Rockefeller grants. But the Foundation decided to subsidize only The Kenyon Review, and in April 1947 donated \$22,500.00 to Kenyon College to be used up in five years. The money was meant for an increase in payment to Kenyon Review contributors to two and a half cents a word for prose and fifty cents a line for verse. Cowley commented that "[i]t was the best choice of the lot, Kenyon, for the sort of help you can give," but hoped that the experiment would be broadened. Trilling reacted likewise: he was "disappointed that the

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

Foundation did not, right off, cut a wider swathe," but his "commitment of affection" for the Kenyon made him "happy that the Kenyon has new resources." So Partisan Review, even though it topped the list, was passed over. Fortunately, its editors soon received such a considerable contribution from Allan Dowling, poet and partner in the City Investing Company, that they could publish Partisan Review as a monthly and still pay writers far better than they had done before. Early in 1948 The Sewanee Review, finally, received a five-year Rockefeller grant of \$27,600.00 in order to raise its rates to the Kenyon's new level.

The Foundation's deliberate passing over of Partisan Review was undoubtedly inspired by that magazine's Marxist origins, even though already in 1937 it had deemed it necessary to "disclaim obligation" to Party politics.¹⁹ This is not to say that by 1947 Partisan Review had become another Kenyon. True, both were highbrow reviews which published distinguished fiction and critical prose, and were hospitable to all kinds of promising serious writing. But the cosmopolitan Partisan gave much more space to European writers and published considerably less poetry and drama than the Kenyon. Furthermore, to generalize broadly, the New York intellectual Partisan still had a definitely cultural-ideological-political slant, was more radical and polemical, and, consequently, more lively, if more journalistic and faddish than the Kenyon. In the light of its fellow-travelling past, all this must have made the Rockefeller Foundation decide not to support Partisan Review.

Closer to the Kenyon was The Sewanee Review. This is apparent from the succession of its editors from 1942 onwards: Andrew Lytle (1942-1944), Allen Tate (1944-1946), and John Palmer, former managing editor of The Southern Review, (1946-1952). Although his editorship lasted only two years, Tate--much more than Lytle, who had been a reluctant,

temporary editor--left so strong a mark on the Sewanee that his successor hastened to reassure its readers that "[i]f under my editorship there should appear to be a break in editorial continuity from the pattern established by Mr. Tate, it will be the result not of intention but of failure of intention." Like Ransom, Tate explicitly modelled his review on The Dial and claimed kinship with The Southern Review.²⁰

Sewanee's close correspondence with the Kenyon is apparent from its list of regular contributors during Tate's editorship, which included J. Berryman, R.P. Blackmur, K. Burke, F. Fergusson, R. Jarrell, A. Mizener, and Wallace Stevens. And, of course, there were the close personal bonds between Tate and Ransom, reflected in their continuous, mainly literary correspondence. Nevertheless, the differences between these two reviews, however minor, should not be disregarded. Philosophy, drama, and the arts, for instance, played only a negligible part in the Sewanee. Moreover, due to both the regional situation of the Sewanee and Tate's continuing deep-rooted interest in the South, the Sewanee was more Southern-oriented and somewhat more cliquish and reactionary than the Kenyon.

The Kenyon School of English and the Kenyon Review Fellows

In 1947 the differences between, on the one hand, the plucky, cultural-political Partisan, and, on the other, the more serene, and perhaps at times somewhat academic Kenyon and Sewanee reviews were still so striking that the Rockefeller Foundation decided to fund only the latter two. Paradoxically, it was another grant by this very foundation which caused the differences between Partisan and the other reviews to

diminish. Since 1946, when the Rockefeller Foundation gave \$7,500.00 to The Kenyon Review, David Stevens and Ransom had been talking informally, off and on, about setting up a summer school of criticism for graduate students. In the summer of 1945, plans were made in earnest. At Ransom's suggestion Rice discussed the school with Lionel Trilling and Robert Penn Warren. Rice's memo to Ransom of these conversations already touched upon aspects which would play an important role in the years to come: the aversion of returning veterans to resuming their literary studies at the existing graduate schools which mainly provided historical-bibliographical scholarship, and the beneficial collaboration which would result among the school's teachers with their varied views about literary criticism. Rice had no doubts whatsoever that such a scheme would be backed financially by a foundation and, in his turn, asked Ransom to draft an extensive prospectus. Four months later, in January 1946, Ransom approached the Rockefeller Foundation armed with a provisional plan.

If in his proposal to the Foundation Ransom emphasized the benefits for the students, his correspondence shows that he set more store by the benefits for the school's staff--the "meeting . . . of contrary and even cantankerous minds" and "the approach to amity and to common views insofar as community is possible among the teaching fellows" which would result.²¹ In one of the drafts submitted for approval to the Rockefeller Foundation, Ransom, in agreement with his editorial policy, emphasized strongly that the school would "not permit itself to be identified exclusively with any one critical 'position.' . . . A staff of teaching Fellows may be generally of high intelligence and skill, yet their several doctrinal convictions may be widely at variance. It would be improper for a School of Criticism to deny or

suppress this variance, and such a school would be evading its responsibilities and its opportunities if it failed to make some provision for displaying and if possible 'clarifying' the basic critical issues." In the proposal proper, subtitled unequivocally "A Plan for an Educational Project in the Humanities," Ransom once again pointed to the limitations of the customary English courses devoted to scholarship and once again made the familiar points about the great importance of critical studies for the understanding of literature, but he now went on to stress strongly the absolute necessity of these studies for the "men and women who are preparing for a career in English teaching."²²

There was initial hesitation about the project because the Foundation thought it would be "essentially a one man show centering around John C. Ransom." John Marshall, who in September 1946 had commented that "the value of the plan hinged on Ransom," wondered about a year later whether it would be advisable to be "putting all our critical eggs in the Kenyon basket." However, the sincerity of Ransom's emphasis in his proposal on the desired diversity of critical points of view is amply demonstrated by his choice of his two associate Senior Fellows, F.O. Matthiessen and Lionel Trilling. In 1972 Trilling described the 'founding of the School . . . as a notable event of my personal past." Ransom's letter asking Matthiessen to become a member of the proposed school's "executive council" brightly reflects his striving after critical diversity: "I have thought for some time of you and Trilling and myself as constituting this council. We are quite different from each other and that ensures a catholic view; and I should say we respect each other enough to put up with a majority ruling gracefully."²³

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

But when, after many letters, explanations, and reassurances the hurdle of the Foundation's fear of Ransom's possible monopoly of critical studies in the United States had been taken, another obstacle came in sight: the Rockefeller Foundation decided that the proposed school was much too expensive. In September 1947, after much haggling, David Stevens proposed recommending an experimental grant for one year only; should Ransom not be satisfied with this, he warned, "the question of help [would] be unanswered." But both Chalmers--who played a major part in the negotiations as Kenyon College was to be the school's site, and liable to pay for its possible deficits--and Ransom unhesitatingly turned this offer down. They had already come down from their original proposal of five years to three years, but a one year school would, as Ransom pointed out, "rate along with . . . conferences, and would not attract the right people for staff or for students." He added that Trilling would surely withdraw from such a slight undertaking unworthy of the name "school." This made the Foundation's officers sit up and take notice, and, contrary to expectation, they decided to grant \$40,000.00 for a three-year period: the school fitted in too neatly with their cherished project of aiding "promising methods for improving the teaching of humanities."²⁴

The staffs of the 1948, 1949, and 1950 Kenyon School of English, as the school came to be officially called, have probably never been equalled for genius, or for critical and personal diversity. They are a gauge to the brilliance, exhilaration, geniality, and glory of these three summers that briefly turned Gambier into "the literary capital of the nation."²⁵ The staffs were as follows: in 1948 Bentley, Brooks, Richard Chase, F.O. Matthiessen, Ransom, Tate, Austin Warren, and William Empson, who was flown in from China; in 1949 Ransom, Tate, and

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

Bentley served again, Herbert Read came over from Great Britain, and Rahv, René Wellek, Mark Schorer, and Yvor Winters completed the team; and in 1950 Empson and Ransom participated for the second and third time respectively, L.C. Knights fortified the British ranks, Coffin and Rice the home front, and Burke, Lowell, Mizener, and Schwartz brought the staff up to strength.

Approximately 75 students were selected annually out of hundreds applying mainly from schools to the west of Gambier, as the critical way of teaching literature had already penetrated the major eastern schools. One student's rapturous reaction is indicative of the boundless enthusiasm the sessions evoked: "I have never before associated with eight men of such brilliance. . . . I honestly believe that I received sufficient inspiration from attending the 1948 session to sustain me in my study of English throughout the rest of my life. I could envision no higher personal honor than the opportunity to return to the school as teacher--say in 1970 or thereabouts." The Kenyon School of English did not only inspire and inspirit its students, attending the School also paid off in job prospects. The School simultaneously drew attention to the existing critical void and prepared its students to fill this void. Soon the new style teacher-critics were in such great demand all over America that Charles Coffin, the Dean of the Kenyon School of English, complained that he seemed to head an "employment agency."²⁶

The same mixture of worldly and spiritual benefits fell to the part of the School's staff: Richard Chase, for example, was appointed at Columbia University mainly because of his having been a teaching Fellow during the 1948 session. The staff was struck by the often unsuspected brilliance of colleagues holding controversial critical opinions.

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

Outlooks were expanded, friendships were formed--or, at least, enmities were buried. Superlatives abound in the staff's descriptions of the meetings, too. Matthiessen, who in 1947 had threatened to resign when he heard of Ransom's having asked Rahv to participate, wrote to Tate that the 1948 "session at Kenyon was very rewarding for me, especially through the opportunity of getting to know better your 'Southern agrarian poets and critics.'" Rahv "found teaching more to my taste than I would have thought possible." Even irritable, thin-skinned Yvor Winters, whom Ransom had come to dislike almost as much as Matthiessen loathed Rahv, but whom he had invited nevertheless as he strove after variety in critical approaches--"I should welcome a Stalinist if there were a good one in the literary sense"--even Winters turned out to be "[m]ost helpful" and companionable.²⁷

It would be wrong to conclude from all this that because of the Kenyon School of English the teaching fellows hastily abandoned their critical views and enthusiastically embraced those of former opponents (there is a story of Empson drunkenly yet brilliantly attacking Burke's views at four in the morning, at which a devoted student of Burke's got so upset that he woke Burke up and pleaded with him to get dressed and let Empson have it; however, when Burke arrived Empson had passed out, his head half under the kitchen sink, so Burke returned to his pyjamas and bed). Nevertheless, the close association, the social gatherings, games, and charades at the School prevented dogmatic isolation and bred tolerance and a broadening of views.²⁸

In 1958, reporting once more to the Rockefeller Foundation, Ransom emphasized the great importance of the School of English for The Kenyon Review: its impact was "momentous . . . so much did it expand our outlook." And, of course, as Ransom remarked to Chalmers, "the kind

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

of interest taken in the Review and the kind of interest taken in the School are almost identical; they have to do with articulating the literary judgment. Our teaching Fellows are also identical, so far as numbers permit, with our contributors to the Review; while the students of the School are our potential contributors." The help of Matthiessen and Trilling notwithstanding, Ransom was the vital, visionary force behind the School. He was the one to come up with suggestions for staff members, to write numerous letters begging coveted Fellows to teach--often in vain, as in the case, for example, of T.S. Eliot, F.R. Leavis, Robert Penn Warren, and Randall Jarrell--he was the one to suggest courses from Donne to modern drama, and, during the sessions themselves, the one to "plea[d] for cooperation and harmony in the collective enterprise." So, as with the Kenyon, it was Ransom's critical knowingness and open-mindedness that made the School a "great success."²⁹

But the School's success could not guarantee its continuance. The Rockefeller Foundation decided to refuse Chalmers' request for a renewed, more extensive three-year grant on the ground that "the recognition that the School has won indicates its very real accomplishment in demonstrating the importance of a truly critical approach to the study of literature. . . . [I]ts wider acceptance means that from now on it can make its way on its own in the United States." But other considerations played at least as important a part: there was the Hillyer business which had got Kenyon College talked about, and there was Chalmers, who, while requesting a grant, had hinted in several interviews with Foundation officers that the Kenyon School of English constituted mere New Critical nepotism. Together with the retirement of David Stevens, the School's guardian angel, this

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

worked against the Foundation's acceding to a second \$70,000.00 plan for what amounted to a more expensive version of the existing Kenyon School of English.³⁰

"I tell you frankly, sir, that the failure of Kenyon College to keep the School of English will probably go down in history as one of the anomalies of academic statesmanship," an enraged Tate wrote to Chalmers. Ransom and Trilling were deeply disappointed, too, and offended by Chalmers' insistence that the School stood for "'one thing'" only. Ransom did not "to save my life know what is the 'one thing' we stand for," and Trilling found the School "'one thing' only insofar as it is good and insofar as it is humanistic," and pointed to the religious, political, temperamental, and critical differences among the Fellows.³¹ Other foundations were approached determinedly but in vain: the Kenyon School of English was lost to Kenyon College. But not lost completely, because Indiana University, where Ransom was teaching during the academic year of 1949-1950, was so impressed by the School's record that it adopted the School integrally, merely changing its name to the School of Letters at Indiana University.

By 1950 a critical approach to literature had become part of the regular university curriculum; this rendered the School of Letters (partly) redundant. Moreover, after the first years when many of its students were subsidized by the G.I. Bill, the School's enrolment dropped drastically; besides, most of its twenty odd students came from Indiana University. This, and the retirement of its director, Newton P. Stallknecht, led to the School's discontinuance in 1972. Meanwhile, Ransom's remaining an active Senior Fellow had staved off the complete severance of the link between the School and The Kenyon Review. Nevertheless, as Ransom only sporadically taught at the School of

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

Letters, the bond between the new Bloomington teaching Fellows and Ransom, and consequently the Kenyon, were never as close as during the School's provocative, convivial, conciliatory years at Kenyon College.

Although the officers of the Rockefeller Foundation refused to subsidize the Kenyon School of English again, they had not washed their hands of The Kenyon Review. When the 1947 five-year grant for raising the contributors' rate came to an end in 1952, the Kenyon was once more in very real danger of being suspended. Although the increase in payment had enabled more writers to dedicate more of their time to writing of the quality required by the Kenyon, the Foundation's officers were disappointed that there had been no notable increase in the Kenyon's circulation, and no improvement in its general financial situation. Consequently, Charles Fahs, who succeeded Stevens as Director of the Rockefeller Foundation Humanities Division and who was no friend of the reviews, wrote to Chalmers that a request for renewal would be refused. Chalmers--who, according to Ransom, once again was 'wonderfully 'for' the Review just as it stands, considering that he doesn't and can't read it"--Ransom and Rice were in sackcloth and ashes, as they read Fahs's letter as "a final brushoff." But Edward D'Arms, recently appointed Associate Director and "a former Oxonian chum of Phil's," gave them "a broad hint" to make the Foundation a new proposition which took into account that its officers "felt that . . . greater opportunity lay in directly encouraging the new-found writers of already-evident ability."³²

Out of this came the first three-year programme of literary Fellowships, inaugurated in 1952 and involving \$41,400.00; this grant was renewed and increased to \$52,200.00 in 1956. The Kenyon Review, although the first, was not the only beneficiary: The Sewanee Review

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

received a similar grant in 1953, which was also renewed in 1956. Moreover, The Hudson Review, and now Partisan Review, too, benefited from this second round of Fellowships, an extension Ransom was "happy" with.³³ The terms of the first grant to The Kenyon Review show the advantages for the magazine:

The proposed grant is for provision for the award by the editors of the Review of three fellowships annually, one each in fiction, poetry, and criticism, and for editorial expenses, including overhead expenses involved in these appointments, the latter item admittedly to assist the Review to some extent in maintaining present rates of payment during a period of transition to other sources of support. These fellowships, which would carry stipends of approximately \$2,000 for unmarried fellows and \$3,000 for married fellows, are to be awarded to individuals in each field whose work in the judgment of the editors of the Review merits such encouragement.³⁴

The Fellowships not only benefitted The Kenyon Review financially, but also had the same effect as the Kenyon School of English had had: they infused fresh blood into the Kenyon, vitally broadening its scope. Although these Fellows, as opposed to the Kenyon Rockefeller Fellows of the mid-forties, were free to live where they wanted and were under no obligation to the Kenyon whatsoever, they eagerly and gratefully submitted the work written during their Fellowships on their own initiative. Their work almost invariably was of such high quality that

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

it was enthusiastically accepted and paid for at the regular rates. Again we find a kind of interaction. On the one hand, the grant required Ransom to exert himself and to look for new talent, on the other hand, Ransom's keen eye for coming writers, and his having his finger on the pulse of the literary world because of his editorship, ensured a varied list of gifted Fellows.

Even though a few writers, such as Walter Elder, Kaj Klitgaard, Robie Macauley, and Robert Wooster Stallman inquired about their possible eligibility after having read the announcement about the Fellowships in the Autumn 1952 issue, the selection procedure was not based on open application, which would have involved an exorbitant amount of work for the editors. Ransom and Rice generally wrote round to the Kenyon's advisory editors and other literary friends and asked for suggestions. Marianne Moore, for example, proposed Ernest Jones, fiction critic of The Nation, R.P. Blackmur, Leonie Adams, Louise Bogan, and Ralph Hodgson, Arthur Mizener proposed Howard Nemerov, Reed Whittemore, and Clay Putman; Francis Fergusson also proposed Leonie Adams as well as Joseph Frank, William Merwin, Robert Fitzgerald, and Leslie Fiedler. The eventual list of Kenyon Review Fellows contains many writers who soon came to achieve national acclaim. The Fellows for 1953 were: in poetry, Edwin Watkins; in fiction, Flannery O'Connor; in criticism, Irving Howe. For 1954: in poetry, William Merwin, in fiction, George Lanning and Flannery O'Connor (again); in criticism, Richard W.B. Lewis. For 1955: in poetry, Edgar Bogardus and Douglas Nichols, both from Kenyon College; in fiction, Howard Nemerov; in criticism, Richard Ellmann. For 1956: in poetry, Ruth Stone, in fiction, Andrew Lytle; in criticism, Leslie Fiedler and the drama critic Theodore Hoffman. For 1957: in poetry, to prop up rather than to

encourage, Delmore Schwartz; in fiction, James F. Powers and Elizabeth Spencer; in criticism, Francis Fergusson. And for 1958: in poetry, James Wright and Theodore Holmes; in fiction, Robie Macauley; and in criticism, Thomas H. Carter.³⁵

A number of these Fellows had published in the Kenyon before, but now they belonged to Ransom's elect. They benefitted greatly from their appointments. Their literary abilities were now manifestly recognized by the prestigious Kenyon Review and the money bought them time to devote to serious work instead of hack writing. A selection of the reactions of the Fellows confirms this. Irving Howe, who compared his acceptance as a critic in New York intellectual circles to "gaining applause for a recitation at a family party," did not feel acknowledged as a serious critic until "a letter arrived . . . from John Crowe Ransom . . . saying I had been chosen for a Kenyon Fellowship in Criticism. For all one's New York cockiness, one still wanted a word, a glance, from those distant spaces beyond the Hudson." And Flannery O'Connor, working away lonely and ill at Milledgeville, Georgia, wrote to John Marshall that the Fellowships had been "a great help . . . financially and in the way of encouragement." In a later letter she elaborated: "Generally you expect to make a thousand or two dollars from a novel but nothing from a book of stories, and not much from the individual story published in a quarterly, so that if you don't have much money, you can't well afford to write stories. . . . You will probably agree that my stories are better than my novel [Wise Blood (1952)]--anyway, at the time that I wanted to write stories and had stories to write, I felt free to write them, thanks to the fellowship." Edwin Watkins "cried like a Frenchman" when he heard that he had been elected the Kenyon's first Fellow in Poetry.³⁶

Challenging the New Criticism

The battle over the Bollingen Prize, the great amount of money given both directly and indirectly by the respectable Rockefeller Foundation to The Kenyon Review, the monopoly position the New Critics had built up in the universities: all this indicates the consolidation and institutionalization in the late forties and early fifties of the New Criticism and the critical quarterlies, among which The Kenyon Review was foremost. Paradoxically, while academics warmed to the New Criticism, Ransom grew cold to it, or rather, grew cold to the academic version of the New Criticism as represented, for him, by Robert Wooster Stallman and others. He condemned the academic "cold-blooded critics of poetry working away at what sometimes appear to be merest exercises with words;" he damned the "doctrinal satisfactions" leading to "shallow judgements" which are "especially brutal when the critic is led to reject on the basis of supposed technical or formal requirements." As early as 1947, in "The Formal Analysis," Ransom had taken his distance from Cleanth Brooks's New Critical The Well Wrought Urn, feeling that the New Criticism had been "slightly disappointing to the expectations it had aroused." Even though a year later, in a review of Stanley Hyman's book on the New Critics, The Armed Vision, Ransom doubted whether it was "wise as yet to sell this criticism short," it did seem to him "that actual production and merchandizing in this business are ready for a going over."³⁷

Therefore, while at the turn of the decade The Kenyon Review was generally considered the epitome of the New Criticism, in fact, the essays contributed by the New Critics were few compared to those

written by new, vital talents such as Paul Goodman, Leslie Fiedler, Richard Ellmann, Stanley Hyman, and Richard Chase. This is not to say that the first generation of New Critics was dropped ignominiously, for critics like Empson, Mizener, and Tate all retained their critical vitality, and whole-heartedly shared Ransom's dislike of dull New Critical academics. The second generation of methodological New Critics, however, although they were very influential in the universities, hardly ever appeared in The Kenyon Review.

If in his reviews of The Well Wrought Urn and The Armed Vision Ransom had indicated which way The Kenyon Review was to go, his editorial intentions became even more clear from "The Critic's Business," a symposium featuring in the Kenyon's tenth birthday issue. Ransom had invited about half a dozen critics to react to his "provocative" Hyman review and to give their opinions on the outlook for literary criticism. It is telling that all the eventual contributors--William Barrett, Blackmur, Chase, and Tate--seized this opportunity to look back on the New Criticism as past, be it elusive history. Barrett, "puzzled as to the unity that is supposed to connect [the New Critics]," suggested that "the term itself, 'the new criticism,' ha[d] outlived its usefulness and could . . . be safely dropped," as the true New Critics such as Blackmur, Empson, Ransom, and Richards, whose one common "initial point of departure" had been "close textual analysis," now, "each in his own direction, ha[d] moved beyond this task." Tate, referring likewise to the "myth" of the New Criticism, but nevertheless acknowledging this myth's presence in The Kenyon Review, strongly repudiated the attempt of the academy to turn myth into methodology. Blackmur, describing himself as "the hunter and the hunted, in The Kenyon's pages," argued that "the New Criticism

which Mr. Ransom has gathered and firmed in The Kenyon Review" had "restored . . . the aesthetic to good standing," but had done this "to excess." Still, Blackmur thought that the time had come to start applying this kind of criticism to the novel, too. Richard Chase, who as the youngest of the symposiasts never had been bound or hindered by the bibliographical-historical chains of the academy, was the harshest judge of the New Criticism. He compared and contrasted it to the kind of moralistic criticism Van Wyck Brooks stood for, and, finding both kinds wanting, saw "a mobile middle ground" as "the only possible habitat for the critic."³⁸

By initiating the pivotal symposium "My Credo," which appeared in the Autumn 1950 and Winter and Spring 1951 issues, the editors helped to put the New Criticism in its proper perspective. "We have meant to assemble a catholic and various statement of the critic's business without presupposing any single kind of thing as preferred," Ransom wrote asking Van Wyck Brooks to contribute.³⁹ "My Credo," which may be regarded as a kind of continuation of "The Critic's Business," also and more importantly was a direct consequence of the Kenyon School of English. Reporting on a meeting of its Senior Fellows Ransom wrote to Rice:

During our session at New York I made the point, which I hold to rather strongly, that one of the benefits of the School of English has been the approach to amity and to common views insofar as community is possible among the teaching Fellows. Matthiessen backed this up strongly, and Trilling was at least sympathetic. But we were all aware that the Foundation would want to see

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

objective evidence of this, and we knew of a little such evidence. Then it occurred to me that something might be done that would be very strong evidence, and of some value otherwise though it could not be improvised in a hurry. Suppose the Kenyon Review should ask the individual Fellows of the School, or a good many of them, to take 2500 to 5000 words apiece and write out their critical Credo's. I think it would be of interest in view of the many misrepresentations which enemies make of the new critics, and might surprise even the critics themselves. It would compel some of the critic-Fellows to search their hearts. KR could print them in instalments, and eventually the New Directions people would surely be delighted (or some other publisher if we preferred another) to publish them all in a book: My Critical Credo, by 15 Kenyon Critics, or something like that.⁴⁰

Rice, the Kenyon's acting editor during Ransom's sabbatical at Bloomington, found this a perfect proposal, and, together with Ransom, drafted a form letter which they sent out not only to the School's Fellows, but to practically all prominent critics, mainly American, of every critical persuasion: from Bentley to Bush, Frye to Fiedler, Rahv to Richards, and Sartre to Spender. Part of this form letter ran as follows: "it would be a public service if various well-known critics quite independently of each other should write out for publication their critical Credo's. . . . The occasion would seem to demand of each critic that he search his own heart afresh if need be, at any rate that

he indicate the vital philosophy from which his way of criticism must have proceeded, and the personal and social responsibilities which it required him to assume."⁴¹

In spite of the absence of a few important, provocatively polemical critics who welshed on their acceptance of this invitation, such as F. R. Leavis and Philip Rahv, the symposium represented, as planned, a broad range of critical approaches.⁴² Leslie Fiedler's ambitious, arrogant, anti-New Critical plea "Toward an Amateur Criticism" started off the symposium. Then the British critic Herbert Read declared himself to be a "Critic as Man of Feeling:" "Sympathy and empathy--feeling with and feeling into: these are the essential psycho-physical processes without which all criticism is null and dull." The next contributor, Richard Chase, did not yet stress the importance of myth in criticism, but proved himself to be truly Trilling's pupil in arguing that "the literary critic will find himself inescapably a political writer." William Empson spoke up for the New Criticism in the conclusion of the first instalment of "My Credo:" he argued that "[t]here is room for a great deal of exposition, in which the business of the critic is simply to show how the machine is meant to work, and therefore to show all its working parts in turn." Ransom was more than agreeably surprised by the quality of these first four statements, which he described as "very various but all composed with great scruple and making philosophical (ethical, social, aesthetic, formal, etc) commitments about the demands which they make on literature and the proper and improper varieties of criticism."⁴³

Meanwhile, Ransom had written to Tate that the symposium "very much need[ed] some old-line new-critic Credos, and most of all that means you." But Tate did not contribute and the editors had to be--and

should have been--content with Cleanth Brooks's "The Formalist Critic," a level-headed, logical defence of the New Criticism. Although Brooks sympathized "with writers who are tired of reading rather drab 'critical analyses,'" he pointed to the dangers of Leslie Fiedler's "amateur" and Douglas Bush's 'human'" criticism. "The formalist critic knows as well as anyone that poems and plays and novels are written by men. . . . But the formalist critic is concerned primarily with the work itself," Brooks wrote decisively. Bush, sworn enemy of the New Criticism, defended "The Humanist Critic" in the essay immediately following Brooks's, and emphasized that literature is "ethical" and 'didactic.'" Given Brooks's excellent essay, Ransom's speaking of "some little let-down in the hands of Bush and Brooks" shows that Ransom's own critical position was further from Brooks's than ever.⁴⁴ Northrop Frye's intricate, almost abstract credo on "The Archetypes of Literature" was not exactly sparkling, but it did no damage to the Kenyon's standards either, and was in fact a worthy conclusion to the second instalment of credos.

Stephen Spender, Arthur Mizener, and Austin Warren brought up the rear: the British critic joined hands with the diverse group of anti-New Critics consisting of Fiedler, Read, Chase, Bush, and Frye, while Mizener and Warren spoke in concert with the remaining few in favour of, or anyway not against, the New Criticism. Mizener's modest essay which culminated in his tolerant statement that criticism 'consists in getting hold of other people's insights, somewhere deep in the seriously idle, unawed, and affectionate part of the mind, and then, by whatever method serves the occasion best, trying to make them available," was perhaps the most sensible, but certainly not the most passionate, provocative opinion to be represented in the symposium.

5. Recognition and New Directions (1947-1955)

Ransom was particularly satisfied with Austin Warren's emphasis on the necessity and inevitability of tension and collaboration between historical scholarship and close reading, and hoped this essay would yet "stir . . . up" Tate "for our wind-up" in the Summer 1951 issue.⁴⁵

But, as Rahv and Leavis failed to deliver the papers promised for that issue, Austin Warren's credo turned out to be the final one. Disappointing, too, was that although both Random House, where David McDowell now was an editor, and the Oklahoma University Press had initially expressed an interest in "My Credo," the symposium did not appear in book form after all, probably because the Cleveland World Publishing Company was about to bring out The Kenyon Critics (1951), a selection of essays and book reviews which had appeared in the first twelve volumes of The Kenyon Review. A missed chance, nevertheless, for "My Credo" certainly was "something super in respect to timeliness & importance in the way of symposia:" almost the whole gamut of contemporary critical approaches are represented in these three consecutive issues of The Kenyon Review.⁴⁶

The Donne Series and the Dante Symposium

"My Credo" illustrated that the new Criticism was wilting, while the freshness of some of the new theoretical approaches in criticism in this symposium was stimulating. Nevertheless, in part of The Kenyon Review, particularly in its continued tradition of successful symposiums and series, the old New Criticism was still alive. The sequence on John Donne, which the editors had organized "[i]n the belief that he deserves a new evaluation now that the controversial period has passed" is a case in point. This series was opened by William Empson's malicious review of Rosemond Tuve's Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery (1947) in the Autumn 1949 issue, and brought to a close by the same author's elaborate discussion of "Donne the Spaceman" in the Summer 1957 issue.¹ As had become the usual Kenyon practice with a unified series of articles on one author, Ransom and Rice asked someone else to become guest editor. Charles Coffin, chairman of the Kenyon College English department, one of Ransom's "best friends," and, most relevantly here, the author of the standard work Donne and the New Philosophy (1937), enthusiastically accepted the editors' invitation.² As had become the custom, too, the editors shouldered part of the burden: Ransom and Rice wrote around for contributions and invited, among others, Burke, Tate, Robert Penn Warren, and Austin Warren. As usual, too, Tate initially accepted and finally reneged. Next to Empson, the eventual contributors were the prosodist Arnold Stein, the poet-critic Josephine Miles, the British critic and Scrutiny regular D. W. Harding, Marius Bewley, Austin Warren, Robert M. Adams, and Coffin

himself.

Arnold Stein's "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse," totalling about forty pages in two consecutive 1951 issues is based on the obvious thesis that sound in Donne's poetry is not merely ornamental but significant. The essay is sometimes strained and basically boring. Even longer, certainly strained, basically unsound, but not boring in the least was Empson's conclusion to the series, tacked on in 1957 after a three-year interval, dealing with Donne as spaceman: "Donne . . . from a fairly early age, was interested in getting to another planet much as the kids are nowadays . . ." For all of the essay's Empsonian ingenuity and deft handling, it is quite understandable that Parker Tyler, the Kenyon's regular movie-critic from 1947 onwards, was led to "wonder audibly at [its] odd direction and perhaps deliberately specious air," and that he argued that the essay sounded "categorically the wrong note and, astronomically as well as aerielly speaking, [was] baldly irrelevant to the purposes of metaphysical poetry."³ Empson's first effort on Donne had been less air-built: he vehemently but persuasively waged war upon Rosemond Tuve whom he accused of not realizing that Donne's words may have more than one meaning.

As he had done with Hopkins, Austin Warren treated his subject biographically with an ecclesiastical slant and in accordance with his own background and interests concentrated on Donne's sermons. Promised in October 1949, Austin Warren's article was not submitted to the Kenyon until February 1954. By that time Coffin had immersed himself in the just published first two out of ten volumes of Donne's Sermons (1953-1962) edited by E.M. Simpson and G.R. Potter. So Coffin's essay on "Donne's Divinity" appeared simultaneously, and somewhat redundantly, with Warren's in the Spring 1954 issue. As in her essay on

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

Hopkins, Josephine Miles concentrated on Donne's language, pointing out that it had only minimally influenced T.S. Eliot, R.M. Adams counterbalanced Miles by discussing Donne and Eliot as "the key figures of metaphysical analogy," Adams was counterbalanced in his turn in a 'Communication' by L.L. Miller in which he discounted Adams because of his judging these poets as if he were God. Marius Bewley set out to prove that Donne's two brilliant Anniversaries only superficially deal with the deceased Elizabeth Drury and at a much more profound level deal with Donne's apostasy from the Roman Catholic Church; and D.W. Harding emphasized the continuous theme of anticipation in Donne's poetry in an essay in which biography and close reading are in perfect harmony.⁴

If the Donne series was successful, even if too drawn-out in time, the Dante issue was superb. The roster of contributors, in the order in which they were published in the Spring 1952 issue, is indicative of its brilliance: T.S. Eliot, Charles Singleton, Erich Auerbach, Tate, Robert Fitzgerald, R.P. Blackmur, Jacques Maritain, and the guest editor Francis Fergusson.⁵ At the time of his election as guest editor Fergusson had not yet published any of his epoch-making works on Dante. As a matter of fact Eric Bentley had regarded it as his duty to warn Rice that according to the Italian poet-critic Paolo Milano 'someone should question everything Fergusson does with Dante.'⁶ But in electing Fergusson the editors made a happy choice. In fact, everything seemed to conspire to turn this symposium into one of the Kenyon's best. It was the only time during the entire run of the magazine that the editors managed to snare T.S. Eliot and that most of the desired contributors accepted, and, what is more, sent in their essays more or less in time so that it took only about half a year to organize the

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

symposium; not even Tate went back on his word.

From correspondence it appears probable that both the symposium and asking Fergusson to guest edit it were Rice's ideas. Be that as it may, Ransom immediately collaborated enthusiastically, and, at Fergusson's request, approached Eliot. Fergusson concentrated on pressing and prodding his Princeton colleagues Blackmur, Fitzgerald, Maritain, and Tate. But, of course, selecting, inviting, and prodding contributors were not Fergusson's only tasks; he had to take care that there would be no overlap in topics and points of view. He also suggested the order in which the essays appeared, beginning with Eliot talking about Dante's influence on his own poetry, a testimony to Dante's modern vitality; then essays on the beginning of the Inferno, Inferno (Canto X), Purgatorio (Canto XVIII) and Paradiso; and ending with three essays dealing with more general observations on Dante.

The unusual speed with which this symposium was organized can be accounted for rather easily: Eliot's "Talk on Dante" had already been delivered at the Italian Institute in London and had been published in The Adelphi, a British magazine hardly read in the United States. Tate did not have to think up a new essay either, his having been read as a Candlemas Foundation lecture at Boston College in February 1951. Auerbach's essay was part of his classic Mimesis, published in German in Berne in 1946, but not translated into English until 1954. Fergusson himself adapted part of his forthcoming Dante's Drama of the Mind (1953) for Kenyon Review publication. But the ease with which the symposium was brought about does not detract from the editor's and the issue's merits. In the prestigious French Mercure de France Jacques Vallette described it as "copieux, important;" those closer to the Kenyon--Ransom, Rice, and Tate--could only find superlatives like

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

"exceedingly good," "top-notch," or "brilliant;" and the editor, Fergusson, admitted to being "pretty pleased."⁷

In his "Talk on Dante" T.S. Eliot reviewed the whole range of his own poetry, a unique event, made even more distinctive by "his sly restoration of Shelley to the canon," as Tate commented in a letter to Ransom. Tate was "a little disappointed" by Charles Singleton, professor of Italian literature and teacher of Dante at Harvard. He was also somewhat disappointed in his friend and fellow-Catholic Robert Fitzgerald. Ransom, too, found Fitzgerald's essay "The Style That Does Honor" "the only ordinary piece" in an otherwise "brilliant" issue. With respect to Blackmur's intricate explication and application of Dante's criticism Tate had "no doubt that Dick is on the trail of something very useful." For Jacques Maritain "to have written that essay in English, is a triumph," Tate went on. Again, however, in spite of his repeated emphasis on the brilliance--a word Tate did not use lightly--of the Dante issue, Tate managed to find fault with Maritain. He found the Catholic philosopher's argument "a little obscure without the context of the book [Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry (1953)] of which it is a part." Fergusson, however, found Maritain's essay "significant not only for the light it sheds on Dante, but as completing his ripest thoughts on poetry," and placed the essay "at the end, because his piece feels to me like 'the last word', and because the end, like the beginning, is a place of honor." And in spite of his comments, Tate admitted that Maritain's "essay teaches me a good deal more than any of the others. His sense of the relation of Dante to Baudelaire and to our own climate is extremely enlightening."⁸

"Well, as for Tate," Tate modestly went on, "he seems in retrospect elaborately thin." He confessed that he felt "an amateur" in the Dante

field, even though Fergusson had assured him that his "The Symbolic Imagination" was "simply first rate. . . . I don't care what the Dantisti may think or say. They could not dispute your general view without a restudy of the Paradiso (at least)--and that takes more pep than they've got." Indeed, "The Symbolic Imagination" and its antipode "The Angelic Imagination" belong with Tate's best critical work. Opposing the "angelic imagination," of which Poe is a clear example and "which tries to disintegrate or to circumvent the image in the illusory pursuit of essence," to Dante's "symbolic imagination," which is rooted in action and in concrete experience, Tate, for all his fascination with Poe, clearly opts for Dante, for the "Poetic Way."⁹

Dante is still in Purgatorio in Fergusson's paper, which he had selected from his work-in-progress "partly because it deals with the middle of the whole poem, between Singleton and Auerbach on the Inferno and Allen on the Paradiso." Tate judged this essay "the best, from every point of view," but in Fergusson's opinion that honour should go to Auerbach's "Farinata and Cavalcante." Tate thought that Auerbach had "a real critical intelligence," but had brought "too much learning to bear up on a small focus . . . cluttering up the exposition." Fergusson disagreed and labelled Auerbach's contribution "one of the very most important contemporary studies of Dante." Although Auerbach's "very fascinating workout on the Cavalcanti episode"--which demonstrates the underlying paradox of the poem, namely that the "image of man eclipses the image of God"--was more than ten pages longer than the second-longest essay of the lot, Tate's "The Symbolic Imagination," Fergusson found it too fine to cut.¹⁰

Individual Approaches to Criticism

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

As with the Hopkins special issues, the editors decided that they had devoted enough space to Dante to last a lifetime, and so Dante was laid to rest, only to be resuscitated briefly again in Leslie Fiedler's *Green Thoughts in a Green Shade*, which appeared in the Spring 1956 issue. Fiedler, a protégé of R.P. Blackmur's, appeared frequently in the Kenyon's pages before he became its Fellow in Criticism for 1956. Although Fiedler recalled in 1964 that he had first encountered Ransom in the loveliest letters of rejection I have ever had, correspondence shows that their first transactions did not go quite so smoothly. On October 19, 1947 Fiedler burst out "It requires on my part a stubborn act of faith to send you yet more of my stuff. Yours is the only publication from which in my year + a half of submitting material I have received nothing but the dumb rebuke of a form-rejection slip. In most cases I get at least some acceptance--in all, decent + interested notes of rejection. I should be less than frank, if I did not say that these anonymous pale slips of yours irk, annoy (and even, tho I am a resilient fellow, discourage) me. I like, in general, your taste, but I am equally fond of my own pieces. What is it? Ransom's detailed, scrupulous reaction to the story submitted with this blast pleased [Fiedler] greatly, as did Ransom's asking him to review for the Kenyon, an offer Ransom regularly made to authors whose submissions he did not yet find up to par, but of whom he expected so much that he wanted to tie them to his magazine."¹¹

Fiedler's first contribution to The Kenyon Review was a Spring 1948 review of The Stature of Thomas Mann, edited by Charles Neider, in which Fiedler took issue with a general unwillingness to close with the problem of evaluation with respect to Mann. Ransom was impressed

and entrusted Fiedler with an omnibus review on the novel. Fiedler proved himself equal to the task: among novels such as The Mote and the Beam by Percy Winner, A Flask for the Journey by F.L. Green, and "one of the most grotesquely melancholy books ever written," Raintree County by Ross Lockridge, Fiedler singled out for praise Bellow's second novel The Victim, which he described as "one of the most complexly moving books of the past ten years," as "a novel that establishes in a single gesture its structure and its meaning." Trilling's The Middle of the Journey, though the "noblest version of the liberal position," was criticized by Fiedler as "a schedule" of its ideas, rather than a unified, felt novel. In the Winter 1951 issue Fiedler's second omnibus review concerned fourteen collections of short stories, an even harder nut to crack, but one Fiedler himself had asked for. Again, he exercised exceptional critical judgment: Irwin Shaw and Christopher Sykes are found wanting; William Carlos Williams' stories "are not efficiently written, not enough re-realized in the passage through sensibility to language;" and although Fiedler finds Paul Bowles "a pornographer of terror," in the end, the "astonishing ease and rhythmical beauty of [Bowles's] style" win him pride of place. Fiedler's emphasis on style is particularly striking in the light of his later, better-known emphasis on myth, sociology, and psychology in his often eccentric but lively critiques.¹²

Sociology and psychology are, however, prominently present in the two essays Fiedler contributed during this period, next to his "Credo" and the article on Dante. In "Italian Pilgrimage," the lead of the Summer 1952 issue, Fiedler looks at the influence of America on Italy and Italian writing, and in passing praises Cesare Pavese, the main subject of his other article. Altogether, Fiedler was an important

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

contributor of criticism before he became the Kenyon's Fellow in Criticism for 1956, following his application outlining a project on "a fullscale book on archetypal themes in the American Novel," which was to become his best-known work, Love and Death in the American Novel (1960). Ironically, his 1956 essay on Dante remained his only critical contribution to the Kenyon after his election as Fellow during Ransom's editorship.¹³

Irving Howe had been the Kenyon's first Fellow in Criticism. This New York intellectual felt obliged to forewarn Ransom--"surely the nicest editor . . . I ever dealt with"--that he was "a Marxist of sorts, though an anti-Stalinist, of course, and a most heterodox Marxist at that." But Ransom was undaunted. He had read Howe's publications and knew that Howe did not often fall into the trap of political parochialism. Moreover, in outlining his Fellowship project on the political novel, Howe had written that the "dangers of such a study are clear: that a consideration of ideology eliminates the matter of art, making one forget that one is dealing with a work of the imagination; or that an excessively narrow esthetic point of view does not allow one to see how the coarse and recalcitrant materials of political reality do enter the works of such writers. Of the latter danger one need not be quite so frightened as the former; perhaps, in reality they are not dangers so much as poles of perspective by which one orients oneself."¹⁴

Like Fiedler, Howe had already proven his worth in his contributions to the Kenyon before his election. He had written an article on the pervasive and ultimately tragic influence of the Zeitgeist on Sherwood Anderson, as well as a few reviews including his first contribution, his Spring 1949 review of The Collected Essays of

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

John Peale Bishop, edited by Edmund Wilson. Ransom was so impressed by this review, in which Howe shed light on Bishop's alienated life and excellent, epigrammatic criticism, that he included it in The Kenyon Critics. Howe's contributions after he was elected, two essays on Conrad and one on Dostoevsky, all stemmed from his Fellowship project. The essays on Conrad happened to fall in beautifully with Ransom's plan to "start a long series of Conrad studies." As it turned out, however, in spite of promises by—once again—Morton Dauwen Zabel and others, Howe's essays comprised two-thirds of the series: an essay by Vernon Young, Hudson Review fellow for 1957, on the three Lingard novels was the only other contribution to this series.¹⁵

The lead of the Autumn 1953 issue, the first of Howe's two essays on Conrad's political novels, focuses on the relation between literature and ideology, and issues into a discussion of Under Western Eyes. Neglected in the United States at that time, The Secret Agent and Nostromo were treated in Howe's second instalment. These personal, intelligent essays throw new light on Conrad's political nightmares. Howe could not, "short of emasculation," prevent his political views from coming into play, but this was all to the good as he successfully applied the "trick" of letting "one's political ideas and knowledge enter into a view of the novels, without allowing them to distort." The same goes for his essay on Dostoevski's The Possessed, which appeared one year later.¹⁶

The first contribution to the Kenyon by the second Fellow in Criticism, R.W.B. Lewis, also stood out. In sending on Lewis' essay "Casella as Critic" to Ransom, Trilling commented: "R.W.B. Lewis, whom perhaps you know, and, if you know, probably admire as a remarkably gifted young critic, has sent me . . . the enclosed piece on R.P.

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

Blackmur. . . . Lewis seems to write on the assumption that I am a working editor and I am explaining to him that I shall have no part in . . . acceptance or rejection of the essay. But I imagine you will like to have my opinion of it, which is very good." And indeed, even if Lewis' emphasis on Blackmur as a theologically-oriented critic is somewhat far-fetched, in general his remarks defending and explaining Blackmur's often intentionally intricate poetic narrative technique show an early and intelligent insight into the workings of Blackmur's mind. Blackmur's own "Madame Bovary" was chosen by the editors to follow immediately upon "Casella as Critic." Its first five pages, which mainly deal with theoretical problems, are indeed so complex as to need Lewis' preceding exegesis. But when Blackmur goes on to discuss Madame Bovary in detail, his scrupulous attention to the text, his insight in and explanation of "Bovarysme," which he defines as "an habitual, and infatuated practice of regarding, not the self, but the world as other than it is; . . . an attempt to find in the world what is not there," are all voiced so lucidly as to render superfluous even so discerning an essay as Lewis'.¹⁷

In his second contribution, on William Faulkner's The Bear, Lewis' use of Christian symbols, giving rise to such empty ingenuities as "it requires only the slightest twist of the tongue to convert the story's title into 'The Birth,'" becomes too emphatic. Less fanciful was "Fiction and Power: Some Notes on Ignazio Silone," "the first fruit" of his Fellowship, and "an unusually hard essay to put together." Lewis also wrote some reviews for the Kenyon, the most important and the best of which was "Poetry's Chevalier," on Randall Jarrell's provocative Poetry and the Age, "the soundest introduction available to modern American poems; and . . . the most irresistible." Possibly infected by

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

Jarrell's "lyrical" criticism, by his "cunning rhetoric," Lewis' language here makes lighter and more pleasant reading than usual. Altogether, Lewis amply fulfilled Ransom's expectations as "holding great promise for the future."¹⁸

Ransom's favourite Fellow in Criticism was Richard Ellmann, who started his tenure in 1955. From 1948 to 1958 Ellmann contributed nine regular articles to The Kenyon Review, which gave him a position of authority if one considers that on average only some thirteen full-scale articles appeared in the magazine annually. Even though Ellmann was only in his early thirties when he placed his first essay, "Robartes and Aherne," the lead of the Spring 1948 issue, with the Kenyon, he was already an accomplished critic; this first of three essays by Ellmann on Yeats was included in The Kenyon Critics. In it Ellmann's trademark of ignoring the contemporary critical practice which tended to be either purely biographical or purely critical is already apparent.¹⁹

The discerning essay immediately following "Robartes and Aherne," W.H. Auden's "Yeats as an Example," was also included in The Kenyon Critics. As Auden considers Yeats's influence on other poets, including himself, the essay tells us as much about Auden as about Yeats. Ellmann's and Auden's essays were part of a Yeats feature which was concluded by Bentley's discussion of "Yeats as a Playwright," in which he compares and contrasts Yeats and Eliot as dramatists. During these singularly successful years, the editors had once again composed not only a harmonious and varied, but also a brilliant sequence. It is satisfying, too, to find that the poetry in this issue, "A Group of Irish Poems," including poems by Roy McFadden, Donagh MacDonagh, and others, harmonized well with the emphasis on Yeats.²⁰

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

Besides his work on Yeats, Ellmann is, of course, best known for his massive, definitive biography James Joyce (1959; rev. ed., 1983). His first Kenyon article solely on Joyce, "The Backgrounds of Ulysses," led off the Summer 1954 issue. In a letter to Ransom, Ellmann emphasized that the essay was "more than a source-hunt--it's also a way of showing how the master's hand alters what his memory supplies--it's the first investigation of Joyce's methods of composition which has been able to start from something like the raw materials." The same goes for his Autumn 1958 essay on "The Backgrounds of 'The Dead,'" which Ellmann described as "a new interpretation of [Joyce's] story at the same time as it tries to relate the story to his other work and to his life." His other article about Joyce for The Kenyon Review during Ransom's editorship, "A Portrait of the Artist as Friend," was partly the result of Ransom's having sent Ellmann an article, for publication in the Kenyon, by William Empson on "The Theme of Ulysses," a radio talk held for the BBC on Bloomsday 1954.²¹ "Although I think Empson is obviously wrong," Ellmann reacted in a four-page letter, "his article is lively and worth printing," adding that if Ransom "would be interested in a quite different 'psychoanalysis' of Joyce's writings, based upon the same materials but reaching quite other conclusions, I have a paper which I gave last month before the English Institute which I should be glad to have you read." Ransom found Ellmann's "A Portrait of the Artist as Friend" a good corrective of "The Theme of Ulysses," and placed it right after Empson's essay. In answer to Ransom's question whether Empson would mind coming out with Ellmann, Empson wrote that that "would be wildly unreasonable." But in a later letter Empson commented that although Ellmann's "scholarly background picture" was "clearly right as far as it goes," it made "Joyce look so neurotic,

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

not to say nasty, that he could not have been liberated into writing Ulysses at all."²² This closed the discussion.

Ellmann found the Fellowship, which he had received for his Joyce studies, "a tremendous help." In October 1955 he was "well into [his] book without the distractions of teaching," and intended "to spend the summer [of 1956] in Trieste and Zurich . . . to check facts and add more information." Clearly, then, some of the lustre of James Joyce reflects on the Kenyon and on Ransom, who as early as 1956 had predicted that this biography in the making was "surely going to be author[*it*]ative." Apart from his essays on Joyce and Yeats, Ellmann also contributed essays on subjects that are less readily brought into connection with him, such as William Carlos Williams and Henri Michaux. Ellmann's piece on Williams' autobiography was published together with an essay by Vivienne Koch on the same subject. This time simultaneous publication had not been planned. Ransom was determined to have The Autobiography of William Carlos Williams reviewed, and when Vivienne Koch--whom he had asked "in desperation" after "five refusals"--kept on stalling, he had approached Ellmann "whom I think well of, though totally foreign in background to Williams." Koch's and Ellmann's essays arrived at the same time and Ransom felt honour bound to accept both of them in spite of the similarity of their disappointment with the autobiography. Finally, Ellmann's sensitive and intelligent essay "The Ductile Universe of Henri Michaux" accompanied by his expressive translation of Michaux' entrancing, fluid prose poems "In the Land of Magic," testify to Ellmann's versatility. Part of the credit for these last gems, incidentally, goes to Rice, who during his trip to France in 1947 had learned about and become an admirer of this neglected Belgian-French poet.²³

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

The selection of Fiedler, Howe, Lewis and Ellmann as Fellows in Criticism, an idiosyncratic, a cultural, a Christian, and a biographical critic, clearly indicates Ransom's and Rice's catholicity. In a different way this is also apparent from their refusing Robert Wooster Stallman a Fellowship, even though this academic New Critic of the second generation kept applying for one from 1954 until the last round for 1958. When it appeared that his politely worded refusals did not register, Ransom wrote pointedly: "We have in view for our next fellowship two candidates or so of almost equal rank with [Lewis, Howe, and Ellmann], so I leave it to you. We will send an application blank if you like." Stallman nevertheless tried again the year after. But the infusion of new kinds of spirited criticism in The Kenyon Review was not brought about solely by those who were so lucky as to become Fellows in Criticism. Very gifted, many-sided writers such as Howard Nemerov, Randall Jarrell, and Paul Goodman also frequently published critical articles in the Kenyon. During these years Nemerov contributed a score of sparkling poetry reviews, and one excellent short story, "Tradition." From 1956 onwards, he would contribute more fiction and more full-scale articles, but, strangely enough, no poetry at all. In 1954 Ransom wrote to John Marshall that he was not sure whether Nemerov 'excell[ed] most at fiction or verse or criticism.' He was sure, though, that Nemerov was "one of the most deserving writers of his age." By awarding Nemerov the Fellowship in Fiction for 1955 and by frequently publishing his criticism, the editors, ironically, helped to further Nemerov's career in all directions but the one on which Nemerov himself had set his heart, poetry. 'It's been . . . during the last year, I think, that I realized writing poems to be what I most wanted to do in this world, and realized, too, that I'd go on even if it could

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

be rationally & geometrically demonstrated to me that I was the worst poet in the world," Nemerov had written to Ransom in 1952.²⁴

If the editors did not show ostensible confidence in Nemerov's talent as a poet, they did make him the Kenyon's regular poetry reviewer from 1948 to 1956.²⁵ In his first review for the Kenyon, the lead of the Summer 1948 book review section, Nemerov discussed C.D. Lewis, Ruth Herschberger, Norman Macleod, Jarrell, and Tate. Though Nemerov was only twenty-eight, he did not suffer from youthful timidity, and scrutinized each and every one of these poets severely, only Tate and Jarrell coming off well. As in his other omnibus review, "Poets in the Dark," Nemerov quotes a bit here and there, but in the end he has not enough room to prove his case. He merely, though convincingly, asserts. Seven pages, however, proved sufficient for his persuasive discussion of The Collected Poems of Dylan Thomas (1953) which punctured Thomas' inflated reputation. Nemerov shows by quoting and explaining a few representative, complexly vaporous stanzas why he is no admirer of Thomas, but in all fairness also closely reads and quotes from the "few poems, and few poets have more, which strike . . . as perfected results and very beautiful."²⁶

Good writing, close reading, a few comments on his personal prejudices and on the kind of sterile, prescriptive criticism that takes itself more seriously than poetry are again the main ingredients of "Three in One," on Theodore Roethke, Karl Shapiro, and Yvor Winters, and of "A Wild Civility," on Stephen Spender, W.H. Auden, and Randall Jarrell. His review of Robert Graves' Collected Poems, 1955 departs somewhat from this recipe. Nemerov, an excellent close reader himself, starts off with a diatribe against the "dominant criticism of the day . . . which explains things." His object in discussing Graves, Nemerov

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

continues, "is appreciation, which is something like advertisement; benign descriptions and free samples. How undignified!" But he braves it out beautifully.²⁷

Randall Jarrell, of course, is the past master at the kind of appreciative criticism Nemerov speaks up for. Fortunately, Jarrell could keep the "[s]omething in me [that] does not want me to write criticism" sufficiently at bay to write the combative or laudative, but always exciting and refreshing essays that made him one of America's major critics. Two of his very best essays, "Walt Whitman: He Had His Nerve" and "To the Laodiceans," on Frost, appeared in the 1952 Kenyon Review. Although Ransom could not refrain from inserting a Ransomian modifier, his description of these essays as "almost epoch-making in establishing for the first time securely the position which Robert Frost and Walt Whitman occupy in American poetry" is unprecedentedly laudatory.²⁸

Earlier, Ransom and Rice had been so totally taken with Jarrell's criticism as it had appeared in different magazines that they suggested that Jarrell write 'a literary column of Views and Impressions' every other issue beginning with the Winter 1952 one. This proposal, the most generous they ever made to anybody, reflected their utter confidence in Jarrell's critical abilities. Jarrell accepted this honour enthusiastically, and sent in his essays on Whitman and Frost. But, with his 1938 New Critical piece on Housman, these turned out to be the only articles to appear in The Kenyon Review. Perhaps they cost him too much. Jarrell wrote: "Here's my article--a piece about Whitman over which I've labored like a hermit horse; for a number of days I've eaten, slept, and written my Whitman article and done no other thing, not one." And: "This is a letter from a really exhausted man, but from

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

one that feels awfully good; I'm hopeful that I've really done the best I could with Frost."²⁹

The Kenyon's preference for wide-ranging, independent thinkers rather than specialized, methodological critics is also apparent from its frequent publication of Paul Goodman at the time when he wrote his best work, long before he became fashionable in the sixties. His 1942 article on Frank Lloyd Wright was followed by one on Freud, which in style resembled a psychoanalytical session; by an excerpt from his impressionistic, perhaps best book of literary criticism, Kafka's Prayer (1947); and by an informative, partly psychological explanation of the importance and construction of Japanese Noh-plays. He also contributed a psychological-sociological description of the relation between the avant-garde artist and his audience, in which he advances the convincing thesis that the avant-garde artist does not dwell in an ivory tower but, in contrast to the "integrated" artist "taking the environment for granted," is "essentially concerned with the immortal perfection of the particular society of which he is a member." These five essays, though widely varied in subject and style, have in common the prevalence of sudden, sharp flashes of insight over logically built up trains of thought. Also, in nearly every essay Goodman's essentially optimistic, perhaps even romantic conception of human nature emerges.³⁰

From 1947 to 1955 Goodman also contributed eight book reviews on subjects ranging from Le Corbusier to psychiatry, and from Elizabethan England to modern short stories. His 1948 review of Oscar Wilde by Edouard Roditi was included in The Kenyon Critics. Although Goodman considered this biography to be of real value, he only partly agreed with Roditi's view of Wilde and spent half of his review giving his own ideas, and the other half quarrelling with Roditi about details. In a

letter to the editors, written from Germany where he lectured, Roditi showed that most of Goodman's quibbles with him were based on misinterpretation.³¹

Goodman's deprecatory, unjust review of In Search of Theatre by Eric Bentley, which appeared in the Autumn 1953 issue, called forth reactions by angry readers, too. Bentley's own reaction was relatively moderate: "An author is obviously the most biased witness of reviews of his books. But it had seemed to me Goodman was not merely unfavorable but arrogantly ignorant--he said he knew nothing of Brecht and then proceeded to explain him to me." Because Goodman's review had seemed to him "to make a painful little spectacle," Lionel Trilling ventured one of his rare pieces of advice: "make it a policy not to review books of your advisory editors." Ransom disagreed: "I should think the general understanding . . . is that we leave all to the reviewer, and pick the best reviewers we can though with the reservation: not the friends, in any close sense, of the authors. . . . Isn't it good to seek the impression that we are willing ourselves to take the chances that other writers do?" Theodore Hoffman, a protégé of Bentley's, enclosed in a letter to Ransom "a sort of jeremiad against Paul Goodman's review of In Search of Theatre. I'd meant to submit it as a letter to the editor but my wrath never subsided enough for me to condense or temper it, so I suppose I must offer it for your private amusement or annoyance." In fact, Ransom somewhat regretted having published Goodman on Bentley and in the next issue he used Hoffman's indeed ferocious letter to offset the review.³²

If two of Goodman's many contributions provoked polemics, absolutely all of Stanley Edgar Hyman's arrogant pieces did. For a while Hyman also was one of the Kenyon's cherished critics. Ransom

particularly admired his writing "with documentation and forceful style," and his "many original insights" in folk literature. But Hyman's career as a Kenyon Review critic did not last long. In 1954, after Ransom had published three articles and two extensive reviews by Hyman, he "closed [the Kenyon's] pages against him," because Hyman had been "poisonous to the people he didn't approve." Hyman's first article turned out to be his only commendatory one. It was the anti-New Critical but laudatory chapter on Caroline Spurgeon from his generally combative The Armed Vision (1948). This provoked only one, rather mild "Communication:" G. Wilson Knight denied Hyman's claim that he had been deeply influenced by Spurgeon. Hyman's "Some Bankrupt Treasures," an abusive review article about some ten books on folklore, did not get off as lightly. Paul R. Beath, whose Febold Feboldson Hyman had slaughtered, found Hyman's treatment "a classic misstatement of facts and deliberate misreading of plain language," and accused him of being, at best, "a mere pamphleteer."³³

Hyman's devastating review of Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend (Volume I), a "seriously and essentially flawed book," "almost to the point of becoming a joke," caused an avalanche of acrimonious letters. Half a year after the Autumn 1950 publication of this review three of these reactions were published together with Hyman's reply. Erminie Voegelin, one of the contributors to the Dictionary took Hyman to task for "several misstatements of fact," and M. J. Herskovits wondered at Hyman's hatred of anthropologists. In answering, Hyman sweetly suggested that Voegelin "might better spend her time seeing that some of the worst absurdities and deficiencies of the book are corrected for a second edition," and assured Herskovits that he did not intend to "drive

anthropologists out of folklore study," but only wanted "to see them pulled off its back." A. C. Morris, editor of Southern Folklore Quarterly, had the last word: "this dictionary in spite of its shortcomings is too valuable a beginning to be treated with . . . captiousness."³⁴

Hyman's other folk entry was a lively one on "The Language of Scottish Poetry" in which he submitted mildly that much modern Scottish poetry, such as Hugh MacDiarmid's, is disappointing. Although Bernard Landis felt obliged to rush to MacDiarmid's defence, the article was in fact not very belligerent. Hyman's "Myth, Ritual, and Nonsense," which appeared in the Summer 1949 issue and butchered books about myth, "the new intellectual fashion," provoked very different reactions. James Dickey was one of what must have been very few readers to be positively affected by it: he regards Hyman's quoting of Van Gennep's concept of "rites de passage" as the "literary or mythological precedent for Deliverance." Richard Chase, whose Quest for Myth was cut to pieces in the article, was not at all "moved to reply. . . . [Hyman] may fulminate at will for all of me, in fact." But R.W. Flint, who did not want his letter to be published because he did not "think Hyman's tactics are worth bothering with in public," was "horrified by the nastiness and dishonesty of it." "[I]t is not only superficial but senselessly malicious," he wrote, and concluded that he really did not "see why the prestige of the Kenyon Review need be put behind [Hyman's] bursts of venom."³⁵

The editors, however, continued to appreciate Hyman's vitriolic articles until he went beyond civilized bounds with what Ransom termed his "'wild interpretation'" of Robie Macauley's first novel The Disguises of Love (1952). Hyman tried to 'defend and explain' this

review because of his "enormous respect and admiration" for Ransom: "As for your general charges of immoderation and belligerence, I would agree that I have written harshly about many books, sometimes in your pages, but would argue that these attacks have been reserved for incompetence and dishonesty, particularly rife in my chosen field of folklore. Whether a critic ought to devote any substantial part of his efforts to exposing this trash is debatable, and in the last few years I have in fact decided to concentrate on more constructive matters, but I do not agree that the effort is unfair or misguided, or the result of any personal belligerence. I just wish someone else were doing it." Not until 1957 was Hyman allowed to appear in the Kenyon again.³⁶

New Critics and New York Intellectuals

Howe, Fiedler, Lewis, Ellmann, Nemerov, Jarrell, Goodman, and Hyman. Beyond dispute, The Kenyon Review was genuinely receptive to young talents in criticism. This does not mean, though, that the earlier contributors to the magazine were shelved: William Empson and R. P. Blackmur, for instance, contributed more articles during this period than they had before and Tate, compared to his earlier contributions, actually crowded the Kenyon with articles. Burke, Matthiessen, and Trilling also continued to figure in its pages.

To start with Empson, besides his contributions on Donne, Joyce, and his "My Credo," he wrote five more articles and two reviews for the Kenyon from 1948 till Robie Macauley became its editor. Empson was, in fact, mainly a Kenyon School of English addition to the ranks of regular writers for the magazine. His first Kenyon article in years, "Emotion in Words Again," which appeared in the Autumn 1948 issue, was

an outgrowth of the course he gave as a Fellow of the School at Gambier during that summer, and it inaugurated a whole series of his essays in the Kenyon. In "Emotion in Words Again," which became part of his The Structure of Complex Words (1951), Empson, in the words of Cleanth Brooks in his Kenyon Review discussion of this book, "works through, and loose from, the limitations of [his teacher I. A.] Richards' earlier theory about emotive words in poetry. Empson is admirably firm in refusing to make a 'flat separation of Sense from Emotion.'" Brooks found Empson on Richards "most interesting and rewarding," but Empson's over-ingenious treatment of the word "all" in Paradise Lost--Empson links "all" and "Fall," for instance,--"pointless and quite unrewarding." The editors' opinion of Empson's article is apparent from its inclusion in The Kenyon Critics. But not all readers were pleased. F.R. Leavis, who had an ongoing feud with Empson, wrote a ferocious letter from Cambridge. He was furious because Empson had suggested that Leavis' own "very scrupulous and responsible criticisms of Richards [were] to be explained by personal hostility," and even went so far as to attribute Empson's "daring to be so irresponsible in print" to "his more alcoholic moments." A much subdued version of this letter was published in the Spring 1949 "Communications" section. Leavis' letter was followed by one by Gerald Smith who, in his turn, jumped at Empson for attacking Richards. Empson's reply was diplomatic. He showed Smith that they did not "really disagree," and, though he was justifiably angry about some of Leavis' slurs on his character, Empson's statement that "his convictions about Leavis . . . [were] on the whole greatly in his favor" was conciliatory.³⁷

"Sense in the Prelude," a Spring 1951 essay in which Empson contends that Wordsworth depended on an undeveloped theory about how

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

the mind interprets what it gets from the senses, is one of Empson's weaker essays; it is clever but implausible. Empson's 1952 and 1953 essays on Shakespeare, on the other hand, were not only witty, but convincing, too. Jarrell, for one, "enjoyed the[se] Empson pieces very much, though often he out-Holmes Sherlock by many miles." Empson gave Dover Wilson a hard time. In "Dover Wilson on Macbeth" he took issue with and partly refuted Dover Wilson's interpretations and editing of Macbeth; and in "Falstaff and Mr. Dover Wilson," a detailed fifty-page analysis on Falstaff, he showed that Dover Wilson's sanctioning only one possible view of Falstaff and Prince Hal does not do them justice. To Murray Krieger, whose essay on Richard III he returned, Ransom explained his preference for Empsonian, unconventional criticism: "we have always been especially skittish about papers on Shakespeare. I guess if we have used them, it has been when they were very comprehensive and radical too, like Empson's long piece on the Falstaff-Prince Hal relation." Sending on to Monroe Spears, the editor of The Sewanee Review, the companion piece to "Falstaff and Mr. Dover Wilson," "Hamlet When New," Ransom voiced the same sentiments, and added a personal note: "It is very good writing, and good thinking, with just enough controversy and meanness in it to make it exciting to the literary mind; and the typography is as always in execrable shape. We'll try our luck with Falstaff, which is the less good of the two. . . I hope you'll find a place for yours; if not just return it to me. Empson is so important, I think, and has been so handicapped alone in China, removed even from any sort of library, that I very much like to serve him if possible."³⁸

Empson's two book reviews dealt with Shakespeare, too. In the Spring 1949 issue, he discussed Robert Heilman on King Lear in The

Great Stage, and in the Winter 1954 issue he violently disagreed with many of the points G.R. Elliott had made on Othello in Flaming Minister. As a victim, Elliott proved to possess admirable resilience: "my enjoyment of [Empson's] really remarkable essay is impaired by the sensation of partial (but not unbloody) decapitation. He . . . discusses only the first word of my main topic, 'pride and self-esteem' . . . ignoring the distinction . . . between false pride and . . . right self-esteem." Empson's final contribution dealt with Tom Jones and took up about one-fifth of the space of the Spring 1958 issue, which was much less than his articles on Falstaff and "Donne the Spaceman." Those essays had each taken up more than one-third of an issue, a privilege granted to the very select few in this magazine committed to concision. In "Tom Jones" Empson set about rescuing Fielding from being "under-rated" and from being read "as a cynical aristocrat." The essay, "one of his best," as Ransom wrote to Richard Blackmur, certainly was a worthy conclusion to Empson's brilliant critical career in The Kenyon Review.³⁹

Ransom continued his letter to Blackmur by emphasizing that his admiration for "Tom Jones" notwithstanding, he would "certainly not prefer it to yours by any means." Ransom referred to Blackmur's "Ara Coeli and Campidoglio," which Blackmur had promised as his "big essay" for the Spring 1958 issue in October 1957, but which he eventually submitted only just in time for the Summer 1958 one. Ransom regarded Blackmur as "the best critic in America," a judgement which was, of course, reflected in The Kenyon Review. Besides some book reviews, the number of Blackmur's essays comes second only to those by Ransom himself. Blackmur's biographer, Russell Fraser, and his best critic, Robert Boyers, as well as many others emphasize that in the

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

fifties Blackmur was definitely not a New Critic any more. This change is not only apparent from Blackmur's previously mentioned attack on the New Critics, "A Burden for Criticism," but also from his later articles dealing with particular novelists, poets, and essayists. Many of these appeared in The Kenyon Review. Fraser and Boyers also agree that the later Blackmur is not half as good a critic as the earlier, more concrete, New Critical Blackmur had been.⁴⁰

As Ransom had never cared about fashions in criticism and critics, Blackmur's growing fame can hardly have seduced him into publishing so much of Blackmur's later, opaque criticism. One could speculate that Blackmur's extremely high standing with the Rockefeller Foundation, the Kenyon's main sponsor, prevented the editors from rejecting Blackmur's obscurer articles, but correspondence reveals that such mercenary motives do not apply. In his letters to Blackmur, Ransom constantly asks for more articles and reviews--"we don't want to go through the Autumn number without another Blackmur item in our pages"--and when Blackmur delivers them--usually late--finds them "distinguished" or simply 'damn good.' Moreover, Ransom did not only praise Blackmur to his face, but also in letters to others: "I think he is a great man," Ransom told Arthur Mizener.⁴¹

Blackmur's contributions to "The Critic's Business," to the Dante symposium, and his essay on Madame Bovary have already been discussed. "Parody and Critique: Notes on Thomas Mann's Doctor Faustus," which appeared in the Winter 1950 issue, and "Anna Karenina: The Dialectic of Incarnation," which appeared two issues later, were published with "Madame Bovary: Beauty Out of Place' in Eleven Essays in the European Novel (1964). These three as well as most of the other essays Blackmur contributed to the Kenyon during this period are both sufficiently

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

well-known and too idiosyncratic and resistant to summary to be extensively discussed here. As throughout this study, it is more to our purpose to look behind the scenes at the author's own notes and remarks, and at Ransom's and other readers' reactions as expressed in private correspondence. The other Blackmur essays which appeared in the Kenyon during this period were "The Politics of Human Power," "In the Hope of Straightening Things Out," "Lord Tennyson's Scissors: 1912-1950," "Toward a Modus Vivendi," "The Substance That Prevails," "Reflections of Toynbee," and "Adams Goes to School."⁴²

Blackmur's "Parody and Critique" was included in The Kenyon Critics. But R. W. Flint, faithful Kenyon reader, was "pretty much anti-Blackmur on Faustus by Mann." He objected to Blackmur's theological assumptions. Even Ransom, although he admired its "elevation" and "seriousness," found the essay "a little bit shrill." But Thomas Mann himself was unrestrictedly laudatory: "the repeated perusal of the study has given me great satisfaction, and . . . quite apart from its topic, I admire Mr. Blackmur's work as a highly distinguished critical achievement."⁴³

In "Ransom as Editor," George Lanning tells the following anecdote about Blackmur's essay on Anna Karenina:

Another time, one of the magazine's less enthusiastic supporters on the faculty brought in his copy of the latest issue and said, "John, read that first paragraph." (The piece in question was an essay by R. P. Blackmur on Anna Karenina.)

Mr. Ransom dutifully read the first paragraph.

"Now, tell me," said his colleague, "what the hell

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

that means."

"I don't know!" Mr. Ransom replied cheerfully, "I don't know."⁴⁴

Anyway, Ransom had told Blackmur that he was much impressed by his "damned fine piece." And indeed, although its first page and a half in which he submits his vague thesis on the importance of "the dialectic of incarnation" in Anna Karenina are unclear and unreadable, Blackmur comes down to earth in his actual discussion of the novel. What he says makes sense, and the way in which he says it is lucid enough. Philip Rahv, an authority on Russian writers, however, did not think so: he "was somewhat exasperated by [Blackmur's] essays on Russian novels."⁴⁵

Blackmur contributed an "admirable" essay on The Liberal Imagination by Lionel Trilling to the Autumn 1950 issue under one of his "fuzzy captions," "The Politics of Human Power." The ideologue in Blackmur was attracted by Trilling's cultural ideology and he treated Trilling sympathetically. But not everyone was thrilled by Blackmur's lenience. He reported, "Fergusson . . . thinks I took too mild a policy towards Trilling; he thinks I ought to have attacked him directly with explicit disagreements." Predictably, T. S. Eliot's Selected Essays gave Blackmur more trouble. He reviewed them lovingly under the title "In the Hope of Straightening Things Out" in the Spring 1951 issue. In a letter to Ransom, though, about this "essay-review of the Possum," he spoke of "other lines" he might have taken "which will lead to a more formal assessment of this and of that. Eg: the failure to deal well with contemporary poetry, with the novel at all, and the general habit of dealing with all literature on the lines that belong appropriately only to lyric poetry. But I would rather give the man a chance." The

editors enthusiastically accepted the article; it was one of the very few laudatory articles on Eliot as a critic to appear in The Kenyon Review.⁴⁶

The lead of the Winter 1952 issue, "Lord Tennyson's Scissors: 1912-1950," a failed poet's tirade against most of his fellow modern poets, understandably provoked hostile reactions. As a critic, Philip Rahv was not personally harmed by this diatribe, but he was appalled all the same: "Blackmur's article in the recent Kenyon did [strike] me as a ne plus ultra of some kind . . . which kind I don't quite know. He was bent on telling everybody off, all but Eliot and Yeats; Pound just barely gets in under the wire. He is writing criticism now of a type all his own, neither 'new' nor old, just Blackmur on a bender." Tate was offended, too, not so much because he had been linked with Ransom in the "School of Donne" as "models of the uncontrollable in pseudo-control," but because Blackmur had treated Yeats, Eliot, and Pound as some kind of "Holy Trinity." Tate described the essay as "brilliant, but awfully cranky and presumptuous." "There's a sort of Delphic pomposity, along with an arrogant frivolity, that really gets on my nerves," he wrote to Ransom, and enclosed a nearly four-page angry "Letter to the Editor," in which he took issue with Blackmur's attempt, as Tate saw it, to substitute literature for religion. But Tate, a recent Catholic convert, soon saw that he had driven his missionary zeal too far, and withdrew this profession of faith.⁴⁷

Blackmur's concept of "the new illiteracy"--of those who have been given the tools of reading without the means or skill to read well or the material that ought to be read--was set forth in his "Toward a Modus Vivendi." Unfortunately, neither Blackmur's own, nor the editors' thoughts on this essay were saved in the files at Gambier.⁴⁸

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

The Kenyon essay by Blackmur about one particular poet during this period was "The Substance That Prevails," about Wallace Stevens. The decrease in the number of essays on individual poets is, of course, another indication of Blackmur's break away from the New Criticism. Discussions of individual poets require close reading, while in the essays on culture, criticism, and fiction which Blackmur now preferred to write he could content himself and others with sweeping statements and the abstract meanderings of his mind. But also in the essay on Stevens Blackmur manages to substitute airy theories and muddled generalizations for close reading. Ransom, however, was convinced of the wisdom of Blackmur's words: "If it had not been Richard Blackmur who wrote recently about Stevens as a poet not only dandiacal but unphilosophical, I should have boggled at both ascriptions, and thought that Blackmur's own guard was down, most unaccountably. But it was Blackmur, and Blackmur as a critic is so far from having an impediment in his speech that he excels other critics in the plenitude of his contexts, so that I dare say there are intimations in the one on Stevens which amount to proper qualifications; or amount partly to them."⁴⁹

Blackmur's next essay for the Kenyon was different in subject and, fortunately, in style too: in the Summer 1955 issue, in "Reflections of Toynbee," he speculated informatively about Arnold Toynbee. Although Blackmur himself was not satisfied with this "undistinguished thing," its aphorisms and analogues make for pleasant, if not exactly consecutive reading. His next essay, in the next issue, was quite different again. "Adams Goes to School" is part of the Henry Adams biography which Blackmur started when he was still in his twenties. In August 1955 Blackmur had submitted about sixty pages on Adams which he

hoped Ransom would print as a unit, mainly because the publication of as many as sixty pages would yield a lot of money. But although Ransom sympathized with Blackmur's attempt "to keep the wolf (the alimony one) from his door," he published only the first half as that contained "more generality" and as the Kenyon did not "have room" for both parts. John Marshall's appetite was whetted. "Incidentally, over the weekend I also got to read your piece on Henry Adams in the autumn Kenyon," he wrote to his friend, and "[i]t makes me all the more eager to see the whole book." But Blackmur never quite finished the biography, and Henry Adams was published posthumously.⁵⁰

We noted that the only one to outdo Blackmur in the number of his contributions to the Kenyon during its second flowering was Ransom himself. When we take a look at Ransom's critical development as demonstrated in his essays of this period, we understand better why he cherished Blackmur's sweeping proclamations. Ransom had always been a theoretical New Critic, the one who stimulated others to pay close attention to the text, rather than doing so himself, but his theories had been precise and clear-cut. Now, however, Ransom, like Blackmur, started to write vague, verbose essays. He was now liable to discuss intangibles like "the actual warmth and feel and the powerful psychic focus, with which poetry comes into our experience." Ransom's gradual disappointment with the practice of close reading showed in his dissentient review of The Well Wrought Urn by Cleanth Brooks, and, especially, in his--and Rice's--selection of critics for the Kenyon, but a consideration of some of Ransom's particular pronouncements at this moment of the Kenyon's history will shed additional light on the turn his mind took. It must be pointed out at the outset that while Ransom and Rice were on the whole extremely discriminating in their

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

acceptances and rejections of critical articles for their magazine, Ransom was not so perceptive with respect to some of his own articles.⁵¹

Ransom's essay-review of Image and Idea by Philip Rahv in the spring of 1950 at first seems to contradict the argument that Ransom turned away from close reading. He writes that style is as important in fiction as it is in poetry, and contends that in judging prose a critic should apply the methods the New Critics apply to poetry. However, Ransom goes on to charge that these critics fail "to identify, or even suspect, the emotional need which causes the public to receive the poems," stresses that "the literary critic now has to be his own psychologist," and even puts in a word for Marxist critics whose "social conscience" has moved him "very deeply." Although far removed from Ransom's earlier, much more specific guidelines for critics, this essay is not yet marred by Ransom's later, vague, philosophical digressions. Ransom himself found the essay "a bit tenuous," but Rahv was more than pleased. "You deployed your own critical categories and interests around mine in a way that leaves us both intact--and that, after all, is what is wanted in any effort at understanding. The questions you raise are very large; but your approach is so stimulating that I would like to write something that would in effect continue your discussion, particularly in reference to the possibility of applying the methods of modern poetry-criticism to the study of fiction." It was not until six years later, however, in the Spring 1956 issue, that Rahv replied to Ransom's "The Understanding of Fiction."⁵²

Ransom's next article, "William Wordsworth: Notes Toward an Understanding of Poetry," was a paper delivered at Cornell on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the poet's death. The article

was preceded by Lionel Trilling's "Wordsworth and the Iron Time," a paper read at the Princeton Wordsworth celebrations, which was later included in The Kenyon Critics. Suggesting to Rice that he ask Trilling to submit his Princeton paper on Wordsworth to the Kenyon, Ransom grumbled: "I think it's high time he sent us an essay." Trilling was quite willing and paid the Kenyon an indirect compliment when he replied that it would "be a real help to me in keeping the tone of the paper what I should like it to be if I know that it is going to be published in the Review." The two papers dealt with two very different aspects of Wordsworth: Trilling advanced the rather far-fetched hypothesis that there is a kind of Judaic quality in Wordsworth's poetry which makes him unacceptable to many readers, while Ransom rather dully discussed Wordsworth's theories about poetry. The nature of the occasion did not allow Ransom to advance provocative theories of his own.⁵³

"The Poetry of 1900-1950," "an odd thing" according to Ransom, was also "dictated by an occasion." On April 6, 1951 Ransom had read this paper before the Ohio English Association. It appeared in the Summer 1951 issue in conjunction with Paul Goodman's "Advance-Guard Writing, 1900-1950." Ransom's list of major and minor poets in the period 1900-1950 hardly bears out those who kept accusing the New Critics of neglecting and rejecting the less difficult and obscure poets. His minor modern poets are: Robert Bridges, Walter de la Mare, John Masefield, Vachel Lindsay, W. C. Williams, E. Pound, Marianne Moore, E. E. Cummings, Hart Crane, and Allen Tate. His major poets: Thomas Hardy, W. B. Yeats, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Robert Frost, and T. S. Eliot. He is not quite sure whether to place Wallace Stevens, W. H. Auden, Dylan Thomas, and A. E. Housman among the minors or the

majors.⁵⁴

Two 1952 papers, "Poets and Flatworms" and "Why Critics Don't Go Mad," give a better indication of Ransom's critical development in these years. In "Poets and Flatworms" he wholeheartedly sympathizes with those who are weary of the New Criticism. He writes: "How confidently, twenty years or so past, were some of us offering a new 'understanding of poetry'! I will not say, How brashly; for the innovation was real, it was momentous; but it was not complete, and now it has bogged down at a most embarrassing point. In the academy the verbal analysis has pretty well secured its place and tenure, but its end-products are only half-finished, and their ragged showing does not alleviate the original apprehensions of the opposition." He now finds that Max Eastman, a Marxist critic whose revised edition of The Enjoyment of Poetry he is reviewing, "belongs in the company of our superior critics."⁵⁵

Ransom's friends and fellow New Critics of the first hour had realized that Ransom had turned away from the New Criticism long before anybody else grew sceptical. Tate had perhaps even been a bit overhasty. As early as 1943, on the occasion of Ransom's editorial "The Inorganic Muses," he had cried out in disgust: "To think that after the brilliant essays in *The World's Body* he has come down to something like Max Eastman!" In the early fifties Cleanth Brooks had become convinced that Tate's censorious view of Ransom's criticism was "entirely right:"

In reading for the book [Literary Criticism: A Short History (1957), written with W. K. Wimsatt], I have been going over--among other things--John Ransom's

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

later work. All honor to John as a man and as a friend, but I am really surprised at what the position adds up to: John has argued himself back, unless I utterly misread him, into the positions of Eastman, the earlier Richards, and of Matthew Arnold!--positions which he so ably castigated at one time. I have been reminded forcibly of what you [Tate] told me as far ago as 1936 of John's basic view of poetry.⁵⁶

Brooks was the main subject of Ransom's playfully written "Why Critics Don't Go Mad." As in "The Formal Analysis," Brooks is Ransom's example of a critic he has grown away from. "The fact is that Brooks and I were about as like as two peas from the same pod," and "perhaps we were most like in the unusual parallel of our formal educations," Ransom observes. But, he continues, "[w]e have diverged a little. . . . I find I am more captious than I like when I confront some of Brooks's departures." Ransom softens this by adding that he feels that he is "contending with my alter ego." From here Ransom takes off to berate Brooks extensively for his neglect of the argument of a poem, and goes on to describe the "Great Scholar"--"Is he the figment of a bad conscience"?--as a "Guide for the critics." In his reaction to this article Brooks conceded to Tate that Ransom "as always" had been "amiable and handsome" towards him, but admitted also that he wished "John would change his critical direction."⁵⁷

From "Humanism at Chicago," which appeared in the Autumn 1952 issue one might gather that Ransom had answered Brooks's prayer: he finds the Chicago critics, whose Critics and Criticism had just appeared, dogmatic Neo-Aristotelians and blames them for paying attention to the

argument of the poem only. Jarrell was amused: "some of the blandest sentences were the most crushing," he complimented Ransom. The Chicagoans, predictably, were not at all amused, and Wayne C. Booth rushed to their defence in a letter published in the Spring 1953 issue. But in his "Reply By the Author" Ransom easily broke through this defence, and then decided that the matter had been settled once and for all.⁵⁸

Ransom's return to his earlier critical position in "Humanism at Chicago" turned out to be only a brief detour from the critical course he had taken in the late forties and early fifties. With his two literary-philosophical essays on "The Concrete Universal: Observations on the Understanding of Poetry" Ransom was back on track. "[T]he language of poetry is the language of feeling, not the language of epistemology," he asserted in the first instalment, and went on to an uninspired description of Hegel's ideas on poetry. In the second instalment, which is even harder to read than the first, Ransom compares and contrasts Hegel and Kant--"the most radical and ultimate spokesman for poetry that we have had"--and emphasizes that the "reading of technical philosophy is the critic's home work."⁵⁹ The philosopher in Ransom, who had always been kept in check by the advocate of practical criticism, had now run away with him.

Rice, the second philosopher on the editorial board, also contributed his share of articles for the The Kenyon Review. In the years 1948 to 1954 he wrote six essays and two reviews for the Kenyon. Most of these dealt with French themes and resulted from his Rockefeller-sponsored three-month's sojourn in France at the end of 1947. In his "A Letter from France," which appeared soon after his return in the Winter 1948 issue, Rice discussed the chaotic political

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

situation in what he regarded as a very sick country. Half a year later, in his "A Letter to a Frenchman," Rice discussed the country's cultural situation and found "that all is not well" in France.⁶⁰

Existentialism and other directions in French philosophy were the main subjects of Rice's two 1950 articles, "Children of Narcissus: Some Themes of French Speculation" and "Existentialism and the Self," which was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics. In "Children of Narcissus" Rice points to the obstinate recurrence of the theme of the awareness of the self in recent French philosophy. He contrasts this to American philosophy which is only concerned with the self when it has become a problem, and then saddles theology and psychology with it. One rarely finds in philosophical papers the great clarity and ease which Rice brings to bear here on his elusive subject. This equally applies to "Existentialism and the Self," the sequel to this essay, which, as its title indicates, deals with the major development in contemporary French philosophy. Praise for both essays poured into the office. Even if one takes into consideration that Rice had sent off numerous offprints, the quantity as well as the quality of the tributes he received reflect the importance of these essays. Philip Rahv "enjoyed [the] piece on contemporary French philosophy. It was a job that needed to be done: very informative and well thought out and presented;" Katharine Gilbert, chairman of the department of aesthetics, art, and music at Duke University, confessed: "As you know, one cannot--or at least I cannot--write letters about all the offprints that people are kind enough to send one. However, I found your paper extremely informing and light-giving" and asked Rice to address the American Society for Aesthetics; and Marten ten Hoor, Clyde Kluckhohn, and Jack Sweeney described the essays as "most distinguished," and "very

helpful," or exclaimed over their "steady clarity and . . . appropriate wit." Jean Wahl's five-page reaction, which was mainly a long denial of many of Rice's points interspersed with remarks like "all my congratulations" and "warm thanks," testifies to the thought-provoking quality of the essays.⁶¹

Rice's 1949 essay on Thomas Mann's Dr. Faustus, his third Kenyon paper on Mann, whom he regarded as one of the world's greatest novelists, had been received similarly well. Mann, for one, congratulated Rice on "one of the most important contributions written about my work." William Cass, who had studied philosophy under Rice at Kenyon College, wholly agreed: "Your article is the only good thing I've read on that book so far." R.W. Flint again dissented. He found the essay "interestingly and intelligently, but profoundly wrong," mainly because Rice's boundless admiration for Mann permeated the essay, while Flint regarded Mann as definitely "second-rate."⁶²

"[S]imply brilliant," according to Philip Rieff, was Rice's final Summer 1954 essay for the Kenyon, "The Intellectual Quarterly in a Non-Intellectual Society." This essay, which had served as a lecture at the annual meeting of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters, again possesses all the qualities of Rice's writing: perspicuity, precision, and poise. In the light of Rice's position as an associate editor, this essay, his one considerable statement on literary reviews, deserves extensive consideration. Rice tries to justify "the egghead quarterlies," as the literary reviews were thought of by their ill-wishers, who described them as "cliquish, esoteric, wilfully obscure, pretentious, snobbish, faddish, anemic, jargonic, and even subversive." Rice finds the customary justification that the reviews "publish the fledgling Hemingways, Faulkners and T.S. Eliots" an acceptable

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

argument, but not more than that. Much more important to him is that they "let writers write the way they want to write, and not according to some formula. Their only formula is to avoid writing that is made to a formula. Their more distinctive job, however," Rice continues, "is that of intensive criticism. Even the fiction and poetry they publish is assumed to reflect a considered critical judgment, and to be illustrative of, or at least compatible with, the standards elaborated in the critical sections of the magazines." This leads Rice to a discussion of different kinds of criticism. The New Criticism—"though this is no longer so new. It is getting middle-aged, and is acknowledged . . . to be somewhat respectable"--he defines as "aesthetico-linguistic-structural criticism," the Old Criticism as "socio-ethico-psychological." Rice emphasizes that his bipartition expresses "at most a tendency and an emphasis," and that the Old and New Critics often "trespass on each other's territory," "supplement each other usefully," and even "manage to co-exist in the pages of the same reviews with reasonable amity."⁶³

As we noted earlier, it is to a considerable extent thanks to Rice himself that these two kinds of equally important critics co-existed in the The Kenyon Review. Again, Rice met with critical acclaim all around. Jack Sweeney, for instance, asked for an offprint. "I was put on to it by W. Stevens who praised it greatly." He added in a footnote: "As you probably know W. Stevens doesn't give praise easily. He's a surety bond specialist for an insurance Co."⁶⁴

Another important publication on literary magazines was Arthur Mizener's 1948 essay on "The Scrutiny Group," whom he discussed as British counterparts of the American New Critics: "In these writers at their best . . . we have a variety of the new criticism which has clung

to the old criticism's desire to evaluate the experience which the poem is, as well as to analyse what it is." Ransom's admiration for Mizener arose rather slowly. In the early forties, Ransom had not yet been quite convinced of Mizener's critical qualities; he found Mizener too "academic," even though as early as 1943 Tate had described him as "the best reader of poetry" in America and soon asked Mizener to succeed him as the editor of The Sewanee Review. Gradually, Ransom came to share Tate's high opinion of Mizener and by 1949 it appeared that Mizener and he saw eye to eye on many important issues. Mizener's lead essay for the Winter 1950 issue, "The Novel of Manners in America," aroused Ransom, who styled himself "Old Man of the New Criticism," to a general "preachment" about the New Criticism:

You've got precisely to the point where . . . all the New Critics of poetry got and where they are still stranded: viz., the poem (or the novel) deals with the concrete or particular, and the more show of the concreteness or particularity by the New Critic . . . the better. . . .

I said concreteness and particularity so long and ritualistically that I finally came to see that I was saying nothing to the pragmatistical or positivistical naturalists. I therefore began to ask myself, What's the good of particularity, pure particularity? If we are dealing with human uses why do we want to clog them with particularity? . . .

The next phase . . . for the New Critics, seems to me, is to show what concrete individuals are for; how

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

they are the appealing factor for the reader; and what they mean for him. . . . It is my hunch that the critics of literature are going to recover for literature, perhaps incidentally for religion, such sanctions as these human behaviors can boast.⁶⁵

Although Mizener regarded not Ransom, but Blackmur as "really the Ancient of Days, the really patriarchal figure" among the New Critics, he found himself in general agreement with Ransom: "Of course your [sic] quite right about the New Criticism. I keep wishing so much Cleanth would emerge from the cysalis stage, for instance, and stop being stubborn about the whole thing so far as poetry is concerned. . . . [I]t is one thing to talk the new criticism in the atmosphere when THE WOR[L]D'S BODY came out; these ideas were. . . needed then and always will be by people in the state of mind I at least was then. But those ideas are as false a note in the present atmosphere of criticism as a lecture at a cocktail party."⁶⁶

Mizener's contributions to the Kenyon reflect this thinking. Simultaneously, they are representative of the general direction of the New Criticism in the late forties and early fifties in that they deal with fiction rather than with poetry. By 1957 Ransom had been completely won over to Mizener, a "first-rate fiction man." He had also acquired a taste for Mizener's reviews on poetry and criticism: "Your pieces on Harry Levin's Marlowe, Aiken, Blackmur, 3 in a row, entitle you to the highest compliments of the season," he wrote to Mizener on February 3, 1953. Ransom showed his profound confidence in Mizener as a reviewer by entrusting him with Marianne Moore's translation of The Fables of La Fontaine. She was a poet whom he "would never trust . . .

to untender hands," but although Mizener was a "Moore man," her translation proved to be a great disappointment and Mizener said so baldly in his review. Ransom valued both Mizener's and the Kenyon's integrity: "M.M. is a wonderful gal, and I do wish she hadn't left her beautiful MUSEUM. It will cut her down 50%, this new thing. But AM & KR, we could do no other." But others were shocked by the deflation of their favourite and the editors were bombarded with fuming letters. R.W. Flint, for instance, usually the kindest, most tolerant of men, wrote three irate, multi-paged letters about The Fables, a copy of which "stretche[d] its wounded and bleeding length" beside his typewriter and cried out "for vindication of some sort."⁶⁷ Generally, though, Mizener's essays and reviews were too well reasoned and too moderate in tone to evoke much reaction. Perhaps that is why Ransom, who liked to stir up literary controversy in the The Kenyon Review, preferred Mizener as a reviewer to Mizener as a full-fledged essayist.

Mizener's New Critical mentor, Allen Tate, appeared only four times as a critic in the Kenyon during this period, even though the editors had assured him that "[t]hree essays by Tate in a year, or five or six, would not be too much for us." His magnificent twin essays on Dante and Poe and his contribution to "The Critic's Business" were supplemented by a rather sloppy essay in which he defends the Metaphysicals against Dr. Johnson. "Johnson on the Metaphysicals" was meant as the pièce de résistance of the Summer 1949 issue, which the editors had intended as a tribute to Tate's fiftieth birthday, perhaps to reciprocate in a small way the handsome "Homage to John Crowe Ransom" Summer 1948 issue of The Sewanee Review which Tate had helped to edit. But the Tate issue was as much a failure as Tate's own contribution to it. Both T.S. Eliot and Austin Warren reneged after initially accepting an invitation to

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

write on Tate; this left the editors with Vivienne Koch, who wrote a careful essay on "The Poetry of Allen Tate," later reprinted in The Kenyon Critics.⁶⁸

Still, compared to other first generation New Critics such as Cleanth Brooks, Austin Warren, and Robert Penn Warren, Tate appeared frequently. Cleanth Brooks's only essay was his "My Credo;" he further contributed only two book reviews on William Empson and Arnold Stein; and it was not until 1964 that Brooks reappeared in the Kenyon. Austin Warren supplemented his contributions to "My Credo" and to the Donne series with an essay, which proved to be his last, on Sir Thomas Browne. Finally, Robert Penn Warren's essays were absent from the Kenyon's pages for all of twenty-one years, from 1947 till 1968, not because they were not wanted, but because Warren's main focus was on his poetry and fiction rather than on writing criticism.⁶⁹

Eliseo Vivas, another old-time contributor, deserves mentioning, too. His "Kafka's Distorted Mask," a New Critical defence of Kafka opposing the prevalent psychoanalytic and sociological explanations of his work, appeared in the Winter 1948 issue and was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics. Vivas further contributed a review of recent books by Paul Roubiczek and Richard Weaver. This review is noteworthy because it illustrates the complete reversal of the naturalistic position Vivas had held when he defended the Encyclopedists in 1939. His final contribution to the The Kenyon Review was a review of René Wellek and Austin Warren's Theory of Literature. Vivas acknowledged its immense learning but blamed Wellek and Warren for not having an aesthetic theory of their own. Incidentally, for once the editors had not been completely sincere. On September 30, 1949 Rice wrote to Vivas: "We have been especially eager to have a philosopher review the book--and

naturally, as our most literate philosopher, you are first choice." Over half a year earlier, however, Ransom had in vain asked Kenneth Burke to review this important theoretical inquiry into the New Criticism.⁷⁰

Two New Critical patriarchs, the Italian Benedetto Croce and I.A. Richards, also contributed to the Kenyon, if only once. "Criticism in Italy," an essay written by Croce for a symposium on "The Great Critics," held at Johns Hopkins University in the spring of 1948, appeared in the Autumn 1948 issue of The Kenyon Review. Although Ransom had solicited Croce's paper, he tried to palm it off to Palmer of The Sewanee Review when he found out that the Johns Hopkins University lectures committee would not allow him to publish both this and his own Johns Hopkins lecture on Aristotle in the Kenyon, as they permitted only one lecture per magazine. Ransom told Palmer that the Croce was "finished, eloquent; not new, except the fling he takes against the 'hermetic' critics, who are we." But Palmer wanted Ransom's lecture, "The Literary Criticism of Aristotle," or nothing, and so the Kenyon was stuck with "Criticism in Italy." Fortunately, the Johns Hopkins lectures committee relented, and the Kenyon's editors were allowed to publish both papers on the condition that they appeared in different issues.⁷¹

I.A. Richards' "The Places and the Figures," which appeared in the Winter 1949 issue, was an essay-review on two books dealing with rhetoric, in which he used such outlandish rhetorical terms as "epenthesis, proparalepsis . . . metathesis . . . aphaeresis . . . synaloepha, and apocope." Richards was "disappointed" in what he had managed to write on rhetoric, that "horribly deep subject," but "very much liked the way [his] article was made up in the Review." He

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

reported that, although "[q]uite a number of people . . . commented . . . mostly on the queer names of the figures," he was glad at "how widely . . . and how thoroughly" his article had been read.⁷²

Kenneth Burke had read it thoroughly, too, and in a letter to the editor felt bound to defend one of the books, Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language by Sister Miriam Joseph, which Richards had criticized. Next to two book reviews, the main contribution by Burke, an unclassifiable critic, was his "Three Definitions," which appeared in the Spring 1951 issue. "Mighty crowded, we are," Ransom wrote, "but this is good, & bears on a big public topic--VALIDITY OF K.B.--& takes care of our long review of [Burke's] Rhetoric in this issue. This last by Kermit Lansner, a bit informal, but respectful, but philosophically dissenting. So there." Kermit Lansner, who had been an associate professor of philosophy at Kenyon College from 1948 to 1950, and who had attended Burke's course at the Kenyon School of English in 1950, had written an excellent, balanced review of A Rhetoric of Motives. But in an interview, over thirty years later, Burke still vividly remembered and resented Lansner's review. His anger was sparked off by its title, "Burke, Burke, the Lurk." Even if Burke called himself "the lurk," he disliked Lansner's having stolen this epithet from him. In fact, though, Burke should have directed his anger about the title at the Kenyon's editors, since it was they who made up the headings. But the actual review pained Burke even more. He informed Ransom: "Wrote out a several-thousand word answer to Lansner. To prove to myself that I knew exactly how ailing his review is." He sent Ransom a copy, but refused permission to publish it. "Communications," unless solicited, usually were not paid for and Burke was in no mood to provide the Kenyon with a free sample of his writings.⁷³

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

Burke's bitterness came as a surprise to Lansner; in submitting his review Lansner had explained that he had written perhaps too sympathetic a critique in order to balance a few unfairly bad reviews Burke had had, which had concentrated on Burke's supposedly Stalinist bias. In the same letter, incidentally, Lansner pointed out that it was "too tiring to track down a set of KR in Paris . . . one finds KR nowhere except at the main library Americain. The bookstores do not sell it although PR is on all stands."⁷⁴

Only a few of those Partisan Review critics who had also been regular contributors to the Kenyon remained: Lionel Trilling, Isaac Rosenfeld, and Hannah Arendt are the only New York intellectuals, as yet undiscussed, who contributed more than one paper during this period. To his essays on the novel and Wordsworth, Trilling added a graphic essay on Little Dorrit and a review of a collection of anecdotes about Henry James edited by Simon Nowell-Smith. Trilling's Dickens essay was meant as the introduction to the British Oxford edition of Little Dorrit and in 1952, "feeling guilty" about his "long non-appearance in KR," Trilling had offered it to make amends. The editors accepted it eagerly, but their ardour did not arouse Trilling to produce more essays for the Kenyon. Eric Bentley was probably right when he asserted in 1982 that Trilling came to feel that the Kenyon was not informal enough, that he had to "put on his best clothes" for it, something he found too tiresome and time-consuming when he could dash off a piece for Partisan in a trice. And so Trilling disappeared forever from the Kenyon's pages. Before his untimely death in 1956, Isaac Rosenfeld wrote as many as six sound, shrewd reviews; five of them on novels by Arthur Koestler, Charles Williams, Henry Green, Ernest Hemingway, and Robie Macauley, and one on an omnibus edition of

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

Stephen Crane's work. Hannah Arendt contributed to the The Kenyon Review before she made her reputation with the publication of The Origin of Totalitarianism (1951). In two review-essays she applauded Bertolt Brecht and Hermann Broch.⁷⁵

The Partisan philosopher William Barrett contributed only one review, in which he compared and contrasted Notes Towards the Definition of Culture by T.S. Eliot to The Revolt of the Masses by Ortega y Gasset. Eliot lost on all scores. "The loss of vigor in [Eliot's] prose reflects the loss of vigor in the mind" and the "snob and the Christian are obviously in conflict in Eliot and though he makes no decisive choice between them, his sympathies seem to lean toward the snob"--remarks like these exemplify the tone of the review. Cleanth Brooks was one of the many readers who were scandalized: "Why should J.C.R. have got Barrett to review Eliot's Notes? It's all very well to 'represent both sides,' etc., but there are certain basic distinctions that must be accepted if we are to talk about literature--or anything else, for that matter--at all." Given that the review had been published in the heat of the Bollingen battle, even Ransom soon came to see that he had been carrying broadmindedness a bit too far. He therefore asked Vivas to write a second and more positive review of the book--something unheard-of in the Kenyon's history. Vivas obliged, but submitted his review "with some misgiving." He could not "take the book for what its author intended it--an analysis of an important sociological category of value." Ransom rejected his review and asked Vivas to write yet another review, one "'answering' Barrett." But Vivas gave up: "I do not see where I could find the time to start over again . . . The second reason is that answering the first review would be such a weary and unrewarding job! . . . No, I am afraid I am not up to

that," Ransom gave up, too. It is unclear, though, why Ransom, after having tried to procure a review in favour of Eliot, selected Barrett's extremely hostile assessment as one of the fifteen reviews to be reprinted in The Kenyon Critics.⁷⁶

Apart from the main contributors during these years, such as Paul Goodman, Stanley Edgar Hyman, the Fellows, the New Critics, and a remnant of the intellectuals, there were others who, although they did not appear often, nevertheless made lasting contributions. In 1948, for instance, the Kenyon published a selection of Valéry's posthumously published Choses Tues, translated by William Geoffrey. In 1953 Claude-Edmonde Magny contributed a polemical essay against biographical-historical criticism, and against posthumous publications of rejected, immature works such as Proust's Jean Santeuil. Closer to home were the Canadian critics Hugh Kenner and Northrop Frye, who, like Hannah Arendt and so many others, published in the Kenyon before they became the fashion. Kenner appeared in 1948 with his first "fresh, original, and . . . convincing" essay on Joyce, "The Portrait in Perspective," a revised version of which appeared in 1955 in his Dublin's Joyce. Frye's exposition of his belief in myth in "Levels of Meaning in Literature," "The Archetypes of Literature," and "A Conspectus of Dramatic Genres," all appeared long before he created a furore with his Anatomy of Criticism (1957). Another critic on the threshold of his career, Irish this time, was Donat O'Donnell, who discussed two Catholic writers, François Mauriac and Georges Bernanos. The Kenyon was still keen on concision: a first draft of the essay on Mauriac, for instance, was returned to the author with the note that the Kenyon "could use [it] if cut 1/2." Which O'Donnell did. His final contribution was a review, solicited by Rice, on his fellow-Irishmen Sean O'Faolain and Arland

6. A Second Flowering of Criticism (1947-1955)

Ussher.⁷⁷

F.O. Matthiessen's final contribution, before his suicide in 1950, was a portrait of the minor poet Phelps Putnam (1894-1948). "In thinking over where to try to print [my essay]," Matthiessen told Tate, "I'd instinctively like to send it to John." When Ransom received Matthiessen's memorial essay he tentatively suggested that they "would like it half the length." But Matthiessen refused to cut so drastically. Only when it appeared that Tate had not submitted his promised paper on Putnam to The Hudson Review, so that it looked as if Putnam would be without any public testimonials, and, more importantly, when it appeared that the The Kenyon Review "turned up short with copy for Winter after the defection of one or two people we thought were committed," did the editors decide to publish Matthiessen's essay in its entirety after all. A critical classic by Mark Schorer, "Fiction and the 'Matrix of Analogy,'" which had been delivered at the Kenyon School of English in the Summer of 1949 before its appearance in the Autumn 1949 issue; a first full-fledged article by Robie Macauley on Ford Madox Ford which inaugurated a Ford revival and which was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics; and a Kenyon Critics book review by R.W. Flint on William Carlos Williams are the final cases in point that exemplify the varied profusion of superior critical articles in The Kenyon Review.⁷⁸

Indeed, to list the Kenyon's main critical contributors is to illustrate its catholicity: Leslie Fiedler, Irving Howe, Richard W.B. Lewis, Richard Ellmann, Howard Nemerov, Randall Jarrell, Paul Goodman, Stanley Edgar Hyman, William Empson, Richard Blackmur, Arthur Mizener, and, of course, Ransom and Rice frequented the Kenyon's pages during this period. Most of these critics were young and newcomers to the

field of criticism, and their individualistic, often subjective approaches reflect all possible colours of the critical spectrum. Moreover, those New Critics who still often appeared in the The Kenyon Review stood in less awe of the autonomy of the text and had broadened their critical horizons, if at times, it must be said, with sad results. Nevertheless, it seems warranted to describe the period from 1947 to 1955 as the Kenyon's second critical flowering.

Philosophy and Politics

The Kenyon Review also experienced a second flowering with respect to some of its other aspects, notably its creative writing. There were, however, no further articles on education. Rice's interest in Existentialism, as noted, for example, in his own articles and the discussions on Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Marcel, Camus, and Sartre, was continued. Other more purely philosophical examples of the Kenyon's interest are Herbert Spielberg's discussions of the "social philosophies" of Existentialism and Walter Kaufmann's review of some "unexciting books" by Kurt F. Reinhart and James Collins about an "exciting" philosophy.¹

Although the discussion about Existentialism was predominant in the philosophy department during this period, attention was paid to some other philosophical views, too. In 1950 Ernest Nagel reappeared in the Kenyon's pages with a paper on "Einstein's Philosophy of Science," in which Nagel contends that in spite of Einstein's many courageous statements about social policy and morality, he was not a profound or systematic social thinker. This article circulated widely among philosophers; from Paris Kermit Lansner reported that he "met [Jean] Wahl . . . [who] was . . . carrying the Review to read Nagels Einstein piece." Henry David Aiken, a friend of Rice's, disagreed with another friend of Rice's, Eliseo Vivas, in a 1955 review of the latter's Creation and Discovery; Aiken had earlier reviewed An Examination of the Place of Reason in Ethics by Stephen Toulmin. In 1953 Aiken discussed George Santayana, one of Rice's pet subjects, but found him a

"cold fish." His "George Santayana: Natural Historian of Symbolic Form" was one essay out of a series of three which made up the scraped-up symposium "Art and 'Symbolic.'" An editorial note explained that although these essays had been "done independently," the editors had "grouped [them] arbitrarily under the term 'Symbolic,' a great word at the moment in the discussion of literature." Richard Ellmann's "The Art of Yeats" was the second article in this series, and Walter Elder's laudatory essay-review entitled "This May Be the Book" about Feeling and Form by S.K. Langer concluded this mini-symposium. Two less successful philosophical surveys, "American Philosophy at Mid-Century" by Arthur E. Murphy and "Philosophy in England" by Morton White, complete the main part of the Kenyon's philosophy department.²

Philosophy had indeed come to play a minor part. In January 1952 Ransom remarked to Chalmers that Rice and he had published so many philosophical essays that they had sometimes said that the Kenyon was a "quasi-philosophical magazine," but this observation was in fact no longer applicable. Still, if the quantity of philosophical essays—and perhaps their belligerency--diminished, their quality usually left nothing to be desired. The philosopher Morton White wrote to Rice that the Kenyon was "a tower of integrity in a field where, God knows, that is rare." The magazine's philosophical integrity was a reflection of the integrity of its editors. In "The Philosopher's Commitment," for instance, Rice's Presidential address delivered before the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1953, at the height of McCarthy's slanderous smear campaigns, Rice spoke unambiguously of "the hysterical atmosphere into which we are moving" and pointed out that the philosopher's highest priority should therefore be given to "honest learning, courageous thinking and

conscientious teaching."³

Rice's political commitment was not mirrored in the Kenyon where as before politics played a minimal part. This was not because Ransom did not share Rice's views. For instance, after he had barred Hyman from the Kenyon, he compared his usual reviewing style to "Sen. McCarthy . . . plunged into the literary arena." But Ransom remained convinced that politics are out of place in a literary magazine. He therefore rejected a review by Thomas Henry Carter explaining that "[i]t doesn't quite suit our content, I think; we haven't gone into the segregation matter because that is a political and social question, not exactly a literary one; and yet politics and social views color one's own writing even as a literary man so much that I felt I needed to see how you would pronounce with your own convictions." In the same letter he informed Carter that the literary quality of his rejected review had gained him the Fellowship in Criticism for 1958.⁴

As politics indeed "color one's . . . writing even as a literary man," a few politically-flavoured articles stole into the Kenyon. Irving Howe's essays on Conrad and Dostoevsky and Richard Chase's credo, "Art, Nature, Politics," are cases in point. In fact, in his Winter 1949 essay entitled "Melville's Confidence Man," Chase's conviction that "the literary critic will find himself inescapably a political writer" had buried Melville under the weight of observations on liberalism. Two bold, cogent, political essays were written by the New Yorker Harold Rosenberg whose "The Resurrected Romans" and "The Pathos of the Proletariat" appeared in Kenyon's 1948 and 1949 Autumn issues. "The Resurrected Romans," in which Rosenberg advances the seductive theory that historical figures when unequal to the situations they have to face assume clichéd attitudes, is particularly brilliant

and became part of his The Tradition of the New (1959). In his summer 1959 Kenyon review of this book, Lionel Abel remarked that, although Rosenberg himself set great store by "The Resurrected Romans," and although it was "much admired by men as keen as Jean Paul Sartre and Merleau-Ponty," he himself had reservations about its soundness.⁵

One final political essay was written by none other than Ransom himself. Correspondence reveals that Ransom had been pressed by the President to pay attention to The Conservative Mind written by Chalmers' friend, the arch-conservative Russell Kirk. When he saw that further resistance was useless, Ransom wrote to Chalmers resignedly: "As for Kirk's book, I've spent the week with it and find that I'd like to review it myself, in Autumn. At first I felt it might be more topical, more in the way of current politics, than we [the Kenyon] were in the habit of discussing. But the issue is really a big one, or can be made so, and I have come to think I have something to dish up there. After all, I'm at least an ex-conservative-Southern-agrarian." Should Chalmers after this note still have had the illusion that Ransom endorsed Kirk's views, he was to be severely disappointed. "The conservative mind," Ransom concluded his essay, "is not unable, as has been charged, to learn any lesson from the change of history. It is only unable to recite the lesson faithfully." It is improbable that Chalmers tried ever again to force Ransom to review his friends' books. Anyway, the few political essays that were published in The Kenyon Review during this period were liberal, even leftist, rather than conservative.⁶

Poetry

As for poetry, Ransom's general ideas about the kind he preferred to publish remained constant. As before, he generally rejected poems which were "too direct and bare," "too sharp, and quick, and informal," too "unorganized," or lacking in "lyrical intensity." His eye for a poetical tour de force remained as keen as ever and whenever a great poem such as Robert Penn Warren's "Brother to Dragons" was submitted, Ransom threw all his editorial principles overboard and made room for it in his magazine.⁷

Edwin Watkins, William Merwin, Edgar Collins Bogardus, and Douglas Nichols were the young writers who received the Fellowships in Poetry for 1953, 1954, and 1955. Watkins, one of the many Southerners who had come to Kenyon College to study under Ransom, did not quite live up to Ransom's high expectations. He appeared only twice in the Kenyon. William Merwin, whose name had been put forward by Francis Fergusson, turned out to be a much more satisfactory Fellow. From London, where he lived during his Fellowship, Merwin reported that "a picture & paragraph" on him had appeared "in the . . . English Vogue telling about the Kenyon Fellowship," regarding this as a tribute to the Kenyon, rather than to himself. In 1954 Ransom had prophesied that Merwin was "certain to be a very brilliant figure" because he possessed "marvellous verbal ability" and he published eight of Merwin's poems. The Autumn 1951 issue was brightened by his first Kenyon appearance, the "Ballad of John Cable and Three Gentlemen," published in Kenyon's still existing "Younger Poets" series--now entitled "A Group of Young Poets"--and preceding the publication of his first book of verse, A Mask for Janus (1952). To Lionel Trilling Merwin's "Ballad" was a pleasant surprise. "I am, as perhaps you know," he wrote to Ransom, "rather indifferent and even hostile to a great deal of the new poetry

I come across. But every now and then something emerges and hits me-- this happened with W.S. Merwin's 'Ballad.' . . . I think he's an extra ordinarily fine poet." Merwin's other poems in the Kenyon included "Canso," "The Nine Days of Creation," and "A Wit in Age."⁸

Edgar Bogardus was highly praised by Ransom in 1954: "His first volume [Various Jangling Keys (1952)] was published recently as the 50th in the Yale Series of Younger Poets, and received an unusual acclaim. We have no doubt about his future." But in 1958 Bogardus died of monoxide poisoning at the age of 31. James Wright had been one of Bogardus' admirers. After a pleasant visit at Gambier, late in 1957, Wright wrote to Ransom that he was sorry to have missed Bogardus, who had joined the Kenyon College faculty in 1956: "I had hoped to tell Mr. Bogardus how much I have cherished his extraordinarily beautiful book, but perhaps you will tell him for me. Poem after poem returns to my mind as I write--AT THE GRAVE OF ROBERT INGERSOLL, PROTHALAMION FOR K., FROM AUTUMN'S THRILLING TOMB (which I have memorized and learned from), CORRUPTION IN HIGH PLACES, EASTWARD TO EDEN. And I haven't seen the book for at least a whole year. He writes as memorably as anybody going." "At the Grave of Robert Ingersoll" and "Prothalamion for K." were among the eleven generally gloomy, intense, mythical poems Bogardus published in The Kenyon Review. Douglas Nichols, "an old Kenyon boy" like Watkins and Bogardus, received the 1955 Fellowship in Poetry simultaneously with Bogardus. Nichols published nine poems in the Kenyon, none of them memorable. Altogether, with the exception of Merwin, who went on to be a reputable poet, the choice of Fellows in Poetry had so far been less fortunate than the choice of Fellows in Criticism.⁹

Two other Kenyon graduates, Anthony Hecht and James Wright--who

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

became the Fellow in Poetry for 1958--brightened the Kenyon's poetry section. A number of the thirteen technically virtuouse poems that Hecht published in the Kenyon from 1947 to 1954 were included in his exceptional first volume of verse, A Summoning of Stones (1954), by which he became famous overnight, both in America and Great Britain. In 1968 Hecht recalled the odd way of his breaking into print in The Kenyon Review. After having commented on Ransom's extraordinary tact which often left his listeners in doubt whether their work had been blessed or damned, Hecht, who had submitted a poem, continued:

One day I went to call upon him in his office for some help and advice about a class I was teaching. It had something to do with Shakespeare, as I remember, and we were deeply and vigorously into it, when I looked past his head to the blackboard where he habitually wrote down the names of the contributors to the next issue of the Review, in the order in which they would appear. And there, to my astonishment, high on the list, and right between Trilling and Bentley, was my name. At this point Mr. Ransom was being very animated about Macbeth, and all for my benefit, but after a minute or two I could not contain myself, and abandoning all decorum, I interrupted him to ask whether this meant that I was to be in the next issue. He turned around to look at the blackboard, and in his very gentle southern voice said, "I seem to have made a slight mistake," whereupon he rose, went to the blackboard and erased the H in front of my name, and put down Br instead.

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

The fact is, he did actually publish my poem in the issue following this one, though it seems to me possible that simple embarrassment forced this upon him . . . I can't believe he could have been much taken with it. But at this period he was often preoccupied with Freud, and particularly with the essay on Wit and the Unconscious, and such slips could not be regarded as wholly insignificant.

But if Hecht's first appearance had been due to a Freudian slip, Ransom's interest in Hecht as a poet was aroused, and Hecht was encouraged to continue submitting poems to the Kenyon. Among Hecht's Kenyon poems which convinced Ransom of his talent we find 'The Song of the Beasts, 'Upon the Death of Santayana," and one of his best poems, the erotic, elegant, technically virtuouse "The Gardens of the Villa D'Este." 10

James Wright, who graduated from Kenyon College in 1952, also abundantly fulfilled Ransom's expectations. During this period we find only three of his poems in The Kenyon Review, 'Lonely' and 'Father," in the autumn of 1951 constituting his first appearance in print, and 'Robert Sitting in My Hands,' which had won the 1952 Robert Frost poetry award at Kenyon College, appearing in the winter of 1953. Considering that Wright was only in his early twenties and that his first book of verse, The Green Wall, which was selected in the Yale Series of Younger Poets, did not appear until 1957, it is not surprising that Wright's publication in the Kenyon at this time was still sporadic. More attention will be paid to him in a later chapter, but he deserves being

bracketed here with Merwin and Hecht as poets whose very different gifts Ransom recognized from the outset and whose careers he supported and fostered without turning these poets into poor copies of himself.¹¹

Of slightly lesser stature is the poet Robert Mezey, who also belongs to the generation of aspiring poets who came to Kenyon College to learn their trade under Ransom. Mezey, too, made his debut in The Kenyon Review, his "Pakim Pond, New Jersey" and "An Acquittal" appearing in the Summer 1954 issue. He appeared once more with three poems in 1957. John Woods's poems also first saw the public light in The Kenyon Review; "Birth Day," "The Old Man is Dying," and "Melville Has Green Eyes" were published in its Winter 1950 issue. As in the case of Mezey, only three more poems of his appeared in the Kenyon and Woods too disappeared from the Kenyon's pages after Ransom's retirement. Other poets such as James Merrill, Peter Viereck, and Isabella Gardner were discovered by Poetry, but they were published in the Kenyon soon after, at the outset of their poetic careers. We find four poems by Merrill in 1947, among them "The Drowning Poet" and "Cloud Country;" he was published again in 1949 and 1958. Peter Viereck's first two poems in The Kenyon Review in 1947, "Now Kindness" and "From Ancient Fangs," were included in his first volume of verse, Terra and Decorum (1948), which won the Pulitzer Prize. Viereck wrote to Ransom that Ransom was "one of the few who like my poem 'From Ancient Fangs,' the most bitterly tragic poem I've ever written, yet wrongly taken as flippant, breezy, humorous by most readers." Over the years Viereck continued to send, as he told Ransom, "new poems I feel excitement about to you before anyone else." Four of these found favour in Ransom's eyes and were accepted for publication. Isabella Gardner appeared once, in 1953, with "Sestina," "Timeo," and "The Minotaur."¹²

Other poets who appeared only once were Walter Southard and Helen Ransom Forman. Helen Forman remembered in 1981 that although her father usually had the final say about the poems to be published in The Kenyon Review, he made her submit her poems under a pen name in order to obtain Rice's unbiased opinion. Rice approved and Helen Forman made her debut, and her finale, with "Ophelia" and "Mother and Child" in the "New Poets" section of the Spring 1951 issue. Other poets who published once in the Kenyon and hardly ever elsewhere included William Belvin, Buddhadeva Bose, and Arthur Boyars.¹³

Of course, the editors did not always recognize a good new poet when they saw one. It was only in 1950, after he had been steadily submitting poems from October 1938 onwards, that Theodore Roethke made his Kenyon debut with "A Light Breather" and "Elegy for Jane." In 1945 he wrote to Kenneth Burke that Tate's Sewanee and Ransom's Kenyon were "the only ones I care much about. The hell with Chimera or Accent: rather bury the piece in the garden." Although Ransom had been attracted by Roethke's poems from the very beginning and had usually returned them accompanied by careful comments and promises of future acceptance instead of by a mere rejection slip, generally their lack of form had put him off. In March 1945, for instance, some of Roethke's poems about greenhouses called forth the following reaction from Ransom: "I do like these things, this garden opera. . . . Perhaps I have not the right, but these excellent pieces seem to me not so much verse as fine prose. . . . It's the lack of relation between a language and its sound pattern that seems to me to avoid the intention of a lyric poem. . . . Professorial remarks like these are what I get into from wanting to go pretty far and still holding back from acceptance." About two years later, Ransom, again "deterred by the looseness of the

composition," rejected Roethke's "The Long Alley," but, he hastened to assure Roethke, "[p]robably I must just take time to get used to literary effects of this kind." Half a year later, in reply to another letter of Ransom's, Roethke wrote: "Regarding your becoming a convert to my work: I console myself that those slow to faith are in the end, the firmest." He included "A Field of Light," "typed by Master Robert Lowell, who says you will recognize what a labor of love his typing is. He thinks you might break down on this one. . . ."14

But it was not until June 1949 that Ransom finally broke down. "I like this 'Light Breather', it is light and suited indeed to its title. Maybe you have another one to go with it? We'd rather publish a little group than a single poem, but we'll publish it anyhow, and thanks." Roethke did not "know when an acceptance has given me more pleasure" and enclosed "Elegy for Jane," which Ransom liked "even better." Both poems appeared in Kenyon's Summer 1950 issue. However, Ransom was not yet completely won over to Roethke and rejected several new submissions. "Old Lady's Winter Words" again appealed to him and appeared in the Winter 1952 number. In 1954 he accepted "Words for the Wind" but returned it when he realized that this poem would appear previously in the European magazines Botteghe Oscure and Encounter: "Just a little while ago this general question of policy came up and we decided not to re-print from them; they both, but particularly Botteghe, have so much circulation in this country." In June 1955 Ransom accepted a final batch, "I think the dead are tender. . ." and "I waited for the wind to move the dust. . . ."15 Even if Ransom never embraced Roethke's often wild and whimsical poems as wholeheartedly as he did, for instance, James Wright's and William Merwin's more formalized work, he did come to realize Roethke's stature as a notable

poet and offered him the Fellowship in Poetry for 1957. Roethke had to refuse regretfully, having just spent a year away from the University of Washington at Seattle as a lecturer in Florence in Italy.

Other established poets who had been rejected regularly before being accepted were Babette Deutsch and Merrill Moore. The latter was so "deeply grateful" when in 1951 Ransom asked him to submit some of his poems, that he proposed to "pay your printer for inserting an extra number of pages," should Ransom wish to print as many as twenty or thirty of his poems. But Ransom only took five of Moore's elegant, proficient sonnets and printed them at the Kenyon's expense. Like Moore, Babette Deutsch appeared only once, in 1948, with her "awfully good" "Fountain and Unicorn," the "most formal and studied poem" of hers that Ransom had ever seen. Richard Wilbur also was published by The Kenyon Review long after his fame had been established. When in 1952 Ransom invited Wilbur to contribute, he was "much flattered" and made his one appearance in the Winter 1954 issue with "A Voice from under the Table."¹⁶

If particularly Theodore Roethke and the newcomers William Merwin, Anthony Hecht, and James Wright enhanced the Kenyon's poetry department, the poetic highlights of this period came from two cherished contributors of long standing, Wallace Stevens and Robert Penn Warren. Stevens contributed his classic poem "The Auroras of Autumn," which led off the Winter 1948 issue. In Ransom's view this poem was "the best thing he ha[d] done for a long time." He told Stevens that he thought it "even better than . . . Esthétique du Mal," because it had "a slightly warmer, more obvious humanism." With the publication of the first half of Robert Penn Warren's magisterial Brother to Dragons (1953), Ransom pulled off an even greater coup.

"Brother to Dragons: A Tale in Verse and Voices" took up over a hundred pages of the Winter 1952 issue and is the longest piece of writing ever published in The Kenyon Review.¹⁷ Considering Ransom's preference for technically proficient, short, dense, lyrical poems, and his dislike of the violence in Warren's fiction, his immediate fascination with and admiration for this long narrative poem full of passion and fury may initially come as a surprise.

Ransom thought the poem was "magnificent." It is very difficult, and perhaps undesirable, to keep up the fullest measure of lyrical intensity throughout such a long poem, and Ransom was struck by the happy mean in style that Warren had found. "Stylistically you have done a wonderful job; there's just enough High Poetry, while the Mean Poetry is always vital and dramatic; what more could you ask?" "You know how to manage a long poem, Red," he wrote, "all the pace, variety, vitality, suspense, in the world." Yet Ransom added some "piddling comments." Speaking of the poem's publication in book form, he said: "I don't thin[k] the title is happy; and I don't think it matters, as for that, that we have already given you a title in KR--'twould make our version all the more attractive to the historian if it wasn't the authoritative title. BROTHER TO DRAGONS isn't euphonious somehow; hard to say, hard to remember, as to which noun is singular, which is plural, and why there's a distinction; and it's a bit Tennysonian, isn't it? Warren did not follow this suggestion, but he did take account of Ransom's comments upon his sometimes excessive use of repetition, and upon little matters such as 'shouldn't it be sweated for sweat, your p. 165? Elsewhere with a common speaker you can say sweat in the past, but this is Grand Style . . . about how Hercules sweat in the Forum.'¹⁸

Ransom did not stand alone in his opinion that Brother to Dragons was "great" and would "make a great impression." Philip Rahv, for instance, ranked the part published in the Kenyon among Warren's "very best things." Randall Jarrell described it as "the best very long poem in many many decades" and complimented The Kenyon Review on "printing that much of it. . . . I think it makes so much difference to do things like that; it would take a magazine like Partisan a couple of years to find room for a couple of pages, since it's poetry." Allen Tate, to whom Warren--as had remained the custom among Warren, Tate and Ransom since their Fugitive days--had also sent his poem in advance for comment, was among the few who were not lost in admiration. "I have decided . . . that I don't at all like it," he wrote bluntly, "but my reasons for not liking it would not be of practical use to you now, if they would ever have been; so I will not go into the questions of character and method. I suppose the first snag I struck was your language. There are many fine things but I kept saying to myself, when they appeared, that they didn't belong here, but in some other poem of about 100 lines." And so on. Warren was, to be sure, "distressed" by this letter, which Tate had hated "like hell to mail," but he was not offended. "No, nothing would have been served had you been less that candid in your expression of opinion," Warren wrote to Tate, adding generously that he thought "The Buried Lake," which Tate had asked him to read, "very effective."¹⁹

In later years Warren himself became dissatisfied with Brother to Dragons and in 1979 brought out a substantially revised version; but Robert Lowell, who reviewed its first version in Kenyon's Autumn 1953 issue, felt "not only that Warren has written a successful poem but that in this work he most truly seems to approach the power of those

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

writers one has always felt hovering about him, those poetic geniuses in prose, Melville and Faulkner. In Warren's case, it is the prose genius in verse which is so startling." "That Warren, one of the bosses of the New Criticism, is the author is as though Professor Babbitt had begotten Rousseau or a black Minerva dancing in Congo masks. Warren has written his best book, a big book; he has crossed the Alps and, like Napoleon's shoeless army, entered the fat, populated riverbottom of the novel."²⁰

Lowell's own poem "Beyond the Alps," which had appeared in the Summer 1953 issue and which would introduce his Life Studies (1959), indicates that Lowell himself rather than Warren had just then broken free from his New Critical background. Describing both his renunciation of classical, formal poetry and his loss of faith, "Beyond the Alps" was Lowell's twelfth contribution to the Kenyon's poetry department. During this period Lowell had already published three poems, "Falling Asleep Over the Aeneid," "Mother Marie Therese," and "The Mills of the Kavanaughs," which together made up about half of his book of verse The Mills of the Kavanaughs (1951). When Lowell submitted "Falling Asleep Over the Aeneid"--Ransom being for Lowell "obviously the only editor . . . to send my Virgil poems to"--Ransom gladly accepted it for the Winter 1948 issue. Half a year later Ransom published "Mother Marie Therese," which he found "gentle and good." Randall Jarrell was one among many who acclaimed these two poems--"Mother Marie Therese' is the best poem Mr. Lowell has ever written, and 'Falling Asleep Over the Aeneid' is--is better"--but had mixed feelings about "The Mills of the Kavanaughs." R.W. Flint described "The Mills" as "magnificent in places and damned tiresome in others."²¹ Unfortunately, Ransom's reaction has not been preserved, but his having this poem lead off the Winter 1953

issue indicates that he, for one, thought highly of it.

Ransom also continued to admire Randall Jarrell's poetry and published two long and three short poems of his during this period. "The Night Before the Night Before Christmas," the longest of all of Jarrell's poems, appeared in the winter of 1949. William Carlos Williams was "rouse[d]" by this "refreshing" meditation of a lonely, grieving girl to submit a few poems of his own--"not that they resemble his work or that I have any great confidence in them"--which Ransom, however, rejected. Jarrell's "All or None," "The Tower," and "The Black Swan," three one-page poems full of feelings of despair and desolation, appeared in the Spring 1951 number. "The End of the Rainbow" was published some three years later and, like "The Black Swan" and many other of Jarrell's poems, combined dreams and elements of fairy tales and spoke of isolation and loneliness. Jarrell had submitted this last searching, painful poem instead of a piece on Yeats he had promised, in the belief that it was "considerably better than the Yeats piece would have been. Anyway, it was considerably more welcome to me, as you can imagine. . . . I wanted to give you the best things I had while I had them."²²

Four of the poems William Carlos Williams submitted during this period did appear in The Kenyon Review; "Lesson from a Pupil's Recital" and 'Voyages' in the summer of 1948, 'The Host' in the summer of 1953, and 'Of Asphodel' two years later. Williams was 'eternally grateful" for Ransom's part "in seeing to the publication of ["Of Asphodel"]. "When I saw the poem printed," he wrote, "I realized that the latter part of it is not quite up to what I could wish--but that is part of the game. The first part of the poem is thrilling to me and I am content.' Ransom also was content, having after years of indifference come to appreciate

Williams' unconventional, loosely metred poetry. Explaining to David McDowell, Williams' publisher, why he had only one extensive letter of Williams' in the Kenyon files for possible inclusion in the forthcoming Selected Letters of William Carlos Williams, Ransom wrote in 1956: "it seems strange now, but . . . we were not printing him often. . . . It is only in recent years, and thanks to you, that I have really known Bill and got so much affection for him." Ransom's growing affection for the man had gone hand in hand with his growing admiration for the poetry and in 1962 he mentioned Williams as one of America's six twentieth-century poets of world-class.²³

Another poet whose work had slowly grown upon Ransom was Richard Eberhart. While he had been published only once during the preceding period, Eberhart was now published no less than five times. Among his nine usually short poems appearing during these years we find "A Legend of Viable Women," "Using the Meditative Means," and four poems grouped together under the title "The Seasons." How detailed Ransom's suggestions for changes and improvement could be appears from Eberhart's answer to his comments on "The Seasons." "I think I will be coy about this now, argue meaning with you later if you like: I have consulted French experts and feel certain fort should not have an e. . . . I think I can explain voluptuary to the inner arm which is clear to me. . . . I debate a comma in Summer after Lost, the first word in line 3, only on time, to slow the movement--yet now I think not and leave it as it is." Eberhart was grateful for Ransom's confidence in his poetry and for his continued editorial support. "You have printed some of my best poems and you have stood by me for many years. My loyalty and devotion, as well as friendship is to you," he wrote in September 1954.²⁴

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

These sentiments were shared by Ruth Herschberger, three of whose poems appeared during these years. After not having "sent poems out in five years," she wrote to Rice in March 1951, "[w]hat I did was sort out poems pre-'48 . . . in the Fall, because they happened to be there, and I sent what I thought were the best to Ransom. I am awfully glad he picked the Mink, and as to those he sent back--I have permanently discarded all but one. . . . So you can see how much it would mean to me if I could send you these culled from the last three years mainly, just for your [Ransom's and Rice's] judgment. 'The Mink' appeared in the Summer 1951 issue, and "To S.R." and "My Dear He Dress in Scarlet" four years later. Another former contributor, Delmore Schwartz, whose poetic talent had long been in decline, published only two minor poems in the Kenyon; "The Early Morning Light" appeared in the spring of 1950 and "The First Morning of the Second World" in the autumn of 1955. John Berryman, Muriel Rukeyser, and Jean Garrigue appeared once during this period, but Josephine Miles remained a favourite contributor with nineteen of her short poems published. "I guess she is about as good as Marianne Moore," Ransom wrote to David McDowell in June 1952. Moore herself appeared just once, in the winter of 1954, with her translation of two of La Fontaine's fables. As before, the Kenyon Review was wary of translations. Among successful ones Lloyd Parks's translations of two of Jacques Prévert's witty poems and Gabriel Nahas' translations of three of Paul Eluard's sombre ones deserve mention. Like Richard Ellmann's 1949 translation of Henri Michaux, they were a result of Rice's sojourn in France in 1947.²⁵

Clearly, the publication of established, important American poets such as Richard Eberhart, Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell, Theodore Roethke, Wallace Stevens, Robert Penn Warren, and William Carlos

Williams, and, in particular, of a profusion of gifted debutants and relative newcomers to the field of poetry, such as Anthony Hecht, James Merrill, William Merwin, Robert Mezey, Peter Viereck, John Woods, and James Wright, shows The Kenyon Review to have championed talented poets during these years. In writing in 1950 that he was "grateful to the KENYON REVIEW for what it has done for me," Wallace Stevens voiced the feelings of many other poets published in the Kenyon, which had come to occupy a prominent place in the limited market for poetry in America.²⁶

Fiction

The American market for short stories was better: in 1952, in The Short Story in America, 1900-1950, Ray B. West noted that "at least a few of the large-circulation periodicals," following the lead of the literary quarterlies, "have, during the 1940's . . . printed a high proportion of the first rate short fiction which has appeared." The Kenyon Review played an important part in discovering new fiction writers and, consequently, in furthering the development of the modern short story. It was harder for the editors to find good fiction than good poetry, however, and during the fifties they often had to solicit short stories, something they hardly ever had to do with respect to poetry. This was not because fiction was not submitted. In 1952 Ransom wrote to Chalmers that the "largest fraction of material submitted in manuscript to us is fiction," but, he added, "sometimes in a single quarter we will return several hundred manuscripts without finding one story that is satisfactory." Still, the editors kept on ploughing through the piles of fiction manuscripts in the hope of discovering good writers. Sometimes their patience was rewarded: Robert Creeley, Ann Mitchner,

and Stanley Sultan, for instance, made their fiction debuts in The Kenyon Review.²⁷

The competition with the middlebrow magazines was strong. In 1946, for instance, The Kenyon Review--which paid better rates than both the Sewanee and Partisan reviews--paid its fiction writers \$3.30 per page (about a cent a word), while The Atlantic Monthly paid a flat sum of about \$200.00 per story and Harper's as much as \$300.00. And the difference only grew over the years. In 1959 the maximum prose rate paid by the "Four Reviews" (Kenyon, Sewanee, Partisan, and Hudson) was about \$8.00 per page (about two and a half cents a word), while The Atlantic Monthly paid \$300.00 to \$750.00 per story, Harper's up to \$500.00, and The New Yorker about twenty cents a word.²⁸ It is quite natural, then, that many talented writers of serious fiction went over to the large circulation magazines.

These difficulties notwithstanding, the Kenyon's fiction record during this period is outstanding. To turn to, for instance, the first Fellow in Fiction, Flannery O'Connor, is to reveal this. It was on the recommendation of Robert Fitzgerald, Allen Tate, and Peter Taylor, that Flannery O'Connor received her first Fellowship in 1953, but its renewal in 1954--O'Connor was the only Fellow ever to receive a renewal--was wholly due to the brilliance of the stories she submitted to The Kenyon Review, which convinced Ransom that O'Connor was "probably the best short story writer in the country." The officers of the Rockefeller Foundation did not object in the least to the renewal and in 1955 a wholly content John Marshall, also taking due account of The Sewanee Review Fellowships, wrote to Flannery O'Connor that hers had been "the most complete success of the three years during which these fellowships have been granted."²⁹

During Ransom's editorship four of Flannery O'Connor's grotesque, sardonic, and tragic stories were published in the Kenyon: "The Life You Save May Be Your Own," "A Circle in the Fire," "The Artificial Nigger," and "Greenleaf." Ransom described "The Life You Save May Be Your Own," which appeared in the Spring 1953 issue, as "the best story I've seen in years." Flannery O'Connor also was pleased, if much too modest: "Mr. Martin at the University of Iowa wrote me that they were interested in 'The Life You Save, etc.' for the O. Henry collection. I've never had a story of mine used for any of these collections before and I find myself thinking that the Kenyon Fellowship has added enough distinction to my situation to get my stories reprinted." Indicative, too, of Ransom's admiration for Flannery O'Connor's stories is that he had "A Circle in the Fire" and "The Artificial Nigger" lead off the Spring 1954 and 1955 issues. "Greenleaf," which was published in Kenyon's Summer 1956 issue, won the first prize in the O. Henry Memorial Awards for 1957 and was included in Robie Macauley's Gallery of Modern Fiction (1966). The sexual symbolism in this story about a woman pierced to death by the horns of a bull running wild was not lost on Kenneth Burke, who may indeed have read too much into this story. He wrote to Ransom: "I wholly agree with you in your admiration for it, though its sexually symbolic dimension puzzles me somewhat, beyond the obvious feature. . . . [O]ne suddenly realizes that, as regards the sheer pragmatics . . . there is the problem of a bull's having two horns, whereupon the membrum virile, as thus transformed, can make contact in two places. So if 'heart' takes the place of 'hymen,' as the euphemistic displacement of one stroke, 'side' might take the place of 'groin' as euphemistic displacement of the other. Or, because of the word 'grip,' we might rather assume that the second

displacement involves connotations of arms, holding the body when initially pierced."³⁰ And so on.

George Lanning, who would be the last editor of the first series of The Kenyon Review, shared the 1954 Fellowship in Fiction with Flannery O'Connor. He contributed only one story, the technically proficient "News about Miss Prince," which appeared in the Autumn 1951 issue, years before his election as a Fellow. In 1954 Ransom described Lanning as "a very young novelist . . . [with] a fine style and boundless resources of invention;" but it is as a writer of light novels, rather than as a writer of serious fiction that George Lanning has made his mark. The Fellow in Fiction for 1955 was Howard Nemerov. Ransom had offered him the choice of a Fellowship in Fiction or Criticism, but Nemerov left it to Ransom: "just at present I have no settled plan for my future work, and have been for some months past in a kind of crisis, arid and deserted by my images. I do not believe this means I will never write again . . . but it seems to me, and so it may to you, that right now I look like a mighty poor risk, fellowship-wise . . ." ³¹ Ransom showed his confidence in Nemerov by awarding him the Fellowship in Fiction on the basis of his past work. Richard Ellmann was made the Fellow in Criticism.

Nemerov's initial interim reports on his Fellowship were hardly jubilant, but by the autumn of 1955 he had come to feel "its benign influence." "As to the Fellowship in Fiction," Nemerov then wrote, "I industriously set to work and broke my spirit on five starts at the same novel, which I incline to regard now as a total loss. Toward the end of summer, though, I began to write short stories, and think I have discovered some things and begun to see the light. . . . So:--I'm not out of the woods yet . . . but I feel the Fellowship has accomplished

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

already part of its purpose--that is, it let me sit still for a while and consider what it was I wanted to do." The "total loss" eventually became Nemerov's witty novel about the academy, The Homecoming Game (1957), and three of his very fine, vivid, tragicomic stories, "Tradition," "An Encounter with the Law," and "A Delayed Hearing," were published in The Kenyon Review and collected in 1959 in A Commodity of Dreams and Other Stories. Ransom came to regard Nemerov as "one of our most faithful and excellent contributors" and declared himself to be "grateful for any submissions of fiction" Nemerov would care to make. But "A Delayed Hearing," which appeared in the Summer 1957 issue and which Ransom described as "a nice piece of juggling between fantasy and the hard facts of life" and as "fine, good all round," turned out to be Nemerov's final short story for The Kenyon Review. His relatively few contributions to the Kenyon after Ransom's retirement were in poetry and criticism.³²

Flannery O'Connor and Howard Nemerov were among the few fiction writers who published for the first time in The Kenyon Review during these years and who published more than one story. Others were Daniel Curley, now known for his children's books and his editorship of Ascent, Ruth Domino, a native of Austria, Priscilla Heath, wife of Denham Sutcliffe of the English department at Kenyon College, Edgar McGuire, a Kenyon graduate and later managing editor of The Western Review, and the British writer Wayland Young. Robert Creeley, Randall Jarrell, Wright Morris, and Richard Stern, who also published fiction twice, and Robie Macauley, who contributed three stories, are better-known and deserve special attention. Robert Creeley in later years spoke up for "'men who are trying to think in terms of contemporary realities, instead of being awfully-old-Southern-gentlemen,'" and spoke

out against literary reviews, but it was in The Kenyon Review that he made his first breakthrough as a fiction writer with "The Unsuccessful Husband," a wry story about a paranoid husband, published in the Winter 1951 issue. Ransom found this story "extremely good" and described Creeley to David McDowell at Random House as "an unusually able writer" and "a great prospect--provided he's got a certain toughness, and can rule himself, and take advice." Creeley's second contribution, "The Boat," which appeared in the autumn of 1953, was another successful, painful psychological study of the miseries of married life.³³

Although Richard Stern had published fiction before his first appearance with "Cooley's Version" in the Spring 1954 Kenyon Review, it was one of his earliest short stories to be published. Stern's second story, "The Assessment of an Amateur," which deals with the old theme of the American in Europe, appeared in the Spring 1959 number and won the Longview Foundation Literary Award. Besides these contributions in the field of fiction, Stern also became a regular reviewer for The Kenyon Review from 1956. Robie Macauley, who had been reviewing irregularly for the Kenyon since 1942, appeared in 1951 for the first time in its fiction department with "The Thin Voice," a tale of war, an early, though not a first story. Macauley's second story for the Kenyon, published in its Spring 1957 issue, "The Chevigny Man," an amusing exposure of academic pretence, was the best of Macauley's proficient, precise stories to appear in The Kenyon Review and won a Benjamin Franklin Magazine Award Citation for 1956. "I have such confidence in your gift as a fiction writer, and a man of letters generally, that I will not hold back from a little disparagement," Ransom wrote to Macauley with respect to his first version of another story, "The Legend of Two Swimmers," and he went on to give detailed

criticism. Hoping that Macauley would not think his "advice . . . impertinent," Ransom concluded this letter by suggesting "humbly that you think through it again and see if you can get the best out of it."³⁴ The revised version was a penetrating story about hero worship and true heroes and appeared in Kenyon's Spring 1957 issue.

Although Wright Morris had been writing and periodically publishing fiction for some ten years, he was hardly well-known when he published his first Kenyon Review story, "A Man of Caliber," in its Winter 1949 issue. This partly autobiographical, compassionate story deals with Will Brady, the protagonist of Morris' novel The Works of Love (1952), as up and coming in the egg business in Calloway. "The Safe Place," one of Morris' most poignant stories, appeared in the Autumn 1954 issue. This story about disease and death, hope and hopelessness, became part of his novel Ceremony in Lone Tree (1960) and was reprinted by Robie Macauley in The Gallery of Modern Fiction. Entirely different from Morris' deeply serious, sometimes seemingly nihilistic stories were Randall Jarrell's two hilarious Kenyon instalments of his satirical chronicle of academe, Pictures from an Institution (1954). At the suggestion of his close friend Peter Taylor, himself a regular contributor to The New Yorker, Jarrell had first submitted his manuscript to that popular magazine in the hope of making a lot of money. Although its editors "liked the book in many ways and really wanted to be able to use a part, or parts of it," they had to return the manuscript with much regret. For the book's first chapter, which they had singled out for possible publication, had seemed to their legal adviser "to involve a libel." Jarrell hastened to forestall Ransom's fear of a possible libel suit, explaining that Harold Taylor, the young, progressive President of Sarah Lawrence College--where

Jarrell had taught for a year--was like Dwight Robbins, the President of his fictional College Benton "(except for a few particulars like curly hair, ingenuous sincerity) only insofar as he's like the general type of such Boy Wonder executives; he was mostly a point of departure for me, but I did take several firm steps before departing."³⁵

Less cautious than the editors of The New Yorker, Ransom, who loved the novel, accepted Jarrell's first chapter for the Winter 1953 issue and Book III, which Jarrell had recommended as "the best of all the books, so far as printing by itself is concerned," for the Winter 1954 number. Most readers were delighted. After the publication of Book I, for instance, the Kenyon published a "Fan Letter" by an impatient reader, Isabel Hathorn, who found "'Institution' the funniest thing I ever hope to read" and begged: "Please, please, isn't there any way I can read the rest of it without having to wait?" Wallace Stevens regarded "'the parts of the novel that have been published . . . [as] of unusual interest and skill.'" And with that characteristic generosity of his towards authors he admired, William Carlos Williams wrote to Jarrell. "Before it is too late I want to compromise myself publicly by praising your recent book . . . The book has a surface, a verbal quality, that attracted me. . . . Its humor reaches into regions seldom disturbed by most modern writing. Thank you for the privilege of reading it."³⁶

Creeley, Stern, Macauley, Morris, and Jarrell, here were five very different and very distinguished writers of fiction who were given an early chance to prove themselves in The Kenyon Review during these years. Among other newcomers to the Kenyon's fiction department, all of whom, for various reasons, published only once, were Elizabeth Hardwick and Leslie Fiedler. Elizabeth Hardwick contributed "Two Recent

Travelers," an atmospheric story about two Americans in Turkey, to the Summer 1953 issue. Robie Macauley reprinted it in his Gallery of Modern Fiction as one of the seven stories--among a total of twenty-four--selected from those published during Ransom's editorship. Ransom, however, initially had some doubts about "Two Recent Travelers" as it did not fit in easily with his rather traditional conception of the short story. He commented: "I want Phil and Peter Taylor and me to have one more conference about the story. It's a mighty nice piece but I think we're stuck in the categorical fallacy: we don't know what it is, since it doesn't appear to be all that a story is generally, and on the other hand is a good deal more than a descriptive sketch . . . we've been quite indecisive about it . . . you know how luxurious it is to . . . postpone making up your mind.' As for Leslie Fiedler, in November 1954 he submitted, as he explained to Ransom, "a story, quite different . . . from my naturalistic vein which has given you so much pain." It was probably because this story, "The Dancing of Reb Hershl with the Withered Hand," was, according to Fiedler, "rather antique" and "un-fashionable," that is, conventional and well written, that it was to Ransom's liking and appeared in the spring of 1955.³⁷

William Goyen, Caroline Gordon, and Robert Penn Warren are three notable Southern writers who published fiction in The Kenyon Review for the first time during this period. "Old Wildwood," a subtle, poetic story about the importance of tradition by Goyen appeared in the Summer 1955 number. Both Gordon and Warren published parts of novels. Gordon's "The Feast of St. Eustace," published in the Spring 1954 number, was a section of her formidable novel about religious salvation, The Malefactors (1956), and Warren's harrowing "Portrait of La Grand' Bosse" was an excerpt of his World Enough and Time (1950). The editors'

opinions of the latter piece differed, however. As usual, Ransom was critical of Warren's fiction: "I hope Red's novel will be better in its general texture than this overblown historic morsel." But Rice was so "delighted" with this "exciting" fragment that he asked Warren whether he had another section "suitable for separate publication" for the forthcoming Spring issue--a request Warren could not fulfill.³⁸ Anyway, as Ransom was at Bloomington, Indiana and had left Rice in charge, Rice's judgment prevailed and "Portrait of La Grand' Bosse" was published in the Winter 1950 issue.

The eminent Irish novelist and biographer Sean O'Faolain contributed a funny story about petty quarrels among Irish journalists to the Autumn 1949 issue. Another coup was "The World's Fair," a posthumous story by F. Scott Fitzgerald, which Arthur Mizener had dug up in the course of his research for his The Far Side of Paradise (1951), and which was published in the Autumn 1948 issue together with a critical comment by Mizener. Ransom thought this story "masterly" and "very beautiful though painful like any tragedy." Others were not as enthusiastic. A sculptress from Baltimore, Maryland, wrote several letters to Ransom, "out of a very real and deep concern for the future of our country," lamenting "this trash" and its deplorable influence on "the young people that represent [the country's] future."³⁹

Next to all these new arrivals in fiction, a few writers who had published stories in The Kenyon Review before now put in one more appearance. Eleanor Clark contributed "The Head in the Parlor," Elaine Gottlieb "Give Her Roses," Isaac Rosenfeld "In the Monastery," Arthur Mizener another Fitzgeraldian story, "Undiscovered Country," and Delmore Schwartz his not very convincing "The Fabulous Twenty-Dollar Bill." Paul Goodman reappeared with two impressionistic stories, "Our

School," published in 1948, and "A Visit to Chartres," published in 1959; Walter Elder had no less than three stories: "Roses Are Red" in 1947, "The Divorce" in 1951, and "The Unsayable" in 1952.⁴⁰

In these eight years from 1948 to 1955, The Kenyon Review published over fifty stories, that is to say some six or seven stories a year, or ten to fifteen per cent of its contents. Yet circumstances were such that the editors were often "rather desperately short of fiction." This shortage problem was more general, as appears from the Kenyon's contract, in the early fifties, with Random House. Thanks to Random House editor David McDowell, this publishing house paid the considerable sum of \$1,000.00 in 1951, 1952 and 1953 for the Kenyon's service of referring young writers to it. This lucrative arrangement testifies to the Kenyon's reputation as a talent scout. In the course of these three years Robert Creeley, Richard Gibson, George Lanning, Mortimer Slaiman, and Stanley Sultan were among those mentioned by Ransom to Random House. He also referred writers whom he did not publish in The Kenyon Review, such as H. Louis Newell, whom he considered "[e]xtremely good, humorous, salty . . . though not exactly a highbrow for KR," or E.R. Karr. Random House decided not to renew the contract for 1954, as none of Ransom's suggestions had brought much profit. Moreover, Random House had expected monthly reports, but Ransom had been "neglectful" of this. Not quite unjustifiedly Ransom blamed this on the fact that he often just did not "have good prospects to report" and that he "couldn't think fiction [was] really flourishing."⁴¹

Yet fiction was "flourishing" in The Kenyon Review. Thanks to the editors' careful and time-consuming weeding out of manuscripts they gathered a fine crop of writers. Although these writers wrote very

different stories, yet, again, as had been the case with the stories published in earlier years, nearly all of them were well written, technically proficient, but not experimental. In a 1952 report to President Chalmers, Ransom explained the current editorial line with respect to fiction:

In the annual collections of "Best Stories of the Year," we are sometimes remarked as a magazine devoted to "experimental" or "Advance Guard" fiction. I cannot think either term is quite correct. We are on the lookout for originality, it is true. We don't want the "well-made" story such as is manufactured by many writers in quantity; nor the story which is too imitative of another writer, or "school"; nor the story which depends on violence, horror, rejection, for its interest. I suppose we just look for good stories; stories that are not only contemporary but fresh, humanly wise, and beautifully written.

The editors used "just those value-judgements made in the critical writings . . . in their . . . selections of fiction and verse," Ransom continued, adding that creative writing ought to be related "to the body of the older literature," and that therefore an academic base might even be advantageous to the young writer.⁴²

Again, as in earlier years, there were about as many Southern writers as New Yorkers. Finally, where they had excelled before in the Kenyon's poetry department only, we now also find quite a number of writers associated with Kenyon College in its fiction department,

namely Walter Elder, Richard Gibson, Priscilla Heath, George Lanning, Robie Macauley, and Edgar McGuire.

Drama and Film

As for the Kenyon's coverage of the other arts, the tradition of reporting on drama and the theatre, on movies, on painting, sculpture and music was continued. During these years the attention paid to drama actually reached its culmination in the Kenyon's pages, in some thirty articles and book reviews focusing on this subject. The driving force behind this emphasis on drama still was the advisory editor Eric Bentley, who, next to suggesting writers to Ransom and Rice, could take credit for writing nearly a third of the articles on drama and the theatre. Besides the earlier mentioned "Yeats as a Playwright," "Chekhov as Playwright," and "Monsieur Verdoux as 'Theatre,'" the last of which was reprinted in The Kenyon Critics, Bentley wrote a review of Jean-Paul Sartre's Theatre, and brilliant, informative articles on Bertolt Brecht and contemporary German theatre, on Eduardo de Filippo and contemporary Italian theatre, and on Jean-Louis Barrault and contemporary French theatre, the latter article being preceded by one by Barrault himself, procured and translated by Bentley. As for the contemporary American theatre, Bentley wrote a severe but just critique of Eugene O'Neill as a victim of his times; entitled "Trying to Like O'Neill," it was published in the Summer 1952 issue of the Kenyon. He also contributed a very laudatory, penetrating study of the ex-Southern Agrarian and famous American theatre critic Stark Young in the winter of 1950. With respect to this article, Bentley recalled in 1982 that Ransom had granted him permission to review Young's Immortal Shadows

(1948) and, as Bentley had explained that he wanted Young's criticism to sink in, to take his time in doing so. Neither Ransom, nor Bentley had probably reckoned that it would take him nearly two years to finish this review, "the most thoroughly prepared book review I've ever done," as Bentley told Jacques Barzun. As the review had grown into a full assessment of Young's career, Ransom waived the criterion of timeliness. One of the many readers pleased by the article was Stark Young himself, who showed or sent "that wonderful article . . . written by Eric Bentley, who knows more about modern drama than anybody in this country" to all his friends.⁴³

These and earlier articles merited the high compliment Lionel Abel paid to Bentley in 1960, when he wrote that "the only functioning critic today, the only writer defending some general hypothesis of taste and testing that hypothesis in discussions of works past or contemporary is Eric Bentley." Unfortunately, after 1952, for reasons unknown, hardly any articles or reviews by Bentley were published in the Kenyon. In September 1959 Bentley wrote to Robie Macauley, the Kenyon's brand-new editor, that "while in earlier years KR published everything I sent, the magazine has rejected the last several things I've sent--is no longer, in short, the place where my own stuff most naturally appears." During Macauley's editorship, Bentley contributed only two more intelligent, well-informed articles, in 1961 "The Political Theatre Reconsidered" and in 1964 "Bertolt Brecht's First Play."⁴⁴

In an earlier chapter we saw that George Beiswanger, Quentin Anderson, and George Nobbe had not been satisfactory chroniclers of the New York theatre scene. In January 1950 Bentley therefore suggested Henry Popkin, "one of last summer's [Kenyon School of English]

students," who, as Bentley told Rice, "does not write too well but is well-equipped." Popkin accordingly contributed the "Theatre Letters" for 1950, 1951, and 1952. In June 1953, however, Bentley wrote that he did not "think Popkin has worked out too well as a drama critic, though I believe I was responsible for his being tried out in the first place." He then advised Rice to give Theodore Hoffman a chance: "His writing is still a bit sloppy but he is more intelligent than Popkin." The editors promptly followed this suggestion too, and Hoffman wrote the "Theatre Letter" for 1953.⁴⁵

The editors were so thoroughly satisfied with Hoffman that they made him a Fellow in Criticism for 1956 but, as Hoffman lacked the time to continue to write up the Broadway season, the next three "Theatre Letters" were written by Mary Hivnor, his unsuccessful competitor for the 1956 Fellowship. Hivnor had also been suggested by Bentley, but her successor, Gerald Weales, who wrote the "Theatre Letters" for 1958 and 1959, was not one of Bentley's favourites. "Weales is a student of mine at Columbia. Very bright but somewhat cantankerous, and I don't like cantankerous tone." He did think, though, that Weales was "rather better than Popkin."⁴⁶

After Weales the series of "Theatre Letters," fifteen of which had appeared over the years from 1942 onwards, was discontinued by Robie Macauley. Basically, the idea of enlivening the Kenyon by these theatre reports had been a good one, but it proved to be impossible to fit accounts of something as fleeting as most Broadway productions to the format and intentions of a serious quarterly. This was not for want of trying. Usually special attention was paid to theatre adaptations of books by distinguished writers and to high- and middlebrow productions rather than to box-office successes. But the high demands which the

writers on the theatre justifiedly put on the productions made for a generally glum tone, which did not contribute to the success of the "Theatre Letters." Neither did the fact that they were published only once a year, while numerous timely accounts of the theatre appeared monthly or even weekly in such magazines as The New Republic. Clearly, Macauley's decision to discontinue this series was wise.

Francis Fergusson was the second important drama critic after Eric Bentley. His penetrating, enlightening, precise, if not thrilling drama essays treated subjects as diverse as T.S. Eliot, Shakespeare, Federico García Lorca, and twentieth-century American drama; his equally well-informed, concise reviews treated books on French and American drama. In his Summer 1950 Kenyon review of Fergusson's "unusually suggestive, in fact excellent" The Idea of a Theater, Kenneth Burke pinpointed Fergusson's kind of criticism: "For the most part, by centering on close analysis of particular texts, he can keep his observations well focussed; yet at the same time, since the theory of drama is so directly relevant to the theory of human motivation in general, the reader is continually getting glimpses down long corridors, vistas that reach far beyond whatever work happens at the moment to be under close scrutiny." Eric Bentley, Francis Fergusson, and the "Theatre Letters" constituted the core of the Kenyon's drama criticism during these years. As for drama proper, the editors published one play, Leslie Fiedler's "masque-poem" "The Bearded Virgin and the Blind God." Ransom was pleased with the play, Fiedler with his "kind words"---and with the fact that he was paid in advance, contrary to customary Kenyon practice.⁴⁷

As in the case of drama and the theatre, movie criticism took a great flight during this period. One would think that the imperfections

in the Kenyon's "Theatre Letters" would also be generic to the "Movie Letters," which were published from 1947 onwards, but this was not the case. The success of the "Movie Letters" depended partly on their biannual publication, as opposed to the annual publication of the "Theatre Letters," but primarily on the fact that the Kenyon had found one of the best American movie critics, Parker Tyler, to write them. A poet and a critic, and a regular contributor to numerous true little magazines such as William Carlos Williams' Contact, Ronald Lane Mortimer's Alcestris, and Charles Henri Ford's surrealist View, of which he became an associate editor, Parker Tyler had in vain submitted poetry to The Kenyon Review from its very inception. He made his first appearance with an article on "The Impressionism of Marcel Proust" in the Winter 1946 number. Once in, Tyler stayed in; his second publication was a Spring 1946 review of Djuna Barnes's novel Nightwood, which he thought "overrated by Eliot and by the dubious clique which seems to have gotten it reprinted."⁴⁸

Impressed by the quality of these contributions, Ransom asked Tyler to review a few recent movies, a request Tyler, a film fanatic and writer of two excellent books on film, could not resist. His first "Movie Letter" appeared in the spring of 1947 and produced evidence for his thesis "that artistic evolution in Hollywood takes more and more for granted the psychic premises of the dream." His second letter, which appeared two issues later, lamented Charlie Chaplin's development from "Little Tramp" to the Chaplin of movies such as Monsieur Verdoux, Modern Times, and The Great Dictator. This letter grew into Tyler's Charlie Chaplin: Last of the Clowns (1948). These two letters, as did Tyler's later ones, constantly challenge the reader, who may often disagree, but is always spell-bound. They made Ransom, who relished

provocative essays, invite Tyler to become the Kenyon's regular movie correspondent. Tyler enthusiastically accepted. In all his letters, usually refreshingly rebellious, Tyler challenges the recurrence of glib professionalism and the loss of artistic integrity; he often explains the movies under discussion in a psychoanalytic and moralistic way, bringing to them his knowledge of modern art and literature, and making no secret of his preference for artistic directors such as Sergei Eisenstein and Jean Cocteau. In later years he noted: "I was delighted to become, in Kenyon Review, an interpreter of film to an elite interested primarily in literature."⁴⁹

Tyler rejoiced over Ransom's inclusion of his condemnatory "Movie Letter" on the film adaptation of Robert Penn Warren's All the King's Men in The Kenyon Critics. He wrote in September, 1950: "It is the first time anywhere, I believe, that film criticism has been formally and signally recognized as of literary value." But within a year, Tyler had become very downhearted about the quality of movies and, concomitantly, movie criticism. In his Summer 1951 "Movie Letter" he explained:

In my ripened stage as a mythographer of the Hollywood product, I am suddenly oppressed by the consciousness of what I have written. It brings the faintly overwhelming thought that perhaps too much sadism is involved in my past amidst the great public. Furthermore, facing my seventh year of intensive and unflattering analysis, I have come to feel that my particular game is no longer worth the candle of critical prose--at least, without danger of

repetition.⁵⁰

Ransom promptly informed him that he had decided to discontinue the biannual "Movie Letter." Although regular "Movie Letters" would never again be published in The Kenyon Review, Tyler continued to appear in its pages with imaginative film critiques which were a credit to the Kenyon, in spite of the virtual absence of comments on such technical aspects as editing, sequence, and sound, and in spite of--or perhaps because of--their usually impassionedly disapproving tone.⁵¹

Whereas earlier some four articles and reviews on painting and sculpture had appeared annually, now the Kenyon published only one, or at the most two, and contributors usually appeared only once. The exception is Kermit Lansner. When a Fulbright scholar in France, Lansner submitted "Art Notes from Paris" which appeared in the Winter 1952 issue; later he contributed articles on George Rouault and on the function of museums. Then there are a number of illustrated articles by different writers, such as Hudson Walker on Marsden Hartley, Frederick Wight on Edvard Munch, and Allyn Weisstein on Marc Chagall. Most successful of these was a study of Pierre Bonnard by Duncan Phillips of the Phillips Gallery of Modern Art in Washington, D.C. Robert Richman of the Washington Institute of Contemporary Arts was so impressed that he intended to send as many as 300 reprints to members of his Institute. Unfortunately, as the type had already been broken up, the costs of the reprints came too high and the project foundered. Besides writing this fine article, Duncan Phillips also made himself useful to The Kenyon Review in other ways; not only did he return his honorarium for the article, but from the late forties into the fifties he gave over \$7,000.00 to the Kenyon. It is likely that Phillips indicated that

he would like to see part of this money go towards payment for the inclusion of colour reproductions of paintings in the Kenyon. These expensive reproductions of good quality on shiny paper were pasted to blank pages; they disappeared after 1954, just before Phillips stopped paying.⁵²

Like the interest in painting, the interest in music in The Kenyon Review dwindled considerably. Only three articles and a few reviews about music appeared from 1947 to 1955. René Leibowitz contributed "The Musician's Commitment" to the Autumn 1949 issue; this article, in which he tried to define the responsibilities of a musician, had earlier appeared in the French Les Temps Modernes. Jacques Barzun contributed "The Fetish of Form: an Example from Music" to the Winter 1950 number. It was an excerpt of his Berlioz and the Romantic Century (1950), a book which Ransom and Rice were sure would "not only be the 'definitive' work on Berlioz but set a new high in music criticism." The editors had solicited part of Barzun's book at Lionel Trilling's suggestion and had "feasted" on the chapters Barzun sent them, but selecting the right one for the Kenyon proved to be difficult. "Our particular problem . . . is to appeal to a generally literate reader without a specialized musical knowledge . . . but I am sure . . . that there must be many passages in the book which are very directly on the music itself, and yet not too 'technical' for the purposes of a magazine such as KR," Rice wrote to Barzun in September, 1949. Another important writer on music was B.H. Haggin, still on the staff of The Nation, who devoted a technical discussion to the music of Hector Berlioz, whom he, like Barzun, much admired. Before Ransom's retirement, Haggin published one more article and two reviews, which constituted almost the entire music department of The Kenyon Review.⁵³

Dance criticism in the Kenyon had never amounted to much, partly perhaps because mature dance criticism did not yet exist in America. Be that as it may, during the period under discussion it was more prominent than ever in the Kenyon, which, however, is not saying much. Six articles on dance were published. In 1948, in "The Firstness of Dance," Walter Terry asserted that dance might mean the salvation of humanity; his highly debatable article was followed by one by Edwin Denby explaining why dance criticism is almost impossible, which, incidentally, did not keep him from lyrically discussing "The American Ballet" half a year later. Beatrice Gottlieb, who had been a student of dance at several studios as well as a student at the Kenyon School of English, took care of three articles on dance in 1950, 1951, and 1952. After 1952 until its demise in 1970, only two or three more articles on dance appeared in The Kenyon Review.⁵⁴

Although the Kenyon's contribution to dance, music, and painting was negligible, its movie and drama criticism, its poetry and its fiction, and, as we have seen in the foregoing chapters, its sponsorship of new and original American critics and its continued publication of the best of the established ones, certainly warrant describing the years from 1948 to 1955 as the Kenyon's "second flowering." This success was thanks to Ransom's editorial genius, but Rice's share must be touched upon again. We saw that the many excellent articles on philosophy, and especially Existentialism, those on France and those about and by French writers bore Rice's editorial mark. His importance for the Kenyon is confirmed by the continuing high quality of the magazine during Ransom's sabbatical at Bloomington, Indiana for the academic year 1949-1950, when Rice was the Kenyon's acting editor. His Winter 1950 issue, for instance, was much admired by The Times

Literary Supplement which noted that "the reader feels the vibration of profound minds investigating profound subjects; sometimes, indeed, the general impression of profundity is a little oppressive. The main effect of this issue, however, is inspiring. That so many literary lights can shine so far above the mundane level proves that creation and criticism in the United States are not yet enslaved by the mammon of the masses."⁵⁵

Rice also edited the Spring and Summer 1950 issues on his own. His issues can stand comparison with those composed by both editors. This is not to say that Rice had no help, for a lively correspondence sprang up between Bloomington and Gambier, with Ransom sending letters full of suggestions and advice. But Rice was in charge and Ransom was always careful to add to his suggestions some such remark as "Do as you will," "I don't propose this for your policy, but I just want to let you know," or "I've told {Steven Marcus} you are the editor." Having to run The Kenyon Review on his own turned out to be "a big job," as Rice wrote to Lionel Trilling in November 1949 in order to enlist his help. Therefore, although he had enjoyed being solely responsible for a while, Rice was glad when Ransom came back to help shoulder the Kenyon's burden again.⁵⁶

Finances and Foundations

Upon his return Ransom again took most of the Kenyon's correspondence upon himself as well as the responsibility for its budget. As Kenyon College stuck to its opinion that The Kenyon Review--which did more to put it on the map than any of its other achievements--should not be paid for out of Kenyon College money, finding sponsors in order to keep

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

the Kenyon out of the red, alive, that is, remained a considerable and tiresome part of Ransom's job. The substantial grants from the Rockefeller Foundation together with the smaller gifts from other angels--Paul Mellon donating \$8,000.00 towards Ransom's salary, Duncan Phillips giving over \$7,000.00 in total, and Random House contributing \$3,000.00--barely ensured the Kenyon's continued existence. "We have almost always been preoccupied in our minds with the problem . . . of survival with credit," Ransom wrote to Marshall in 1958, adding that at "various times there has been the problem of any kind of survival." For instance, in 1950, before Paul Mellon came to the rescue, Ransom had almost made up his mind to stay on permanently at Indiana University at Bloomington--which would have been overjoyed--in order not to have his salary burden the budget of The Kenyon Review. "Inflation and the necessary increase in salaries" had exhausted the 1940 Carnegie grant, which otherwise "would have proved adequate to pay for [Ransom's] chair to within a few months of Professor Ransom's reaching the retirement age."⁵⁷

In late 1951, or early 1952, when the Rockefeller gift of \$22,500.00 had been nearly used up and the editors were certain that the Foundation had decided to refuse further financial assistance, The Kenyon Review was again tottering on the brink of ruin. Ransom and even Chalmers searched for money in every nook and cranny. Ransom, for instance, exacted payment for the Kenyon's review copies from the library of Kenyon College and Chalmers tried to "make an arrangement with a publisher to manufacture and distribute the magazine and handle its subscriptions and advertising and payment to contributors." "GKC has been quite fine in his recent dealings with us," Ransom wrote to Rice in April 1952: "It's somewhat as a last resort . . . that the

President talks about making a deal with [his publisher] Regnery; thinks it wouldn't be a good thing except as easing the financial worries of the College and the editors." But Regnery did not rise to the bait. Neither did Scribners, which was approached late in October of that year. Two other projects that Ransom mentioned in the same letter to Rice did, however, go through:

We stand to make a little money from [the reprint magazine] PERSPECTIVES USA that [James] Laughlin is about to put out with the backing of the Ford Foundation . . .

[James Laughlin] has suggested, or been given to understand, that Ford in his zeal to export American high-brow production will probably buy up a considerable quantity (maybe 900 copies) of KR to give to impecunious patrons abroad.⁵⁸

As for Perspectives USA, due to the Kenyon's financial reports, which were generally none too accurate, it is not quite clear how much money The Kenyon Review made from reprinting Kenyon essays. It is somewhat easier to track down the financial advantages for the Kenyon resulting from the second project. In a letter to President Chalmers of July 9, 1952, James Laughlin, in his capacity as President of Intercultural Publications Inc., wrote that his "little program of sending high level American Magazines to institutions abroad" would "mean at least a thousand subscriptions to the Kenyon Review." In the end, the Kenyon served only 468 foreign libraries, but the grant, which had initially been given for only one year, was renewed twice. In a

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

note of December 15, 1955 to Chalmers, Ransom explained that the "cost to Intercultural Publications was at the rate of \$4.50 per annual subscription, or \$13.50 for three years; and the total was at . . . \$6,318 for the three years."⁵⁹

Besides these two kinds of earnings, both of which were indirectly given by the Ford Foundation, the Whitney Foundation gave \$500.00 in 1953. This grant was, in fact, a severe disappointment as the editors had earlier had "good hopes" of receiving an annual grant of \$5,000.00 for three years. The Kenyon's application to the Whitney Foundation was dated October 1, 1952, that is, after the Rockefeller Foundation had promised to subsidize three years of Fellowships, and involved ambitious plans for the extension and improvement of The Kenyon Review. Among other things, the money was to be used for "retaining two Foreign Editors," for "art-work," for "oversized numbers," for "extraordinary payments to contributors," and for "fees to Special Editors and advisers." The innovations formulated in this application show that Ransom and Rice still possessed a lot of editorial verve. But, as Chalmers reported on February 14, 1953, the Whitney Foundation only gave \$500.00. "Professor Ransom proposed using the gift in additional activities of the Review," Chalmers added, "but . . . he [Chalmers] . . . could not recommend its use for anything but general operations, which would have the effect of reducing the accumulated deficit." The deficit at that time was over \$9,000.00; it was reduced to \$7,223.00 by June 1953. Part of the money from the Rockefeller Foundation was used to diminish the deficit, and wholly against Ransom's wishes, who, as is apparent from his application to the Whitney Foundation, had wanted to use any surplus money to improve The Kenyon Review, in 1954 and 1955 Chalmers again insisted that any surplus was to be used to decrease the

deficit, so that in June 1955 the Kenyon's accumulated deficit had been brought down to \$3,468.63.⁶⁰

This may seem in contradiction to earlier assertions that the position of The Kenyon Review was very unstable, but it should be kept in mind that had not the Rockefeller Foundation decided to continue its help in 1952, the Kenyon would almost certainly have collapsed. "The REVIEW is saved," Charles Coffin wrote to Austin Warren in July 1952, and "John and Phil are mightily well pleased." In January 1955, when the 1952 Rockefeller grant had nearly run out, Ransom wrote to Chalmers that "the loss of the \$4,800.00 from our operating budget would be a heavy one. Indeed it would probably be fatal to the continuance of the Review." Angrily, and also anxiously, he added: "It has been my strong impression that our friends at the Rockefeller Foundation would not want to repeat their gift, now that it has come sharply to their attention that during the first two years of their grant more than half of their allotment of \$4,800.00 for 'administrative and editorial expenses' has gone into the College treasury as a credit against the accrued deficit of the Review."⁶¹ It turned out that Ransom was too pessimistic, but his letter shows that without the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, The Kenyon Review was but a house of cards.

Duncan Phillips' gifts excepted, private gifts totalled less than \$1,000.00 from 1947-1955. Advertising was a more reliable source of income, averaging \$1,500.00 annually. The subscriptions and bookshop sales also remained regular sources of income, bringing in, in round numbers, some \$8,500.00 per year. Looking at the circulation reports of the Autumn issue of The Kenyon Review, we find that the Kenyon's circulation during all these years remained steady at just over 2,000. From these reports it would seem that the bookshop sales part of the

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

Kenyon's circulation dropped sharply: in 1947, 681 copies of the Autumn issue were sold in this way, in 1949, 425, in 1952, 244, and from 1953 to 1955 bookshop sales are no longer included in the circulation reports. However, from a contradictory and perhaps doctored report dated March 3, 1953, dealing with figures from 1944 to 1953, it appears that bookshop sales climbed rather steadily from an average of 250 in 1944 to an average of 950 in 1952.⁶²

Even so, the Rockefeller Foundation--for whom the boosted report probably was meant--had changed its ideas about the optimum circulation of literary magazines and had become dissatisfied with the Kenyon's figures. John Marshall and his fellow officers urged the Kenyon to raise its circulation, and on September 16, 1952 Rice sent a long letter to his friend Edward D'Arms, which contained and explained "the figures in which you expressed an interest, on the amount of increase in circulation which would enable the Review to become self-supporting." Summing up after considerable figure-juggling, Rice wrote rashly that it looked "as though a permanent increase in circulation of 1,500-2,000 copies (in addition to Magazines Abroad [Intercultural Publications Inc.] subscriptions) would make us self-sup[p]orting." The editors hoped that the prospect of their future independence would result in immediate financial assistance for extensive advertising campaigns, but the Foundation was not fooled. So, by February 1953 the editors again expressed "doubts . . . as to whether magazines like the Kenyon Review can be made wholly self-supporting from circulation and advertising." Continued financial assistance would remain indispensable, they now argued, for magazines like The Kenyon Review, "even though they are not avant-garde or wildly 'experimental', exist in order to be on the frontiers of literary and critical effort; they

must always be receptive to writing that appeals initially to a limited public.⁵³ As, on the other hand, it seemed to the editors that an increase in circulation would decrease the deficit, they wholeheartedly welcomed the willingness the Foundation had expressed after all to help with their promotional activities.

As the Foundation felt it would be more sensible and economical to aid a group of magazines jointly, rather than to aid each of them separately, they convened a meeting with the Hudson, Partisan, Sewanee and Kenyon reviews on March 12, 1953. After the official meeting, the editors of the 'Four Reviews' continued the discussion on their own and Rice was delegated to report their conclusions to the Rockefeller Foundation. As their projected promotion campaign involved \$12,000.00 per magazine, the Foundation promptly decided not to pursue this plan any further.

Their decision was made notwithstanding Rice's references to the British Times Literary Supplement, which had repeatedly commented with envy upon the major role of the serious literary magazines in America. Indeed, the attention lavished on the American literary reviews in the foreign, and especially the British press was unprecedented. For instance, in 1952 The Times Literary Supplement reported that "[t]oday there is a remarkable body of criticism in America and the work of the youngest generation which finds its way into such journals as Partisan Review, the Kenyon Review and the Sewanee Review is of a very high level." A year later, the same paper lamented that there was "no equivalent . . . in this country for American literary magazines like The Kenyon Review or Hudson Review." And in 1954 it noted that if "by numbers of subscribers" and "[j]udged commercially" these reviews were 'negligible,' they were indispensable in that "[l]acking the outlets

7. Literature and the Arts (1947-1955)

they provide, the unconventional poet or story-writer, who, as it is, meets difficulty and delay enough in getting a hearing, would find the attainment of that hearing harder still." In that same year, 1954, in the British periodical Twentieth Century, William Newman stated that "America . . . can . . . be proud of its literary reviews. . . . In one respect at least the American reviews live up to the standard of the French: their approach is cosmopolitan and catholic." The interest in the foreign press was more than equalled at home. In 1950, the New York Herald Tribune called The Kenyon Review "the literary quarterly that is one of the most respected in the field;" in 1958 the Nashville Banner noted that the Kenyon had "achieved an international reputation as a journal of the arts;" and in that same year Time described it as "one of the nation's best and healthiest quarterlies."⁶⁴ Within twenty years of its birth, The Kenyon Review had left an indelible mark on letters and learning at home and abroad.

The Institutionalization of the Quarterlies

The encomiums on the Kenyon and other literary reviews were for a little while free from false notes. After the battle about the Bollingen Prize had been won, the highbrow magazines confidently and as a matter of course further consolidated their grip on the literary world. Foundations now seemed to gain prestige from the reviews they subsidized rather than the other way about. The reviews no longer had to defend themselves against the charges of the early forties when their New Critical contributors were accused of "new barbarism" and were challenged to demonstrate that they were "of real importance in the literary life of the nation." They had become the acknowledged leaders of the literary world. The times worked very much in their favour. Much of the criticism these magazines published was not politically oriented and therefore safe and ideally suited to the cold war atmosphere of the fifties. Criticism, and particularly the New Criticism, had never had it so good.¹

However, the monopoly position the reviews and their critics held in the literary world, which had now become largely centred in the universities, turned out to be self-destroying. Respectability, institutionalization, and a concomitant professionalism generally made for staid and academic, rather than for fresh and vital criticism. The first grumblings to be heard in the fifties against the reviews no longer came from the middlebrows, but either from original writers inside the universities, such as Randall Jarrell, or from independent writers outside the academic world, such as Kenneth Rexroth. Primarily

8. Decline (1955-1960)

a poet, but also a critic out of the common run, Jarrell complained, in his comic but contentious "The Age of Criticism," about the overpowering predominance of criticism and the quarterlies. A great deal of the criticism published in the reviews, Jarrell wrote, "might just as well have been written by a syndicate of encyclopedias for an audience of International Business Machines. It is not only bad or mediocre, it is dull; it is, often, an astonishingly graceless, joyless, humorless, long-winded, niggling, blinkered, methodical, self-important, cliché-ridden, prestige-obsessed, almost-autonomous criticism." Kenneth Rexroth, rugged individualist and anti-academic to the backbone, concentrating on the sorry state of poetry in America, commented in 1952 that "[o]nly some aged crone . . . telling her beads would read anybody like the people who appear in the Kenyon & Partisan Reviews."²

By the late fifties the reviews came in for severe criticism from all quarters once again, but now for the last time, as their rapidly waning influence subsequently kept them out of the literary limelight. In a 1960 article in The Nation, Barry Spacks slated "the Great Apathy of the Moment," described the Kenyon as one of the "bulwarks of respectability," noted the diminishing influence of the literary reviews, and blamed this on their having become "robust academic playthings." Granville Hicks also was bothered by "the stamp of the academy" on the literary magazines. The impression Robert Phelps had of the reviews in 1963 was "tutored, tame, and shaved at the armpits. The tone is middle-aged, proper, sober, professional." Phelps too thought that the "most obvious reason for this situation" was "the proximity of ivy-covered walls." Speaking of the "Declining Fortunes of the Literary Review: 1945-1957," William Barrett, who as early as 1946 had warned

against the dangers of a close association with the academy, wrote their somewhat premature epitaph in remarking that the academic "knows that Bohemia belongs to the past, that modern society has closed down on it, and that the literary review, which once drew its sustenance from that quarter, is no longer possible."³

Unlike earlier complaints these charges contained more truths than untruths. In the case of The Kenyon Review the change to a duller, staidier state can be dated from about 1956. Like the other magazines it had lost much of its individuality. The "Four Reviews" had grown more and more alike over the years, to such an extent that they were eventually written down, with some reason, as "a single clique" with "a very undesirable amount of inbreeding." One factor that caused the decline of the reviews is that there was little left to fight for. With respect to criticism, the quarterlies had so much capitalized on the "congenial literary spirit in the M.L.A.," which Ransom had detected in 1938, that they had rendered themselves almost redundant. Even PMLA now published criticism rather than bio-bibliographical articles. Not scholarship but the publication of criticism had become the yardstick for a successful university career. And whereas in the late thirties hardly any outlets for serious criticism existed, from the mid-fifties the market was overcrowded with new academic critical reviews. By 1956 The Kenyon Review, one of the "conventional quarterlies," had played out its role as a pioneer in the field of criticism; the battle against the old-style scholars had been won and the defeated had enthusiastically become reconstructed and regenerate.⁴

But there were also internal reasons for the particular decline of the Kenyon. In 1949, when he was about to leave for Bloomington, Indiana, Ransom had remarked to Robert Lowell that he wanted "to get

8. Decline (1955-1960)

away from KR completely for a while for fear I'm growing too stale." And when about a year later there was serious talk of his staying on at Indiana University, he confessed to Tate that he would not "mind dropping the editorship in favor of doing more writing at this stage," adding, though, that this was "not an objective."⁵ Paul Mellon's gift of \$8,000.00 secured Ransom's return to Kenyon College and The Kenyon Review. His sabbatical had been beneficial; for the next few years the Kenyon maintained its standard of superior writing.

Slowly, however, cracks began to appear. Ransom reached his sixty-fifth birthday in 1953 and was getting tired of teaching and editing. The usual retirement age at Kenyon College was sixty-eight and in July 1955 Ransom admitted to Richard Blackmur to being "afraid my President won't carry on KR beyond my own tenure." In the same letter, however, Ransom mentioned that very early in 1955 Chalmers had asked him "to carry on for two years more if we get set up by the [Rockefeller] Foundation for another triennium starting in the fall." Replying to Chalmers' request on January 18, Ransom had insisted that he could not make a definite decision yet. In November Ransom spelled out three conditions upon which his acceptance of a possible renewed contract for two more years hinged: secretarial aid was a "must item;" besides, the contributors' rates and the Kenyon's size should remain unchanged to "ensure that the Review [would] not be cheapened." Chalmers, who knew that the "secret of the Kenyon Review is John Crowe Ransom," was wholly willing to grant these three wishes.⁶

By this time, too, the Rockefeller Foundation had promised to renew its Fellowship grants, so that financially at least the last few years of Ransom's editorship would be easy. As usual, the Rockefeller renewal had not been plain sailing. In September, after much to and fro,

8. Decline (1955-1960)

Ransom still had not heard from the Foundation, so he tried a little blackmail. "I am obliged to say, in confidence," he warned Marshall, "that if this request fails, the Review will not continue beyond the Winter number now being planned." Although the Trustees liked "the public notice which [the Kenyon] has given of the college," they were "pinching pennies very tightly" and, Ransom predicted, would not subsidize the magazine beyond "paying the salaries of the Editor and Associate Editor, as always, and supplying us with offices and some perquisites for the job." He had "some writing projects long overdue," but was "accustomed to work so much out of [his] editorial experience, with the constant stimuli which come in there," that he would "like to keep that up." In view of the fact that, as Louis D. Rubin so aptly put it, Marshall was "the honeycomb and Mr. Blackmur . . . the lion," Ransom's final, diplomatic argument may have been decisive: "we are publishing authors like Richard Blackmur who depends on us as his outlet, and we are keeping a number of valuable balls in the air by way of some topics of artistic and cultural interest which we revert to again and again. This will explain why I should wish most of all if I keep on professionally for a few years to keep to the old base of operations."⁷

At the end of 1955 the Rockefeller Foundation decided to grant \$52,200.00 to The Kenyon Review. The stipends for married and unmarried Fellows were raised to \$4,000.00 and \$2,700.00 respectively, but the Kenyon received only \$4,000.00 instead of \$4,800.00 a year for expenses. In accordance with a request by Chalmers, who pointed out that Ransom had decided to retire at the end of the academic year 1957-1958, the Foundation fixed on June, rather than on December 1958 as the termination date of the Fellowships. With Ransom almost free from

8. Decline (1955-1960)

teaching from June 1956 onwards, it looked as if The Kenyon Review, now financially safe, could sail smoothly until Ransom's retirement.

But soon the first blow fell. On January 3, 1956, Rice, having left home in an overwrought state of mind, was seriously injured in a traffic accident. He seemed to be recovering, but suffered a sudden relapse and died on January 25 at the age of 52.⁸ In numerous letters Ransom wrote of his grief and despondency about Rice's death. Kenyon's Spring 1956 number contained Rice's epitaph, written by Ransom:

PHILIP BLAIR RICE, Associate Editor of the Kenyon Review died on January 25 last, in his fifty-second year. He had helped in the launching of the periodical, and his wisdom and energy had been invaluable throughout its history. . . .

At Kenyon he organized and administered the philosophical curriculum so well that his department became one of the best in the nation at the collegiate level; and his pupils often went on to be welcomed in the best graduate schools, and at length to be philosophers themselves. There was a wonderful scruple in his intellectual handling of ideas, and a grace and clarity almost unmatched among his contemporaries in philosophy when it came to expressing them. . . .

His interest in aesthetics was both cause and effect, perhaps, of a certain breadth of view which will have appeared, as I imagine, in these pages. There were not many persons who knew so much about so many arts. But unquestionably his favorite art was

literature, and in literature his favorite genre was fiction. He wrote well and freely for the Review. But there were many other functions which he performed superbly. Probably the best working rule ever adopted in this office was the one prescribing that a manuscript had to be approved by both the Editor and the Associate Editor before it could be accepted for publication.

So the Editor of this Review, and its readers too, have suffered a loss indeed.⁹

Ransom was not the only one to grieve. Lifelong friends, such as Joseph Sagmaster, philosophers such as Henry David Aiken and Van Meter Ames, and many of his former students, such as Walter Elder, Kermit Lansner, Robie Macauley, David McDowell, Walter Southard, and Edwin Watkins, sent their sincere condolences to Kathryn Rice. Robert Lowell, also a former student, wrote to her of Ransom's "talking about the 'High-powered' man he had discovered to edit the Review with him." He recalled "handing in a paper, wild, illegible and foolish, which proposed that the different philosophies differed only poetically and were all equally valid, like Shakespeare's plays. And Phil despaired and gave me an A- for time spent, his time, I guess, trying to decypher my handwriting and lack of logic." Lowell also remembered his last meeting with Rice, in 1955, when they "talked over all the old subjects . . . Phil's growlers and joking subjects: President Chalmers, Hillyer, Thomist philosophers . . . and so on." Chalmers himself, Rice's opponent in many heated arguments, spoke to the point of "the force of his strong feeling, whenever he fought for principles in which he

8. Decline (1955-1960)

steadfastly believed, and whenever he though[t] a friend had been wronged," of "the speed of his distinguished and brilliant mind," but also of his "abrupt and sometimes curt manner."¹⁰

Within four months of Rice's death Chalmers died of cerebral hemorrhage on May 8, 1956, likewise at the age of 52. On the occasion of Chalmers' death Austin Warren wrote to Ransom: "About him, I felt--like you, I dare say--quite mixed. He held the right principles, but held them too lightly and slickly."¹¹ Indeed, in most of the numerous disagreements between the editors and Chalmers the former had had justice on their side. But then Chalmers had constantly found himself in a dilemma. On the one hand, the Trustees were after him because he spent too much money and procured too little from foundations and such; and on the other hand, the editors--and others--found him mean and closefisted. Chalmers may have evoked mixed feelings in most of the people he dealt with, but his accomplishments are undeniable. In the less than twenty years of his Presidency he had put Kenyon College on the map, not in the least by his creation and continued, if sometimes less than half-hearted, support of The Kenyon Review.

Chalmers' death came as a shock to Ransom, but it was not one that deeply touched his inmost self. Charles Coffin's sudden death, on July 20, 1956, did. Over the years Coffin, Ransom's nearest neighbour, had become his "best friend," who did not only share his passion for literature, but also his delight in gardening and bridge. 'Within six months we lost Rice, Chalmers, and Coffin, a very dreary record," Ransom wrote to Robert Penn Warren in one of those characteristic emotional understatements of his. I can't feel that the place is quite the same without them. And I guess of the three that I was closest to Charles."¹² But these losses were not all. Ransom himself had been in

ill health for some time. He suffered from vertigo, which forced him to give up golf and made travelling very unpleasant. Quite apart from the purely practical fact that Ransom now had to do all the Kenyon work on his own, he clearly had little energy and enthusiasm left for editing his magazine creatively.

The Search for a Successor

In 1946 Ransom had sensibly declared that when "the editorial impulse is spent, it seems altogether a mistaken piety to try to 'keep the magazine alive,' as if there were a virtue in the business. It is time then to let nature take its course." But he did not obey his own credo. While at his retirement the Kenyon could have died an easy, natural death, desperate attempts were made to keep it alive artificially. The new President of Kenyon College, Franze Edward Lund, who had been appointed because of his financial acumen rather than because of his scholarship, understood the promotional value of the magazine for the College and was all for its continuance. Ransom himself was in two minds about terminating The Kenyon Review. On the one hand, he told Robert Penn Warren and other friends that this was "the time to discontinue the magazine;" on the other hand, when the Kenyon's final hour drew near, he could not stand by and watch it die and he sedulously searched for an editor to succeed him.¹³

Initially, this had seemed to be easy enough. In 1953 Ransom had made Peter Taylor an advisory editor in fiction. He was a Kenyon graduate, who had left Tennessee to study under Ransom, and who had already made a name for himself as the writer of subtly ironic, extremely well-made Tennessean stories when he became a member of the

8. Decline (1955-1960)

English department at Kenyon College in 1952. In a 1981 telephone-interview Taylor emphasized that he had been made an advisory editor because of his easy accessibility and that Ransom had hardly ever consulted him—in short, that this position had been merely honorary. He remembered having read only a dozen stories or so during the five years he lived in Gambier. Unknown to Taylor, Ransom had not made him an advisory editor for the benefit of his advice only. A memo written by Chalmers in June 1953 reveals that Ransom had Taylor in mind as his successor already then, and had put him on the staff so that he could familiarize himself with the Kenyon, and its readers could get used to his name on the masthead.¹⁴

After Rice's and Chalmers' deaths Ransom offered the editorship, as planned, to Peter Taylor. A letter written by Taylor on March 17, 1957, in which he confides to his friend Randall Jarrell that he had "agreed to become the editor of *The Review* when Mr. Ransom retires," reveals Ransom's preference for a change in editorial policy. "Please don't laugh," Taylor wrote, "Mr. Ransom and everyone else concerned has urged me to take it over and . . . to make a different sort of magazine of it—which means one devoted almost entirely to fiction and poetry and plays. . . . I really tried to get out of doing this. . . . But their pressure and my own vanity and ugly ambition and the thought that a lot of it would be really fun decided me finally to do it."¹⁵

Soon Taylor "decided that editing *The Review* would interfere with [his] own writing" and declined after all, perhaps partly because he was "more or less turned out of his house by the Acting President" of Kenyon College, Frank Bailey. Weary of it all, Ransom, on July 3, 1957, wrote a letter to Robert Penn Warren which once again shows his contradictory feelings about the Kenyon's continuance:

I believe it means that KR will go out after the Spring issue next year, just before my final retirement. No use going on just to be going, especially in a field (more of less 'new' criticism, which has now decayed in the editorial sense, its fight being won and tucked away) that doesn't have the interest or urgency it had 19 years ago. What we would have done would have been to make Peter the editor . . . of a KR devoted to new fiction, theatre, and poetry, with just enough reviews and essays to keep the reader up; I think it might have been something very distinguished.¹⁶

Yet, remarks such as "I'd rather it broke up, than be inferior" notwithstanding, Ransom had been "casting up accounts" of competent people in a restless search for a successor and had consulted friends whose literary judgement he trusted, such as Eric Bentley, R.P. Blackmur, Francis Fergusson, Allen Tate, and Robert Penn Warren. He asked Tate, whose advice, as always, he valued most, what he thought of Murray Krieger, indicating that his own "fear would be that he might have still too academic a mind." On October 2, 1957 he told Tate that he was "very grateful" for Tate's confirmation of his fears about Krieger and for his suggestion of Robie Macauley. He added that Taylor, whom he had telephoned in the meantime, had seconded Tate's suggestion of Macauley, his fellow-student at Kenyon College, but that he had also agreed with Ransom that John Thompson, another fellow-student and a close friend of Robert Lowell's, "would be quite a fine stroke." "And my feeling is a little more for Jack [John Thompson] than for Robie,"

Ransom confessed.¹⁷

Thompson, who had contributed five poems to The Kenyon Review, had "a better critical head . . . than Robie," Ransom explained two weeks later. "I have always felt that Robie is one of the best technical critics, but commonplace . . . in the categories to which he submits the arts in the last resort. I'd look for a little more elevation (and style) in Jack's judgments." But he would "back either one of them" over and above two other writers Tate had newly mentioned, Howard Nemerov and William Jay Smith. Ransom did not really know Smith and he "thought Howard . . . a little foolish in finding his praise for Lolita, Nabokov's naughty novel that I had found pretty pointless (Howard reviewed it for us)."¹⁸

Ransom met Thompson for an interview, but, Ransom wrote to Tate in October, "he wasn't as impressive on the intellectual level as I had hoped." He mentioned Karl Shapiro, whom Robert Penn Warren had suggested as early as 1955, and Joseph Frank, but confessed that he was not happy with these two either. He concluded with a remark that was a complete contradiction of his earlier opinions. "Most of all I would like to feel that a real critic, having force, would be in charge," Ransom now wrote. "I suppose there is a good place for a merely 'literary' Review, especially centered upon the actual printing of much contemporary fiction, theatre, and verse, edited by a man who knows his literature; i.e. one with very high 'standards'. But I can't think that's the best; I wonder if it would even be the most interesting thing."¹⁹ Ransom was to change his opinion about a critical as opposed to a literary Kenyon Review time and again.

Meanwhile President Lund had left Ransom a message saying that he was determined to let the Kenyon continue. The first thing Ransom did

on receiving this note was to send off a letter to Newton P. Stallknecht, Director of the School of Letters, who, on behalf of Indiana University, had expressed an interest in taking over The Kenyon Review, informing him of the President's decision. There were other interested parties. Immediately after his official instalment on October 4, 1957 Lund had received unsolicited advice from Russell Kirk, who wrote that he would be sorry to have The Kenyon Review "vanish utterly," and that, should "dissolution be imminent, perhaps some consolidation with Modern Age [a quarterly review which he had just started] might be effected, Modern Age completing existing subscriptions and continuing some Kenyon connection."²⁰

Lund assured Kirk that he was 'firmly determined not to let the publication die,' and invited his suggestions. He confessed: "I have tried to read two or three copies and . . . it is quite incomprehensible to me. Naturally I am terrifically impressed, but I have also the sneaking impression . . . that what we may have is a case of the 'emperor's clothes.'" Kirk subsequently showered Lund with suggestions, sending him an extensive letter about every two weeks. Ransom's adverse review of his The Conservative Mind (1953) explains, perhaps, Kirk's vengeful description of the Kenyon's contents: "Kenyon Review in its present form . . . represents a literary vogue of twenty years since--and so is something of a bug in amber. . . . Rather an acid note has crept into the Kenyon Review these several years past; and though Ransom tries to be liberally-minded, the odds are that an essay representing his own present left-liberal sentiments will obtain preference over one representing his earlier agrarian and theistic views." Kirk's first two candidates for the editorship were both Southerners, Thomas Henry Carter, the founder and first editor of

Shenandoah, and Richard A. Weaver, the author of the conservative treatise Ideas Have Consequences (1948).²¹

As Lund found the succession "too important a matter to accept just one man's [Ransom's] recommendation," he had set up a committee consisting of Ransom, Denham Sutcliffe of the English department, and himself.²² They regularly consulted together, but it is clear from memos and the extensive relevant correspondence that Ransom dominated these meetings and had the final say. Moreover, he took suggestions from his literary friends, and Tate in particular, much more seriously than those made by the other two members of the committee. Ransom wanted Tate's considered opinion of every possibility he proposed. On November 5, 1957, for instance, in a letter to Tate again expressing his doubts about Joseph Frank, who was recommended whole-heartedly by Richard Blackmur, Francis Fergusson, and others, as well as about Robie Macauley, he came up with a new name, Randall Jarrell, the only candidate after Taylor he endorsed, if with reservations:

I have said to the old President, and the present one too, that Jarrell is too polemical and stylistically too journalistic and personally too fond of his enemies (of having enemies) to be acceptable. But right now I'm inclined to think he might be the right man for our unusual situation. His way of life in a small community would make a riffle, and there would be many incidents, but . . . I have yet to find in Jarrell a lack of courage or of principle. I've always respected him for the way he will pitch into a question which puts the Jew at a disadvantage; even though he might pass for a

Gentile if he kept quiet; and of course for his readiness to fight for unpopular causes, which indeed, being aggressive on principle, he rather enjoys. Now Randall has a great journalistic or publicist flair, and in the main it is directed against the Philistines. He is more or less sensational. And yet he showed enormous scruple and loyalty to a going institution during that year when he replaced Miss M[a]rshall on the Nation. . . . I hate to pester you with our problem so much, but you are the statesman and strategist for us all in these matters.²³

A November 23 memo of conversations Ransom had with Lund and Sutcliffe lists Macauley and Jarrell, but not Frank, and suggests that Tate, too, had doubted the latter's editorial abilities. Other new possibilities mentioned in this memo were the established novelist and critic of fiction, Albert J. Guerard, the poet Donald Hall, whom Ransom found too young and too little known, and Stanley Edgar Hyman, "enfant terrible," but of "prodigious energies and (increasingly) learning." Howard Nemerov, whom Tate had proposed in October, also appears on this list. It is apparent from a letter written to Tate on this same day that Tate had not only disapproved of Frank but of Jarrell too. It also is clearly apparent from this letter, that Jarrell was Ransom's favourite still, even if Ransom submitted for Tate's consideration the new possibilities of Guerard and Hyman, as well as, again, Macauley and Nemerov.²⁴

Ransom had expected Lund to be pleased with Jarrell, but, initially, this was not the case at all. In giving his ideas about the

8. Decline (1955-1960)

two candidates who were most seriously considered at this point, Macauley and Jarrell, Lund wrote to Ransom on November 26, 1957 that because of Ransom's "high regard" for Jarrell he had "tried to stifle [his] original hostility," but had not been able to "escape the conclusion that he must be at least personally, a very silly fellow." In an attempt to be helpful, Lund further mixed up matters by mentioning Carlos Baker and John W. Dodds as well as Kirk's suggestions of Thomas Henry Carter and Richard A. Weaver. Meanwhile, at Lund's request, Jacques Barzun and Lionel Trilling had also discussed "persons and qualifications;" they suggested Joseph Frank, Robert Lowell, Leslie Fiedler, and Richard Chase. Kirk had been contemplating further and on December 10 recommended Monroe Spears, the editor of The Sewanee Review, Anthony Harridges, "an experienced editor . . . and an intelligent conservative," Louis Rubin, founder and editor of "the late lamented" Hopkins Review, Nicholas Joost, former managing editor of Poetry and "a good critic," and Edward McClellan, who had helped Kirk with Modern Age. He supplemented these suggestions with a detailed description of the general policy The Kenyon Review should follow; his ideal Kenyon came down to a very conservative foil to Partisan Review.²⁵

The reader of the Presidential correspondence has the definite sense that the matter had already taken up too much of Lund's valuable time, but Kirk continued to submit new names, among them Donald Davidson and Allen Tate: "Either would make an admirable editor, but I doubt if you could detach them from their present haunts." To nominate Davidson and Tate had come as an afterthought to Kirk's mentioning them as possible informants about Joseph Frank, whom Kirk hardly knew. On reconsideration, on February 9, Kirk had come to the rather paranoid

conclusion that the fact that Barzun, Blackmur, and Trilling had concurred in commending Frank, a regular contributor to Partisan Review, might be "an endeavor . . . to establish two Partisan Reviews, one at Kenyon College." Having earlier described the "Partisan Review set" as "a tight and sour coterie intent upon setting up an intellectual hegemony in America," and as "disillusioned, disappointed, bitter, and substantially nihilistic," Kirk clearly meant to sound a serious warning.²⁶

All this advice, however, was no longer needed. Ransom had already sent out invitations to Jarrell, of whose worth he apparently had been able to convince Lund, and, against all expectation, to Nemerov--and not Macauley--, asking them whether they wanted to be considered for the editorship. Both were willing and Nemerov immediately wrote to Tate, who had first proposed him, that he was "much moved, as well as honored, that you and Ransom should think of me in this connexion." Although it now seemed to be merely a matter of choosing between Jarrell and Nemerov, Ransom felt obliged to give Lund his reaction to the men newly proposed by Barzun and Trilling. "Does Joseph Frank know how to address himself, or his periodical, to the general reader?', he wondered, implying that Frank did not. And if Leslie Fiedler had "magnificent qualifications," he also was an "egotist, to a pathological extent," and therefore not suitable. Ransom also objected to Richard Chase, who was "a good literary man without any disqualifications" except for the fact that he was "not extremely good." This left Robert Lowell, who, "but for the question of his [mental] health," would be "the very best man living for the Review."²⁷

On January 3, 1958 Lund told Kirk that "out of respect to the very real father of the Review, John Ransom" he had committed himself "to a

joint decision." "Currently," he continued, "we have met Nemerov and eliminated him." To his surprise, Randall Jarrell, whom he had just interviewed, "while eccentric, . . . [had] lacked being either a poseur or a terrible-tempered Mr. Bang. . . . He was soft-spoken, reticent even, earnest, erudite, and sweetly reasonable."²⁸ Some three weeks later Ransom wrote apologetically to Tate:

I hope you won't be too much dismayed at our settling finally for Randall Jarrell as the man. . . .

He has far more personal force than Nemerov, though we thought Nemerov would do a good job. . . .

I'd better add that the President takes the line that we have got a man whom we have confidence in, and will not interfere with; and that was certainly my own line. It is not expected that Randall will run the Review as it has been run, but as he wants to run it, and his ideas indicate that he has a good idea of how that will be. . . . I think that after our 20 years it is time for the Review to drop the technical emphasis on criticism and put forward the poems and bits of theatre and the fictions that come up in our time for themselves, with a critical background of general humanism. . . . There will be in the content perhaps a little more the sense of addressing the general but literate reader.²⁹

It took Jarrell nearly two weeks to make up his mind and then he declined. Although he was very much aware "what an honor and

responsibility it would be to try to take Mr. Ransom's place," he had "a good many reasons" to refuse. "[I]t would interfere too much with my own writing and general peace of mind," Jarrell wrote to Lund on February 5, 1958. "I shouldn't be able to do the right kind of job because I don't feel enough sympathy with most of the criticism and poetry I would have to like, I'm afraid."³⁰ As Ransom and Lund now had set their hearts on Jarrell, Ransom telephoned him and wrote to him, begging him to reconsider. But Jarrell stuck to his rejection.

On February 14, Ransom, who had had enough and just wanted to get the succession over with, proposed Macauley to Lund in a letter airily waiving his former serious objections.

I think Robie Macauley is the best next man perhaps. Tate and others suggested him right off, when I first began to write round. He is wise and thoroughly experienced, an excellent critic (not given to extreme commitments but forceful and knowing); a pretty good fiction writer who has just begun to get a lot better; and a person universally admired and liked. He is a fine man, and he has a fine wife (from Memphis) and small son. He is a very tall lean dark man (from Michigan originally) with a mighty bright eye. You can't make him say or agree to foolish things. And he is a Kenyon man, as much as Taylor or Lowell or Jarrell. . . . I think he would be glad to come to Kenyon as an editor.³¹

Lund was in no mind to argue any more either and Macauley was

8. Decline (1955-1960)

invited to come up to Gambier for an interview. "Would you be interested in succeeding this editor on the Kenyon Review?" Ransom wrote to him on February 20. Because "the new criticism is the old criticism," Ransom suggested that the "saving course" for the Kenyon might be "a halfway-between position . . . with . . . criticism . . . along with a larger body of creative writing." Ransom, Lund, and Sutcliffe met Macauley at the beginning of March. The matter was settled at once. On March 11, 1958 Lund offered him

the combined position of Associate Professor of English and Editor of the Kenyon Review--to succeed Mr. John Crowe Ransom on or before July 1, 1959. This appointment will be effective June 30, 1958, and you would be on technical leave-of-absence from Kenyon July 1, 1958 to July 1, 1959--during which time Mr. Ransom will carry on.³²

Macauley's beginning salary would be \$8,000.00 per year, in addition to housing at the expense of Kenyon College, that is, \$1,000.00 less than Ransom was earning. Macauley accepted by return of post. The hitch in Macauley's appointment was that he had just received the Fellowship in Fiction for 1958 and had already made arrangements to spend that year abroad by the time he was approached for the editorship. President Lund therefore had to give him leave of absence and Ransom wearily consented to keep the Kenyon going for another year.

In Kenyon's Spring 1958 issue it was announced that Robie Macauley was elected the Kenyon's next editor and that Edgar Bogardus was to assist him as managing editor. Bogardus, Kenyon graduate and Kenyon

Review Fellow in Poetry for 1955, had been an instructor in English at Kenyon College since September 1956. Charles Coffin and Ransom had recruited him with the notion already in their minds of having him appointed managing editor after Ransom's retirement, provided he suited the new editor, of course. Eventually Macauley had no choice but to be satisfied with Bogardus, as due to the fact that the selection procedure was taking much longer than expected, Bogardus had been employed in his new job since February. "They should make a good team," Ransom informed John Marshall on April 14, 1958. 'They are knowing about literature generally, and versed in contemporary letters. Both write criticism, and Macauley is a writer of novels and short stories, while Bogardus is a poet, so that their special interests should complement one another.' At any rate, Ransom would have Bogardus, whom he thought highly of, to help him out during Macauley's absence. Moreover, Bogardus would come to know the ropes of editing, so that he, in his turn, could break in Macauley. But this was not to be as Bogardus died on May 11, 1958. A week later, Irving Kreutz, another member of the English department and as the writer of two plays particularly interested in the theatre, was hurriedly appointed managing editor. "His duties on the magazine," the Kenyon Alumni Bulletin reported, "include acting as first reader, soliciting advertising and new subscriptions, and collaborating with the editor, John Crowe Ransom, on policy and production matters."³³ Ransom's opinion of Kreutz as managing editor may be gathered from his preference for Bogardus, although Kreutz had been at Kenyon longer and was Bogardus' senior.

Ransom's correspondence at this time shows crystal clear that he was fed up and worn out by all the troubles and misfortunes and simply

8. Decline (1955-1960)

served out his sentence of an extra year. "This is my last year in the harness, and I am getting mighty willing to take to the pasture," Ransom had written to Andrew Lytle in August 1957, before he knew he would have to shoulder the Kenyon's burden for another year. The last few months of that year were the heaviest. When it appeared that Macauley would not be on duty till late August 1959, Ransom complained in uncharacteristically strong language that he was "mighty fagged out" and that keeping "the home fires burning about seven weeks after my retirement waiting for Robie . . . was a chore."³⁴

Ransom was now completely lacking in editorial initiative. This was not only because he was weary, but also because, knowing that Macauley was going to edit the Kenyon along different lines, he did not see any point in looking for new contributors, or in developing new projects. Moreover, every time Ransom had thought the next few issues were to be his last, he had felt obliged to use up the accepted manuscripts indiscriminately, so as not to prejudice the performance of the next editor. For this reason alone, Ransom had been rejecting many excellent unsolicited poems, stories, and essays. When it seemed, against earlier expectations, that Ransom would have to get out the Summer 1958 issue, too, he asked Blackmur and other contributors of long standing to submit some "very choice things to leaven the rather indifferent items, at least several in number, which I stirred up from the bottom of the barrel."³⁵ Finally, when Macauley returned later than planned from Europe, Ransom even had to get out the Autumn 1959 issue.

This issue marked the definitive end of Ransom's twenty-one years of editing The Kenyon Review. For its five final issues, rather than overexert himself looking for fresh blood and also because he did not

want to break the editorial continuity of Kenyon's "Old Phase," Ransom again turned to faithful contributors such as Blackmur and Burke. On November 10, 1958, before Ransom knew he would have to edit the Autumn 1959 issue too, he had written to Blackmur: "We'd like RPB in Winter, Spring, and Summer if we can; after that I'm a retired man. I speak casually, but you know how strongly I want this, desiring to leave the office with a bang not a whimper."³⁶ Blackmur and Burke appeared no less than three times each in these five issues, as did Paul Goodman and Richard Stern. Yet it was with a whimper rather than resoundingly that Ransom's Kenyon ended.

Criticism

For years The Kenyon Review had been the leading magazine among the critical quarterlies, all of which, partly because of their having become institutionalized, had gradually grown flat and vapid. Now the Kenyon suffered from additional troubles such as sudden deaths, age, retirement, and the time-consuming problem of finding a successor, so that it actually started to lag behind its competitors. To discuss its contents during this period is to expose its spiritless state. Most of the important critical articles which loyal contributors had submitted in the last years before Ransom's retirement have already been treated in a previous chapter, including all of William Empson's essays. Richard Ellmann, Francis Fergusson, Paul Goodman, Stanley Edgar Hyman, Richard W.B. Lewis, and Arthur Mizener each submitted only one or two more pieces which deserve consideration.

Richard Ellmann's illuminating, though in parts too ingenious essay "Wallace Stevens' Ice-Cream" appeared in the Winter 1957 issue.

8. Decline (1955-1960)

According to Ellmann the essay differed "from previous work in that it re-interprets some of his more famous poems and tries to penetrate his work through his conception of death rather than of imagination." The lead article of this same issue was Fergusson's critical credo, entitled "The Human Image," which served as the introductory essay to his book The Human Image in Dramatic Literature (1957). Paul Goodman acclaimed Marius Bewley's important book The Eccentric Design (1959) and his account of "A Visit to Chartres" appeared in Ransom's final issue. Kenneth Burke thought Hyman's long Autumn 1957 review of Literary Criticism (1957) by Cleanth Brooks and William K. Wimsatt "quite a good job," and Ransom found R.W.B. Lewis' Winter 1957 essay about "The Fiction of Graham Greene" "first rate." Arthur Mizener contributed an omnibus fiction review to that year's Summer issue.³⁷

There is more to tell about two other old-time contributors, Richard Blackmur and Kenneth Burke. Blackmur published an article on Emily Dickinson, "Emily Dickinson's Notation," in Kenyon's Spring 1956 issue. In September 1955 Ransom had asked him with respect to the Winter 1956 number: "If it's a final issue, or otherwise, we'll want Blackmur in it. . . . I know what I'd like: a long note or essay on the new Johnson performance [The Poems of Emily Dickinson, ed. Thomas H. Johnson (1955) and Thomas H. Johnson, Emily Dickinson: An Interpretative Biography (1955)] with Dickinson." He added persuasively: "Won't you have to post yourself on that anyhow, in deference to your profession?" Blackmur could not "resist the trap" Ransom had set. As usual, though, he was late in submitting copy and therefore had to be put off until Spring. Blackmur did not mind at all and suggested that he write an essay instead of a review. "Please give me as much time as you can . . . and let me know the date," he wrote on

January 11, 1956, adding that he very much wanted to see the piece on Dickinson Ransom was writing for James Laughlin's magazine Perspectives USA. "My own thought has been running on Emily as the archetype and usufruct of all New-England shut-ins," he continued. Ransom, knowing Blackmur's bent for procrastination, feared that his thoughts would run loose forever and repeatedly pressed him to submit the promised essay in time for the Spring issue. When Blackmur did, Ransom felt that he had wronged him "in being so peremptory about getting . . . that Dickinson essay," but also thought that he had been proved "right, because it came through in good order" and had turned out to be one of Blackmur's "most distinguished writings." Ransom's praise was unwarranted. If "Emily Dickinson's Notation" is slightly less abstruse than many other of Blackmur's later writings and in parts perceptive, the essay does ramble and is full of high-flown, meaningless phrases.³⁸

Blackmur's next contribution was a Winter 1958 review of F.A.C. Wilson, W.B. Yeats and Tradition, under a title, "Obscuris Vera Involvens," which contrary to Kenyon custom with reviews, was probably of his own invention. Blackmur's essay "Ara Coeli and Campidoglio" appeared in the summer of that year and was an impressionistic, sometimes snobbish account of his recent travels in Europe and Japan. For the next issue Blackmur pledged an essay on the plight of the modern intellectual. When he did not finish a satisfactory draft in time, Ransom speculated that the early versions must have seemed "too bold and plain" to Blackmur. The essay was ready for Kenyon's Winter 1959 issue, by which time Blackmur had managed to obfuscate it to his heart's content. Yet, "The Logos in the Catacomb: The Role of the Intellectual" contained some intelligent, provocative pronouncements.³⁹

Blackmur's final article for Ransom's Kenyon also was late. He had

8. Decline (1955-1960)

promised an essay on the poet Edwin Muir for Spring 1959, but by the end of February he still had not handed it in. As nearly always with Blackmur, Ransom was forgiving, apologetic even, rather than angry about his tardiness. "If there's any point in it," he wrote to Blackmur on February 27, "we can happily pay for the essay upon receiving it, any time. And we wouldn't a bit mind having you twice in our pages in one issue if you'd concur." Both payment upon reception instead of upon publication and a contributor's double appearance in one issue were unusual for The Kenyon Review. Obviously, Blackmur was a very special case. Ransom himself suggested that Blackmur review the forthcoming paperback edition of Leon Edel's The Psychological Novel: 1900-1950 to appear simultaneously with his Muir essay. The next day Ransom came up with "another possibility for a review," The Literary Works of Matthew Prior, "which should be a delicious book."⁴⁰

As Edel was a friend of his, Blackmur declined to review his book, but he gladly took up Ransom's second offer. It was to be expected that he would submit his Prior review too late for it to be included in the Summer issue with his "Edwin Muir: Between the Tiger's Paws." Blackmur sent this glowing but abstract defence of a poet, who at that time was still underestimated, on April 29, 1959 with a covering note in which he complained: "I think my quotations are good but I am sorry there are so many of them since you have the abominable policy of not paying for them." Still, he was grateful for Ransom's promise to pay upon reception. "Homo Ludens," Blackmur's laudatory review of the H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears edition of Prior's verse was the very last piece of writing to appear during Ransom's regime. As Blackmur was second only to Ransom himself in the quantity--and most likely, in Ransom's opinion, in the quality too--of his writings for the Kenyon,

it was fitting that "Homo Ludens" was the conclusion to Ransom's Kenyon.⁴¹

If the number of Kenneth Burke's contributions to Ransom's Kenyon Review only came to less than half of Blackmur's, and if Ransom did not constantly think quite as highly of Burke as of Blackmur, Burke, too, remained a highly valued contributor. His sometimes tortuous journeys into the labyrinths of symbolic action, logology, and rhetoric would now attract Ransom keenly, then seemed to him to be going much too far, yet always inspired his respect. And if, in his turn, Burke could not always make out Ransom's true opinion of his work, he valued his judgment so highly that he often tried out new writings on him, always awaiting his verdict "with trepidaysh".⁴² Their voluminous correspondence, which, as few of Ransom's letters to Burke have been preserved, is unfortunately rather one-sided, testifies to this. To listen to Burke thinking out loud in his multi-paged letters is fascinating and fun; to see how over the years Ransom comes more and more to understand Burke and to agree with him, and even, clearly influenced by Burke, comes to write more jauntily is engrossing and exciting.

For example, the correspondence dealing with Burke's Autumn 1957 masterpiece 'The Anaesthetic Revolution of Herone Liddell'--an unclassifiable work, part fantasy, part philosophy, part poetry, full of double and treble meanings, or, in Burke's description, an "Erziehungsnovelle" about a "palpably autobiographical figure . . . who felt as though he had got his balls cut out, and meditated accordingly"--is enjoyable and enlightening. Not knowing "whether to love this thing or loathe it," Burke had submitted his account of Herone's harrowing hospitalization. It is "a grand thing," Ransom

8. Decline (1955-1960)

enthusiastically replied, "and confirms my idea that either I have been growing up to your philosophical problems, or my mind basically is much closer to your mind than I had known." Burke "o'ernipped at the bottle in celebration" and in July 1957 wrote to Ransom: "I am more than happy at your re-assurance that my dear friend Herone's shaydevver [chef d'oeuvre] is to appear this Autumn. The poor guy's ego badly needed patching up, John--and your authoritative charity was just what the doctor ordered. God bless John C.R. and his Kenyon, that may help get Ken out of his canyon." About a month later Ransom informed Burke that the printer had "Herone in charge now. (I think of him as a curious compound, extremely organic, of Hero and Heroin and Tyrone, etc. etc.) But I want to ask you about Liddell, his family moniker. I confess that, getting him packed off to the printer the other day, I finally crossed out the accent on the e, but realize fully that it is necessary only for you to express your wish and it will be restored in the proof. It feels like a small affectation to me. Probably you want to stress the possibility of an L or ell or dell in his make-up. I have felt, myself, that this name stands for his learning, as in Liddell and Scott; he's a highbrow. But you tell me, if you want the accent restored." Burke did not have "strong feelings in the matter" and consented to "leave it so," without the accent. Yet, he had pondered at length about this and other seemingly small matters. Burke explained:

Originally I put [the accent] there because I heard someone pronounce "Liddell" on the first syllable—and I didn't know how prevalent this practice might be. So, just to be safe, I indicated the stress. Later, I began to think that it might have a certain advertising

value, like commercial spellings of brand names, such as kreemee and taystee. Eventually I began to suspect also that perhaps it could be psychoanalyzed. In any case, you are right in your notion that I had the Liddell and Scott Bible in the back of my mind. . . . I also had in mind a remote pun on "little" (so that the name wd. have connotations of "little hero")--and, as I once wrote to [Howard] Nemerov on this point, I thought that, in going out of my way to put the accent on the second syllable, I'd be in the position of one who doth protest too much. Yep, all that was involved in that hickey-madoodle; but at times the fate of empires has depended upon less.⁴³

The very simple accompanying illustration, the only illustration to go with fiction during Ransom's editorship, was considered less extensively. Based on a sketch by Burke, Ransom's daughter Helen Ransom Forman had drawn a plain wrenchlike bone to elucidate one of Herone Liddell's nightmares. Burke's enthusiasm seems a bit out of proportion. "The combination of strength and roughness is perfect," he wrote, "I feel exactly as a novelist might if an illustrator drew the imaginary portrait of his main character, and it turned out looking exactly as he had seen it with his inner eye."⁴⁴ "The Anaesthetic Revelation of Herone Liddell" was published as the lead of Kenyon's Autumn 1957 number, is wonderfully witty, but also curiously serious, and shows that for Burke creativity and criticism often merge. Poking fun at Freudians, Jungians, symbolhunters, New Critics, and what have you, Burke is his own skilful anatomist here.

Burke's next contribution appeared one year later and was a discerning review of Paul Valéry, The Art of Poetry, introduced by T.S. Eliot, in which Burke also managed to render clearly and concisely some of his own involved theories. Ransom "thought so highly" of Burke's analysis of Valéry that he "sent it to the printer to be set up in 12-point, for the front part," instead of incorporating it, as planned, into the book review section. But whereas about a year earlier Ransom had reasoned that he had gradually grown closer to Burke's ideas, he now saw it as the reverse process. "I think you have come over to my sober responsible conservative reactionary [literary] position, though you have done it mighty brightly and gracefully, not stodgily. . . . I think there has been a new springtime and widening in your views here these last few years, which (to whatever extent it exists) pleases me very much." Burke balked at this reading and on September 20, 1958 pointed out that when writing the Valéry review he had been "thinking continually of my early [1931] essay on Remy de Gourmont." In his eagerness to convince Ransom that, although he had perhaps "somewhat altered" his "tactics in expressing" his ideas, he had not "essentially altered" his "position on litry matters," Burke sent him several explanatory letters in quick succession, but it is doubtful whether he succeeded in changing Ransom's mind.⁴⁵

In early February 1959 Burke submitted a paper on catharsis, part prose, part poetry, in good time for Kenyon's Summer number. Ransom and Burke did not quite agree about the actual publication of this "magnifique" essay. Initially, Ransom had written warmly: "You never wrote better than these days. And the Appendix, the Exercise of Disgruntlement, the Poem, must stay in." Soon he changed his mind and informed Burke that he preferred publishing the piece without its

nearly seven pages of poetry. "Just so that my clumsy readers won't boggle over the PHILOSOPHY because there is an appendage of POETRY by the same hand. That's my Puritanism, Purism, however Freud might name it." Burke was crushed: "Oef! Helndamnaysh! . . . If that's how you think it had better be, then so it should be--and punctum. However, in keeping with the sound Aristotelian principle of enargeia (bringing the sorrow before one's eyes, making the judges weep by making them see the very form and color of the wounds), let me at least relieve myself by these depositions . . ." And Burke argued so eloquently that Ransom replied immediately: "But you know I wrote: we'd accept your decision. And even if you're pretty wonderfully polite about it, you don't think you (or we) ought to give up the conclusion,—so, by Heck, I've written the printer to go ahead with it. Some contributors rate having their own way with a piece, and we'd be in bad order to try to stop 'em."⁴⁶ And so The Kenyon Review was once more enriched by one of Burke's sometimes far-fetched, but always entertaining, sparkling critical-creative papers. In comparing, contrasting, and combining Aristotle's theories about catharsis and Freud's theories about purifying physical purges, in playing with and upsetting common notions about pity and fear, hubris and hamartia, and in concluding with a "Poetic Exercise on the Subject of Disgruntlement" and a poetic "Litany of Laments," Burke once more showed himself to be an imaginative, wide-awake, wide-ranging thinker.

Meanwhile, Burke, realizing that "after that big chunk of Burke scheduled for Kenyon's hammock-literature number, a review by one K. Burke may seem a bit de trop," had hesitantly asked to be allowed to review Philip Rieff, Freud: The Mind of the Moralists. But as Burke as well as Freud--let alone a possible meeting of their minds--had become

8. Decline (1955-1960)

meat and drink to Ransom by this time, he greedily rose to the bait. Burke "went berserk during the reading" of Rieff's book, but nevertheless managed to come up with a review on July 30, 1959. Two days later, feeling that he had not done quite right by the book, he sent in "about the only thing" he was capable of in his "present state of disrepair," namely an eleven-line addendum which emphasized the brilliance of the book. Burke's perceptive review, in which, as Ransom had hoped and expected, he entered into a dialogue with Freud, appeared with its addendum in the 1959 issue and marked his final contribution to The Kenyon Review.⁴⁷

Other faithful contributors of long standing such as Eric Bentley, Leslie Fiedler, and Irving Howe were not published at all during these last years. Ransom himself had little gusto left and because of all his additional duties he was so pressed for time that an article on Milton and anthropology and an article on prosody were all he could manage. "The Idea of a Literary Anthropologist: And What He Might Say of the Paradise Lost of Milton," a revision of a speech Ransom had given in Williamsburg in 1957, appeared in Kenyon's Winter 1959 number and was in part a reply to Roy Harvey Pearce's important "Historicism Once More," published in its previous issue. If in his "beautifully perfected essay" Pearce "recommended to the critics a kind of historicism, the speech will be recommending a kind of anthropologism," Ransom explained in the prologue to his own piece. Pearce's keen yet cautious essay, appearing in Ransom's Kenyon some twenty years after Ransom's own seminal essay "Criticism Inc.," which took virtually the opposite direction, fought against the prevalent mode of methodological, mechanical New Criticism, and argued that the historical-cultural context of a literary work should be taken into

account too. It manifested once more the turnabout that had taken place in the academic literary world over the years.⁴⁸

Ransom, of course, had never tolerated New Critical narrowness and had usually been at least one step ahead of the academy. But if Ransom now still was out of step with the academics, he was no longer a pioneer. His essay on Paradise Lost was, in fact, an impotent, if timely attempt to introduce into literary-critical studies the "literary anthropologist," who "must needs be a great humanist," "a scientist," "a good naturalist or economist, and his understanding of literature . . . must have to do with its adaptation to the natural economy." His other essay, "The Strange Music of English Verse," also was weak. It was part of the only symposium published in The Kenyon Review during these years, "English Verse and What It Sounds Like," which took up nearly half of the Kenyon's Summer 1956 number.⁴⁹

Tedious and repetitious, "English Verse and What It Sounds Like" was the worst symposium Ransom published. In his introductory essay, which was actually published at the end of the symposium, Ransom noted that it was "strange that a generation of critics so sensitive and ingenious as ours should have turned out very backward, indeed phlegmatic, when it comes to hearing the music of poetry, or at least, to avoid misunderstanding, to hearing its meters." Even if "the authority of meters is passing, or is past" in modern poetry, he continued, the "old poetry is still vivid with us, and it is metered." The symposium was meant to break with the long neglect of prosody. However, its opening essay, written by Kenyon's summer 1944 Rockefeller Fellow Harold Whitehall and entitled "From Linguistics to Criticism," consisted of a reprint of his Kenyon Autumn 1951 review of George L. Trager and Henry L. Smith Jr., An Outline of English Structure,

8. Decline (1955-1960)

supplemented by some remarks on the book's section on prosody. Whitehall's essay was followed by a very technical discussion by Seymour Chatman, who analysed Robert Frost's "Mowing," combining its abstract metrical pattern and the ordinary intonation pattern of spoken English, and basing himself on the Trager-Smith approach to English. Stressing the close interplay of sound and meaning, and asserting that intonation helps understanding, Chatham tried to show with the help of charted readings that intonation prevails over metre.⁵⁰

The next article, Arnold Stein's "Donne's Prosody," was another Kenyon 1951 reprint and consisted of four and a half slightly sharpened pages on Donne's "Elegy" from the second instalment of his "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse." Stein's essay was followed by Chatman's refutation of his assertion that the ambiguity of Donne's "Elegy" lies in its metre. As Stein had had "some small uneasiness about being specifically commented on without rebuttal," Ransom allowed him to submit an "independent little note" on "the form of meter, that asks the question: what does meter do in a poem?" Ransom was very pleased with Stein's "admirable" and "imaginative" second paper and placed "A Note on Meter," which was partly an attack on Chatman, right after Chatman's "Mr. Stein on Donne".⁵¹

Before publication, about a hundred advance orders for bound reprints of the symposium had reached the Kenyon office, justifying Ransom's diagnosis of the shortage of and need for studies in prosody. The interest in metrical studies was obviously very lively, so what had started out as a one-issue symposium was expanded into a series of papers published intermittently over three years. The first paper to follow the symposium issue was a "Communication" by Chatman, who was allowed to reply to Ransom's recapitulative essay. George Hemphill,

while praising the "liveliness" of the papers presented in the symposium, in his "The Meters of the Intermediate Poets," published in the Winter 1957 issue, criticized and set out to remedy their neglect of the existing, if somewhat hidden metrics in modern poetry such as written by Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell, Josephine Miles, and Robert Penn Warren. In the Winter 1958 issue John Thompson published "Sir Philip and the Forsaken Iamb," an intricate chapter of his Columbia University dissertation on the rise of modern English metres. The essay immediately following, Robert Beloof's discussion of Marianne Moore's prosody, was the final article to appear before John Hollander's opaque essay "The Metrical Emblem" closed this generally mechanical, spiritless series in the Spring 1959 issue.⁵²

Arnold Stein, the contributor of two papers to the series on prosody, had over the years become the Kenyon's favourite writer on metrics. Besides his two essays for the prosody symposium and his two essays for the Donne series on "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse," Stein had published an article on "Structures of Sound in Milton's Verse," which Ransom and Rice found "brilliant;" they thought that he had "made Milton uniquely interesting for his sound structure." Stein's final contribution was a lively and discriminating article on Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra for the Autumn 1959 number. This article and the four discerning, skilful reviews Stein published in the Kenyon over the years testify more convincingly to his critical intelligence than his articles on prosody.⁵³

All the critics discussed so far had regularly appeared in The Kenyon Review before it started suffering from exhaustion. If a number of their contributions such as Francis Fergusson's "The Human Image" showed these authors at their best, hardly any of these articles

8. Decline (1955-1960)

signified a new and exciting critical point of departure. The four Fellows in Criticism elected during this period did not contribute much towards a sorely needed rejuvenation of the Kenyon either. The final contribution by Leslie Fiedler, Fellow in Criticism for 1956, was his pre-Fellowship Spring 1956 article on Dante's "Stony Sestina." Ransom was very disappointed by the result of Fiedler's Fellowship, Love and Death in the American Novel (1960), and not until 1964 did Fiedler reappear as a critic in the Kenyon's pages. Theodore Hoffman, who had been nominated by his friend Eric Bentley, was the second Fellow in Criticism for 1956. His project was "a book of essays in drama, not at all confined to the modern period," but the Kenyon did not reap any fruits of this work. Hoffman's final, also pre-Fellowship contribution, appearing in the Spring 1955 issue, was an extremely critical but just review of Wisner P. Kinne, George Pierce Baker and the American Theatre. Ransom was so taken with his review, "47 Workshop," that he chose it as the lead of the review section.⁵⁴

The Fellow for 1957 was Francis Fergusson. Like Fiedler's, his contributions during these years have already been discussed in an earlier chapter. Fergusson received his Fellowship for "a series of critical introductions to plays of Shakespeare's," solicited by Dell Books. As The Kenyon Review had "always been especially skittish about papers on Shakespeare" unless they were "very comprehensive and radical too," it is not surprising that, if Fergusson did in fact submit his introductory essays, they were not published. The Kenyon's final Fellow in Criticism was one of the Southerners proposed by Russell Kirk for the editorship, Thomas Henry Carter. Since the early fifties Carter had been submitting suggestions for essays and reviews to the Kenyon, but although Ransom found him a promising critic, as late as 1955 he still

thought that Carter had "one disability which is extremely honorable, youth rather than maturity." And, he pointed out to Carter, "you let it get you into a corner unnecessarily."⁵⁵

If Carter felt cornered, Ransom himself was at least partly to blame, for more than once he accepted one of his reviews, only to reject it when a better review turned up unexpectedly. This happened with Carter's "excellent" review of Malcolm Cowley, The Literary Situation, which, later, suddenly "wasn't solid" anymore and was returned to Carter indecorously. Carter was not cowed by this ungentlemanly and uncharacteristic behaviour of Ransom's and managed to get three reviews published in the Kenyon before he applied for a Fellowship in Criticism in 1957. His proposed project was extremely ambitious, covering a book of essays on American culture, William Carlos Williams, Ezra Pound, Ford Madox Ford, Wyndham Lewis, William Faulkner, Flannery O'Connor, and more. Yet Carter was convinced that it would only "take from nine to twelve months to complete the book." By 1961 Carter, as might have been expected, had not yet written the planned papers on Flannery O'Connor, Ford Madox Ford, and Ezra Pound. None of the essays outlined in his application appeared in The Kenyon Review. His only contribution after his election as the Fellow for 1958 was a short Spring 1963 review of Lawrence Durrell and Henry Miller: A Private Correspondence, edited by George Wickes.⁵⁶ So, in general, after their election these Fellows contributed only a few occasional papers to the Kenyon.

Howard Nemerov, unsuccessful candidate for the Fellowship in Criticism for 1953 and 1954, but the Fellow in Fiction for 1955, so far had only published superior reviews, but Ransom now also wanted articles from him. Besides two reviews, one about a study of A.E.

8. Decline (1955-1960)

Housman, the other about Vladimir Nabokov's Lolita (1955) and My Poor Pnin (1957), during these final years Nemerov published three lively, intelligent articles, one on Shakespeare's aesthetics, one on the poet Reed Whittemore, and one on the difficulty for younger poets "of continuing to see lyric poetry as an art by itself, the preference . . . to see it as the expression of strong emotions or fashionable opinions, the insistence on communicating as opposed to making." In the correspondence dealing with his Winter 1958 essay entitled "Younger Poets: The Lyric Difficulty," Nemerov disclosed his critical credo:

I am uneasily sensible that in our like of certain poems and dislike of others there is always much that is accidental and much that is arbitrary, nor can more than rather crude distinctions be made on any bases of 'craft', which anyhow are usually afterthoughts. . . .

I do think, though, that the critic's business when he is being professional, as on his reviewing occasions he is, is to make his judgments as unequivocal as he can, and even perhaps exaggerate them somewhat—let him be decently wrong, as he will be wrong in any event some of the time, but let him reveal that he is taking some sort of responsibility for his judgments . . .⁵⁷

Another essay noteworthy both for its intrinsic quality and the attendant correspondence is Philip Rahv's "Fiction and the Criticism of Fiction," which had initially been promised to appear simultaneously with, and as Rahv's reply to, Ransom's Spring 1950 "The Understanding of Fiction," which, in its turn, was prompted by Rahv's collection of

essays, Image and Idea (1949). Rahv procrastinated, forgot, and did not return to Ransom's essay until the summer of 1955 when he gave a lecture on the criticism of fiction at the School of Letters at Bloomington, Indiana. On August 7, 1955 Rahv told Ransom that he had been "much encouraged by the response" to the Bloomington lecture and was "planning to recast the piece somewhat before sending it on" for possible publication. "As I have a strong sense of the platform and of the direct communication it entails," he explained his desire for revision, "I can never get myself to write a lecture as I would an essay." Rahv added as a two-edged compliment that he "really env[ie]d people like [Lionel] Trilling, who so seldom deviate from their settled literary tone even when facing a live audience." Although he had promised the essay "in good time . . . for the Winter number," it was only on January 26, 1956 that Rahv sent in, "all too belatedly," the "much-revised version" of his lecture.⁵⁸

In his essay Rahv rested his argument on the premise that "20th Century criticism has as yet failed to evolve a theory and a set of practical procedures dealing with the prose-medium that are as satisfactory in their exactness, subtlety and variety as the theory and procedures worked out in the past few decades by the critics of poetry." But after paying the critics of poetry this indirect compliment, he started berating them, objecting forcibly against the "recent infection of the prose-sense by poetics," and particularly against the fallacy, as exemplified by Ransom's "The Understanding of Fiction," that style is "the 'essential activity' of imaginative prose." In his polemical essay Rahv had deliberately overlooked Ransom's admittedly rather vague and ineffectual, but at any rate not coldly mechanical emphasis on the "human importance of the art-work . .

8. Decline (1955-1960)

.[which] 'touches the heart'" as well as his recognition of the "great contribution of the Marxists to literary theory," namely "their firmness in regarding literature as a public property and holding it socially responsible for its effects." Stridently contentious, too, were Rahv's concluding remarks about myth criticism. The "obsession with symbolization is at bottom expressive of the reactionary idealism that now afflicts our literary life and that passes itself off as a strict concern with aesthetic form," he stated peremptorily. In "Fiction and Its Critics: A Reply to Mr. Rahv," which appeared in the spring of 1957, Robert Wooster Stallman, whose "far-fetched religious exegesis" of Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage Rahv had denounced as "mere Zeitgeist palaver," quoted Joseph Conrad's declaration that the nearer a work approaches art . . . 'the more it acquires a symbolic character.'" Marvin Mudrick, a critic Stallman had bracketed with Rahv, had the final say. Neither he, nor Rahv, he stated, 'deny the value of the study of myth and symbol in fiction, but . . . suggest that an . . . exploitation of symbol, as practiced in some of Conrad's fiction and . . . reflected in some contemporary criticism (Mr. Stallman's, for example), does not produce valuable fiction or valuable criticism."⁵⁹

With the exception of the articles on prosody, the contributions discussed so far might suggest that, earlier remarks to the contrary, the Kenyon still had quite some life in it. In fact, what life there was, was created by contributors of long standing, and while a fair amount of their writings were skilful and intelligent, they had largely lost their provocative or spectacular quality. One would expect to find such revivifying aspects in essays by newcomers to the Kenyon. But most of their contributions lessened what life the Kenyon still possessed.

It is depressingly easy to find instances of contributions by newcomers which are too academic, tedious, or lifeless. James Hall, "The Fiction of Henry Green," Henry Gifford, "W.D. Howells: His Moral Conservatism," Murray Krieger, "Tragedy and the Tragic Vision," Albert Cook, "Modern Verse: Diffusion as a Principle of Composition," Glenn Pedersen, "Forster's Symbolic Form," and Peter Kline, "The Spiritual Center in Eliot's Plays" are cases in point. Newton P. Stallknecht, Director of the School of Letters, and the critic William Van O'Connor were not altogether new to the Kenyon's pages as each had appeared once before this period of decline; in these few years both appeared twice and to little effect.⁶⁰

The following example by Cook illustrates the deadly tone that characterizes many of these essays:

Vaporization and centralization constitute poles of the same Moi. So poets who vaporize with diffusion of images, and poets who centralize through strict control over a single image, are approaching the same problem from two different directions. It is because of their centralization in the midst of a consciously resisted flux that the modern poem of severe control and exclusive statement seems far more airtight than its romantic or classic prototypes. . . .

One can triumph over flux and defeat mere stasis in a poem either by mastering flux through keeping time with it in diffuse images, or by banishing flux as utterly as possible from the total artifice of the work. Modernism in poetry is not so much a tradition of

8. Decline (1955-1960)

diffusion or concentration as it is a condition of living, of knowing, in which the poet . . . tries to come to terms with living and knowing in a fusion so faithful to both that it will not admit the finality of either classical rhetoric or romantic tonal (and mythic) unity.⁶¹

Some of the new contributors steered clear of the Kenyon's academic course, but the results were often as disappointing. For instance, in his emotional Summer 1957 essay, "The Limitations of Flaubert," Vivian Mercier, writing from a decidedly leftist point of view, mainly manifested his own limitations in describing Flaubert as a "sentimental bourgeois" who wrote "sentimental rubbish," and whose "implied contempt for almost all the characters in his novels may be a form of compensation for [his] sense of inferiority." And Frederick Hoffman, in an Autumn 1957 essay, which, concordant with the current growth in psychological awareness, discussed "Psychology and Literature," went too far in wanting literature to be "analysed in terms of the verbal and metaphorical equivalents of the psyche and its behaviour." Lucia Dickerson was equally in step with the spirit of the times when she discussed the "Portrait of the Artist as a Jung Man" in Kenyon's Winter 1959 number. Dickerson's "sort of rough translation" of P.H. Newby's novel, The Young May Moon (1950), begins as follows:

At the opening of the story, Alec (the libido, the creative, Dionysian element) is living at Number 7 Zion (sunny, hill) Terrace (suggests levels of, for instance, the Seven Storey Mountain) with his wife,

Freda (the super-ego? the conscience in the form of early instilled maternal values?), whose only charity is the Salvation Army. His first wife, Laura (the feminine creative unconscious), has left him and their son Philip, and married Grainger. (The anima has allied itself with the intellect, producing a mana figure, the wise man. From this alliance, disturbances in the unconscious inevitably follow.) The product of this union has died. (Sterility of intellectualism.)⁶²

The writer continues in this vein for two more pages.

A new and in itself interesting and promising venture, the interview, also failed. In Philip Stratford's "One Meeting with Mauriac" the interviewer puts himself rather than Mauriac in the forefront and the interview does not rise above banalities. Unsuccessful, too, was an old and tried practice, the publication of letters from abroad, which was revived at the suggestion of the British writer Wayland Young. His Spring 1954 Kenyon story "The Glass Trumpet" had displayed sensitivity and elegance, but his three letters from London fell far short of his creative writing. Ransom described Young as "one of the best commentators going," but the characterization of his first letter by Gertrude Buckman, Delmore Schwartz's first wife, as "freshman theme drivell" seems more to the point. Young's final Summer 1957 "Letter from London," which was in large measure an early and appreciative discussion of William Golding's works, formed a marked improvement on his first two letters with their affected insipid witticisms about the politico-cultural situation in Europe.⁶³ These two letters, incidentally, constituted about all the attention the

Kenyon paid to politics during these vapid years.

At the conclusion of this discussion about the Kenyon's critical department, which, on the whole, was so disappointing during this period, the few articles by new contributors which were refreshing, if not particularly bold or impassioned, should be mentioned: Ernest Borneman, "Credo Quia Absurdum: An Epitaph for Bertolt Brecht;" Martin Green, "British Decency;" Frank Kermode, "The Dissociation of Sensibility;" and Barbara Watson, 'The Dangers of Security: E.E. Cummings' Revolt Against the Future.'⁶⁴

Poetry, Fiction, the Fine Arts

The philosophy department of The Kenyon Review had almost completely disappeared. Two articles, by Albert William Levi and Walter Kaufmann, on Søren Kierkegaard appeared in Kenyon's Spring 1956 issue to commemorate the centennial of his death. As a memorial to Rice, Henry David Aiken wrote "Philip Blair Rice and His Philosophy" for the Autumn 1956 issue. The essay concentrated on Rice's life-work, On the Knowledge of Good and Evil, which had been published shortly before his death. Rice's concise, clear survey of the contemporary diversity in ethics and value theory had been very well received. Ransom, for one, thought Rice's study showed "on every page a meticulous scruple in passing judgment on other philosophers, and on frail ordinary mankind too which could only belong to an author who was himself a good man" and thought it would mark him "as a leading contemporary philosopher." In his Kenyon essay Aiken described Rice as "a fine philosopher," "a first-rate editor and a great teacher," and 'first of all, a magnificent human being,' but this did not mislead him into admiring

Rice's book unqualifiedly. Apart from Walter J. Ong's confused 'Personalism and the Wilderness,' these few articles represent the bulk of the sad remains of Kenyon's once proud and prominent philosophy section, of which not only the quantity, but also the quality decreased considerably during these meagre years.⁶⁵

With respect to the Kenyon's poetry section we note a diminishment of energy. Again, as was the case with the Kenyon's criticism, no new, exciting discoveries were made. Again, The Kenyon Review survived weakly on the reputation of its old-timers and did not really try to discover and foster rejuvenating young talents. We find, for instance, two poems by Richard Eberhart, two by Jean Garrigue, one by James Merrill, three short poems by William S. Merwin, three by Robert Mezey, ten brilliant, witty, precise poems by Josephine Miles, and two by Theodore Roethke. Robert Penn Warren published three poems, among them the "Ballad of a Sweet Dream of Peace" about which Ransom rhapsodized: "You are extending the genre of the art here, Red, it's a fantasy full of melody and history, and it progresses, and your reader feels good progressively."⁶⁶

Although quite a few poetry contributors were indeed new to the Kenyon's pages, in contrast to earlier years it was not The Kenyon Review which could take credit for discovering them. Among them were accomplished poets such as John Ashbery, James Dickey, Irving Feldman, Donald Hall, John Hollander, and John Logan, but all of these poets had been published in other literary magazines for some years before their first and often only appearance in The Kenyon Review. The same goes for somewhat less distinguished poets such as the Canadian Margaret Avison, the poet and critic Edwin Honig, the editor of The Hudson Review Frederick Morgan, Landis Everson, Patricia Goedicke, and Arthur

Gregor. Everson, Goedicke, and Gregor made their first Kenyon appearance simultaneously with six other even lesser-known poets, Michael Fried, Alan Marshfield, R.S. Patton, John Pauker, Sheila Pritchard, and Margaret Tongue, in a Winter 1958 poetry section entitled "The Younger Poets Themselves." It was one of Ransom's rare sparkling editorial ideas during this period to have these younger poets speak for themselves in order to balance Howard Nemerov's "Younger Poets: The Lyric Difficulty" in the same issue.⁶⁷

The poet and translator Richmond Lattimore had also appeared regularly in other magazines such as The Hudson Review and Poetry before his spring 1955 entry into The Kenyon Review with translations of verse by the Greek poet Konstantinos Kavaphes. Ransom's choice of Lattimore's own "Andritsaina Revisited" and "Poussin's World" for the Summer 1959 issue showed editorial perspicacity; they won the Longview Foundation Literary Award. The publication of early poetry by the versatile and productive novelist, translator, and poet David K. Slavitt, whose intelligent and arresting "Partiti da Cotesti che son Morti," "Great Grandfather," and "Warning" appeared in Kenyon's Summer 1956 number, also was meritorious.⁶⁸

Less commendable from a critical-aesthetic point of view, though all to Ransom's credit from an ethical perspective, was the election of Delmore Schwartz, by then virtually burnt-out, as the Fellow in Poetry for 1957. Edwin Honig and Karl Shapiro were among his competitors, and, in fact, Ransom first offered the Fellowship to Shapiro. Only when the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, where Shapiro was teaching at that time, suddenly decided to refuse him a sabbatical year, did Ransom approach Schwartz. Informing Honig of his rejection, Ransom wrote on December 11, 1956 that the elected Fellow in Poetry was "a man pretty

well established as a poet, but just now neglected and very much in need of assistance."⁶⁹

Three days earlier Schwartz had told Ransom that the possibility of a Fellowship was "the nicest thing" which had occurred to him since 1954 when Ransom had accepted his "The First Morning of the Second World" for Kenyon's Autumn 1955 issue. This letter of 8 December was sound and sensible, but the Fellowship project he enclosed was incoherent, illegible, and frenzied and manifested Schwartz's struggle against encroaching madness. During his Fellowship year Schwartz sent no news of himself. His terrorized second wife Elizabeth Pollet left him, he frequently suffered from spells of insanity and, for a brief period, was committed to Bellevue. In March 1958 Schwartz again sent Ransom a lucid, sober letter and enclosed a few poems which he had managed to write in spite of his adversities. Ransom was "awfully glad" to hear from Schwartz, praised the "integrity" of his poems, and spoke out against the current cult of merely intellectually sophisticated poetry. "I don't hold with the intentional willed subtlety of the modern poets; they are just evasive, and awed by the 'ideas' of the age," he wrote. He thought that Schwartz had made "fine use of the Fellowship" and published six of the poems Schwartz had submitted in the summer of 1958. By mistake a slightly different version of the first poem, "Poem," also was printed as the concluding poem of the group. This caused Schwartz to comment that he had "heard so many very pleasant things about the group--some of them so pleasant as to be implausible--that the errors were clearly unimportant, save for the repetition of the first poem. The repetition was interpreted as deliberate on my part and the whole group as a cycle and in general--this is partly what I mean by implausibility--the poems were

8. Decline (1955-1960)

interpreted as having all sorts of systematic but hidden philosophical meanings: I wish some of them had occurred to me when I wrote the poems."⁷⁰

In an attempt to help Schwartz to some more money, Ransom suggested that he write an essay on the Symbolists. As Schwartz felt "more indebted" to Ransom "than to any other poet" and as he found Ransom's proposal "exciting" and "attractive in itself," he was very tempted to accept this offer, but he felt obliged to refuse as he was already up to his neck in all kinds of unfinished projects. In the autumn of 1958 Schwartz flooded the Kenyon with some of the results of these projects--with poems, a long short story, part of a play, and an essay. He was surprised by his own output. The "quantity is such," he wrote, "as to surpass even Merrill Moore [who wrote many thousands of sonnets] in any period of eight months." But Schwartz's writings did not come anywhere near Ransom's standards, so he tried to reject them as diplomatically as he could. He was "happy" over Schwartz's "immense literary activity," but did not "quite think these manuscripts . . . [were] quite up to [his] big things heretofore in the matter of gravity and concision . . . in the matter of the pace, the speed." And "considering the crowded condition under which I have to work to get out the remaining issues," Ransom added, he had to return Schwartz's writings, even though they contained "so many good things."⁷¹ Although tactfully worded, Ransom's letter came down to a rejection of nearly all that Schwartz had written over the preceding year. The absence of further letters to Ransom suggests that, in addition to Schwartz's rapidly declining mental health, this discouragement hastened the end of a warm and mutually respectful relationship that had lasted for over twenty years.

8. Decline (1955-1960)

The other Fellows in Poetry were Ruth Stone for 1956 and Theodore Henry Holmes and James Arlington Wright for 1958. Stone, blessed with, in Ransom's words, "the gift of poetic phrase, and great originality," had been publishing poetry in literary magazines since the early fifties. In the summer of 1953 she placed her first poems with The Kenyon Review; after her election she published four more poems there, but she has remained virtually unknown. Holmes, a protégé of R.P. Blackmur's, made his debut in the Spring 1956 issue with "The Life of the Estate." Admiringly, Ransom wrote to Blackmur, who, acting as an intermediary, had submitted Holmes's poems to the Kenyon: "You know my own prejudices, and that I'm hoping there will be a stage in his sophistication in which he will not be afraid to make his moments formal and eternal [?]. But as to the free verse, don't we now have the courage to take it without question as the inevitable form of the flux of the matter, when one is at a certain stage of civilization (or sophistication) and too advanced to harden and sterilize the experience by just formalizing it somehow? Holmes is completely alive . . . and there are not too many young poets you can say that for." This letter shows once again that in spite of Ransom's basic preference for formal, metred poetry, he actively disliked poems that were merely technically proficient, poems without life, without vitality. "A Prayer For Rain," "Journeys," "The Lovers in the Graveyard," and "The Knowledge of Our Dream" were the other long poems Holmes published over the years in the Kenyon. However, although Holmes has several volumes of poetry to his name, he has not established much of a reputation as a poet.⁷²

James Wright, Holmes's co-Fellow in Poetry for 1958 found him "an original poet" but could not "quite understand what he is doing technically." Wright's own poetry at this time was still richly and

8. Decline (1955-1960)

brilliantly formal. He made his first appearance in The Kenyon Review in 1951, when he was still an undergraduate at Kenyon College. In 1953 he appeared in the Kenyon for the second time; after that he was not published for five years. After his graduation from Kenyon College Wright kept up a regular, lively, personal and literary correspondence with Ransom. This correspondence reveals that Ransom stimulated Wright to write formal, traditional poetry and tried to curb his tendency to write too personal, too unformed poems, a direction Wright was to take in his later, loose and despairing poetry. For example, returning quite a number of Wright's poems in February 1957, Ransom noted: "In all these present manuscripts . . . there is considerable care . . . and less of what used to look to me like a certain haste and blindness in your composition." Submitting a new group of poems in November 1957, Wright replied obediently: "You know that fatal weakness in almost everything I have written: I tend to shriek when I ought to speak, to howl when I ought to sing, to be frantic when I ought to be modest, and to be vaguely grandiose when the true source of power in language . . . is its patient precision."⁷³

Ransom was impressed by Wright's new poems and when they met at Christmas suggested that Wright himself choose five pages of verse from them for Kenyon's Autumn 1958 issue. Wright selected "A Girl Walking into a Shadow," "All the Beautiful Are Blameless," and "With the Gift of a Feather." He added a new poem, "Safety," of which he wrote: "In earlier versions it was overwritten (my old weakness, which you pointed out long ago, of violence in language where the true strength would be a quiet restraint). But now I am convinced that I have made a real lyric out of it: a beautiful scene and a human attitude toward that scene, both clearly sung--as clearly as I can do.' It seems as if

Ransom wanted Wright, more than any other poet he supported and advised, to write rather like he himself did, with "quiet restraint;" perhaps because Ransom realized that Wright could succumb to hysteria in his poetry. And Wright, at least at this stage of his career, wholly agreed with Ransom. "If I could curb my personal hysterias, then perhaps by the same token I could purge my verses of their violence. Violence is weakness; it is precision and grace that are strength," he admonished himself on May 25, 1958. Wright's last publication in The Kenyon Review was "President Harding's Tomb in Ohio," which appeared in the summer of 1961 and still belonged to his formal, but vibrant style.⁷⁴

Also on the credit side of the Kenyon is the publication of "Red Jacket (Lake Seneca)," the only one of Paul Goodman's poems to appear there, and the publication of two rhythmically simplistic, almost didactically philosophic, but also witty poems, "Lighting Fires in Snow" and "Screens," by I.A. Richards. On its debit side are the reappearance of Roberta Swartz with "Why We Loved Her" and the publication of three poems by the Kenyon College graduate Albert Herzing. Ransom was not the only one to appreciate Herzing's "The Candy-Man's Art Is the Sweetest Art I Know." Unknown to Ransom, Partisan Review had already accepted it for publication and the poem appeared simultaneously in both magazines. Ransom reacted extraordinarily graciously. "Herzing should be proud of his poem now that it has appeared in two of our leading reviews; . . . we are perfectly willing to let him have the whole of your payment [instead of Partisan receiving royalties], mainly because we pay so little for verse and feel terribly guilty on that account." Charles Coffin's "Evening at the Atheneum," published in Kenyon's Summer 1957 number, is not

8. Decline (1955-1960)

particularly distinguished either; it should be seen as a memorial tribute by Ransom to his best friend.⁷⁵

Concomitantly with the staunching of the inflow of gifted new poets, there was a considerable decrease in the quantity, though not in the quality, of the fiction published in The Kenyon Review. A steady stream of unknown young fiction writers appeared in the Kenyon. About two out of the four stories that were now published annually came from people new to its pages. The Fellows in Fiction, Andrew Lytle for 1956, James F. Powers and Elizabeth Spencer for 1957, and Robie Macauley for 1958, were seasoned writers, however. "Lytle has already done three novels, of which at least two are absolutely first-rate, and at his best he has enormous style. I have known him since my Fugitive and Agrarian days at Vanderbilt, and I have the greatest faith in his vitality and potential. I have thought it was a scandal to see his whole time taken up in his teaching," Ransom wrote to John Marshall informing him of Lytle's appointment. Lytle submitted part of the novel The Velvet Horn (1957), his masterpiece and fruit of his Fellowship, but Ransom, who from the outset of the project had been "feeling a little antipathy . . . to the novel on the subject of incest" rejected the submitted section. Later, after he had read the entire novel, he admitted: "I can see now how mistaken I was in not using the magnificent section we had a chance at . . . a good while back. I'd say that your novel is a series of lyrical & dramatic achievements, on a base of philosophical attitude founded on the sense of nature and the paradoxes of sex, and grounded firmly in history and the old (and maybe timeless) South. This is the same Andrew we have known so many years, maintaining himself over a big novel at the top of his powers.' And in reviewing The Velvet Horn for Kenyon's Autumn 1957 issue, Robie

Macauley concluded that this novel "should assure Mr. Lytle of his rightful place among the first rank of American novelists practising today."⁷⁶

The Southern writer Elizabeth Spencer who, like Lytle, had published several novels before her election as a Fellow, again like Lytle, did not appear in The Kenyon Review after she had become a Fellow. However, in her case there is no evidence that she actually submitted stories to the Kenyon, although one may assume that, like all the other Fellows, she did. It was only in the Spring 1962 issue that James F. Powers appeared in the Kenyon. "Sailing Against the Wind" was part of his novel-project for the Fellowship, his superbly witty, tragicomic study of a worldly priest, Morte D'Urban, which won the National Book Award in 1963. Robie Macauley was so "delighted" with "Sailing Against the Wind" as it had "all that grand involvement of understanding and misunderstanding" that he liked so well in Powers' fiction, that he reprinted it in Gallery of Modern Fiction. Macauley's own three contributions in fiction, "The Thin Voice," "The Chevigny Man," and "Legend of Two Swimmers" also all appeared before he became a Fellow. During his Fellowship Macauley intended to write a novel "built around arrivals and departures" in which "the journey's ends and journey's beginnings make the world of the book," a novel "meant to reflect American life in the 1940's and '50's," but he never finished it.⁷⁷

Ransom's financial administration of the Fellowships was not a success. On June 14, 1958 he wrote to Marshall that "[j]ust yesterday" he had realized "that the amount to be expended for the Fellows' stipends was precisely \$40,200," whereas he "had wrongly supposed that the sum was \$48,000, allowing for the appointment of Fellows who were

8. Decline (1955-1960)

all married, if it should turn out so." As nearly all of the appointed Fellows were married, Ransom had "over-expended" the grant by \$5,200.00. "The blame is entirely mine," he admitted, but suggested nevertheless that the Rockefeller Foundation make up the deficit. Marshall agreed with Ransom "that the writers to whom these fellowships have gone are an admirable lot," but was "somewhat at a loss to know how to reply" to his letter. Meanwhile, fortunately, Ransom had also been negotiating with President Lund and on July 22 could quote from a "nice note" he had just received from Lund: "My idea is to 'consolidate' the accumulated deficit of the Kenyon Review up to July 1, 1958, including this \$5,200, then write it off. When Robie Macauley takes over, he should start with a fresh budget."⁷⁸ Lund's generosity, incidentally, foreshadows his openhandedness towards the Kenyon during Macauley's editorship. At any rate, Ransom's problem was solved.

Returning to the Kenyon's fiction in the late fifties, we find among prominent writers who had not appeared in the Kenyon before John Wain, Anthony Ostroff, and David Antin. John Wain's amusing, atmospheric Spring 1957 story "A Few Drinks with Alcock and Brown" was reprinted in Gallery of Modern Fiction. Ostroff's moving "La Bataille des Fleurs," in which he interwove straight narrative with stream of consciousness technique, appeared in that year's Summer issue. In the Autumn 1959 number appeared David Antin's early, grotesque, sombre story about the protagonist's failure to create a "Balanced Aquarium," a microcosm in which each living thing feeds on some other in an endless circle. Other newcomers to the Kenyon's department of fiction, such as William Van O'Connor, who in its Autumn 1956 issue published his first story, the much too academic "The Retirement of Professor John Underhill," and Elaine Zimbel, whose "Margie, This Is Your Father"

probably remained her only attempt at fiction, hardly enlivened the Kenyon's pages with their well-made but commonplace stories.⁷⁹

Among the stories by regular contributors in fiction we find some truly noteworthy ones. Peter Taylor contributed "Venus, Cupid, Folly and Time" to the Spring 1958 issue. This subtle, stylistically immaculate story about Southern morals and incest, about society and manners, was an O. Henry first prize winner and was reprinted in Gallery of Modern Fiction. Taylor's second excellent recollective story, "Who Was Jesse's Friend and Protector," published in the Summer 1959 number, treated the slow and sadistic destruction of a Negro servant by his seemingly protective white employers. After an absence of fourteen years David Cornel DeJong returned to the Kenyon in the Summer 1958 issue with a psychologically convincing, penetrating study of patronage, "The Drowning." To the Winter 1959 issue Priscilla Heath contributed a discriminating, feminist story tracing the turmoil and guilt-feelings of a formerly self-sacrificing wife and mother, who, after her husband's death, frees "The Other Woman" in herself.⁸⁰ All in all, if there was not much fiction in the Kenyon, it was generally intelligent, discerning, and polished.

Except for the "Theatre Letters" by Mary Hivnor, Henry Popkin, and Gerald Weales, the criticism of drama was very much neglected during this period. We find a few good book reviews such as Mary Hivnor on Antonin Artaud, The Theatre and Its Double (1936; translated by Mary C. Richards, 1958), and Gerald Weales on T.S. Eliot, The Elder Statesman (1959), and one or two important articles such as the lucid 1955 Wood Memorial Lecture on the "Progression of Theme in Eliot's Plays" by the British critic D.W. Harding and another slightly revised, enlightening speech by the translator and poet H.R. Hays on the neglect of Ben

8. Decline (1955-1960)

Jonson's plays in the modern period. Ransom found Hays's "Satire and Identification" "first-rate" and did not think he had "ever seen a modern examination of Ben's art," as so far the "academics exclusively," lacking in "modern tools," had written about Jonson. Apart from these few pieces of drama criticism, the Kenyon published two plays. In its Winter 1956 issue Act One of Peter Taylor's successful comedy "Tennessee Day in St. Louis" appeared; and in its Summer 1958 issue "The Life of Confucius," a wise, witty, posthumous fragment written by Bertolt Brecht for a theatre of child-actors. ⁸¹

Criticism about the visual arts was as badly represented as drama criticism. Only two noteworthy articles were published. In the autumn of 1958 Sidney Tillim described the recently deceased sculptor Constantin Brancusi as an opportunist and his work as "sentimentality dressed up to look like an idea." One year earlier Alfred Werner had made his Kenyon debut with his first "Art Letter" on "Dr. Picasso and the Toothache," in which he compared the shock the 1940 American Picasso exhibition--cynically criticized in the Kenyon by Wyndham Lewis--had occasioned to the sedate reception of the 1957 American Picasso exhibition.⁸² Werner soon became the Kenyon's perceptive and responsible regular fine arts critic and appeared about once a year in its pages until its demise. Both the movie criticism and the music criticism of this period, covered by Parker Tyler and B.H. Haggin, have been discussed already. In fact The Kenyon Review no longer had a fine arts section to speak of.

Both the institutionalization of the quarterlies as a group and its own internal troubles had turned The Kenyon Review into a sadly spiritless publication. As Ransom was too listless to seek out innovative writers, his magazine barely survived on the reputation of

contributors of long standing. Particularly with respect to its important criticism department, those few critics who were new, were severely disappointing. And whereas formerly the Kenyon's extensive coverage of the arts and especially of drama had greatly contributed to its overall excellence, now these subjects were neglected. In all, following timeworn tracks, The Kenyon Review of Ransom's final years was as spent as its editor.

Change-over

Ransom spent the rest of his life at Gambier and must have run into his successor almost daily, but he took scrupulous care not to interfere with Macauley's approach to the editorship. He announced in Kenyon's Autumn 1959 issue: "This issue concludes Volume XXI. . . . Mr. Macauley the new Editor has returned from his year's leave of absence abroad, and is from now on in full charge. We commend him without reservation to the readers of this Review, and wish him a long and happy tenure of his office. We beg to advise contributors and correspondents that from our private residence in Gambier we shall have no official connection with the periodical." And he kept his word. When, for instance, in 1965 Vernon Watkins sent him a "beautiful poem," he replied: "I am rather overnice perhaps, but I take care not to make any suggestions to my successor . . . for fear he might think I was encroaching upon his freedom; and nobody ever interposed in my own freedom"--and handed the poem over to Macauley without comment.¹ It was not published. As Ransom denied himself any influence on the running and the contents of The Kenyon Review under his successors, it will be instructive to compare his editorial performance to the fortunes of the Kenyon under Macauley and Lanning. It will put the Ransom years in perspective.

The discussion of the final years of Ransom's editorship during which the Kenyon had reached a point of exhaustion, may leave the reader with a too pejorative impression of his editorship. It is easy, however, to right the balance by calling to mind the years of high achievement. These were celebrated in the glowing testimonies about

Ransom as the 'presiding genius over the Kenyon's 'most influential years' and about The Kenyon Review as a "shaping influence" on the lives of many writers and critics. If, as Ransom was the first to realize and regret, an issue never did measure up with anything like evenness to the perfection that ha[d] been dreamed for it," Ransom got from his writers 'the best they had to give," so that the Kenyon "was the best actual review . . . there could be."²

This last remark was made by Arthur Mizener in his article in John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters (1964), which began:

It would be fine to see justice done [to] John Crowe Ransom as an editor. Mr. Ransom's distinction as a poet is widely recognized but not . . . his greatness as an editor. Even more than The Southern Review under Brooks and Warren or The Sewanee Review under Allen Tate . . . The Kenyon Review under Mr. Ransom was the focus of the literary energy of its time; and The Kenyon Review was John Crowe Ransom. He not only invented the magazine; he practically invented many of its writers, giving them a conception of their function they would not otherwise have had and providing an imaginative sympathy that could make you feel you simply had to do your best because here was an editor who would understand your best and appreciate what it cost you.³

In this same Tribute we find John L. Stewart referring to The Kenyon Review as "our bible" and to Ransom as "Moses leading us through

the deserts to the promised land of poetry;" we find Malcolm Cowley wondering rhetorically whether "anybody else [had] been the teacher, friend, guide of so many talented writers" and had "done so much to establish a sound literary culture away from . . . the busy New York world of publishing and reviewing," we find Allen Tate pleasantly surprised by the fact that Ransom had turned out to be "the most hospitable editor of his time to new talent;" we find Howard Nemerov remarking on "Ransom's fine poetical gift, . . . undeceived intelligence, and . . . great generosity," which "made The Kenyon Review such a challenging paper to write for, and so stimulating a one to read;" and we read Mark Schorer's opinion that "Mr. Ransom should receive some lavish award for his long and devoted stewardship. Through his efforts on The Kenyon Review, he brought to American letters a new kind of dignity, seriousness and style." One could object that these encomiums are questionable as they appeared in a booklet published to honour Ransom on his seventy-fifth birthday. However, if one takes into account that John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters was not an official, prestigious publishing venture, but the result of a sudden impulse of two undergraduates at Kenyon College, the fact that so many distinguished writers were most willing, even eager to contribute to this amateur project reveals their real admiration for Ransom's achievements. Many writers of very different plumage, among them W.H. Auden, Jacques Barzun, Cleanth Brooks, Richard Eberhart, William Empson, Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Northrop Frye, Granville Hicks, Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell, Marianne Moore, Elder Olson, Norman Podhoretz, W.D. Snodgrass, Stephen Spender, Louis Untermeyer, and Robert Penn Warren, testified to Ransom's greatness.⁴

The spontaneous reactions that poured into the Kenyon office as

soon as rumours of Ransom's retirement spread are also eloquent. Philip Rahv doubted whether Ransom's successor would "ever be able to beat [his] performance;" Stanley Edgar Hyman sent Ransom "congratulations on eighteen years of a superb magazine;" Kenneth Burke spoke of his having "contrived an exceptionally admirable combination of authority and pliancy;" Delmore Schwartz felt "devoted and obliged to the K.R.;" and Douglas Nichols thought Ransom and his Kenyon had "made us all better readers, writers, poets." Ransom was not praised to his face only. Karl Shapiro told Robie Macauley that Ransom's Kenyon Review was "probably the best magazine in the country" and John Berryman confessed to the new editor that he was "a lifelong admirer, or rather lover of Mr. Ransom."⁵

To these private reactions public tributes by fellow-editors can be added. In 1968 Charles Newman, editor of TriQuarterly, called The Kenyon Review "perhaps the most influential critical review in the country when under the editorship of John Crowe Ransome [sic];" and in 1978 Theodore Weiss, poet and founding editor of the Quarterly Review of Literature, spoke of "the influential Kenyon Review, magisterially edited by John Crowe Ransom." In 1970 James B. Colvert, editor of The Georgia Review, told editors of similar critical quarterlies that they should stop trying to "aspire to the impossible," that is, "to the eminence of such paragons among quarterlies as Eliot's Criterion, Ford Ma[d]ox Ford's English Review, or Ransom's Kenyon," and be satisfied with the "humbler function" of being "wholeheartedly academic." The "great reviews," he pointed out, "are special phenomena. They rise with great literary movements, or even in some cases set them in motion. Their editors, though they may have academic connections, are first and foremost men of letters who possess extraordinary creative and

intellectual powers. Their quarterlies are institutions in themselves, reflecting a powerful, coherent critical view of the world.... Such quarterlies occur at special historical moments when radical changes in the operating of the critical intelligence are germinating, and when men of unusual abilities are on the scene to command and shape them."⁶

If there was a general sense that the folding of Ransom's Kenyon had put an end to an historic episode, reactions to the election of his successor, Robie Macauley, to the editorship were, on the whole, positive. Although Philip Rahv had been "rather surprised to hear of Macauley's election," he thought Macauley would "acquit himself well in the post." Judging by Macauley's writing alone, Delmore Schwartz was sure that he was an "excellent" choice, while Karl Shapiro was "delighted" that Macauley was taking over and found him "one of the finest and delightful young men" and "certainly a talented writer." Born on May 31, 1919 in Grand Rapids, Michigan, Macauley had not yet turned forty at the time of his election. Although he had gathered some editorial experience over the years, this was negligible, even compared to Ransom's training as one of the editors of the short-lived Fugitive. Like so many other aspiring writers Macauley had come to Kenyon College to study under Ransom in 1938. He graduated in 1941 and was a special agent in the Counterintelligence Corps in Europe during World War II. In 1950 he received his M.F.A. from the State University of Iowa, at Iowa City and went on to teach English at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. It is not quite clear what kind of work Macauley did between 1953 and 1958, when he became the Kenyon Review's Fellow in Fiction, but a letter written by Ransom on August 11, 1953 gives an indication: "I'd say we'd have high hopes of making a Fellow out of Robie if he doesn't take a job

with Central Intelligence, as I've heard he's going to." Whatever Macauley did, he found time to publish a collection of accomplished stories, The End of Pity (1957), the successor to his 1952 novel The Disguises of Love.⁷

When Macauley came to The Kenyon Review his assistant, inherited from Ransom, was Irving Kreutz. Kreutz's duties remained mainly restricted to routine office jobs such as "promotion and advertising, proof-reading, lay-out work." After one year as Macauley's managing editor Kreutz left for Great Britain for a sabbatical for the academic year 1960-1961. George Lanning succeeded him. Lanning was only a few years younger than Macauley; he was born in Lakewood, Ohio on July 30, 1925. He graduated from Kenyon College in 1952 and his first novel, This Happy Rural Seat, was published in 1953, a year after Macauley's. Lanning had been writing the first draft of this novel under Robert Hillyer in 1949, while he was simultaneously working as a "dogsbody" for The Kenyon Review.⁸ Lanning remained with the Kenyon in this menial capacity until his graduation, when he became the College's Director of Publicity at \$250.00 a month, and, for a year only, an official Kenyon Review office assistant at the lordly sum of \$38.00 a month. In 1960 he became assistant editor of The Kenyon Review, which took up three quarters of his time, and, for the remainder, editor of the College's Alumni Bulletin, which he had developed singlehandedly from a mere circular into almost a full-fledged magazine during his appointment as Director of Publicity. In late 1964 Macauley left for a sabbatical year and Lanning dropped the Alumni Bulletin and became the Kenyon's acting editor at about \$7,000.00 per year, in addition to housing. David Madden, a newcomer to Kenyon College, was appointed his assistant editor and lecturer in English at nearly the same salary.

Madden held these jobs until the summer of 1966 when he left for Ohio State University at Athens.

Interviews with Macauley and Lanning indicate that soon the working relationship between Macauley and Lanning came much closer to the one between Ransom and Rice than the relationship between Macauley and Kreutz had been. Robie Macauley remembers: "George was a . . . wonderful number two editor. . . . We each did first readings and then, if we liked something well enough, we would pass it across the desk. We had a partners' desk. . . . I would sometimes veto, but generally we got along very well, understood what each of us wanted." And Lanning agrees that it was "pretty equal."⁹ Unlike Ransom and Rice, however, Macauley and Lanning, though making a good team, never became close friends.

In 1982 Macauley recalled that "Kenyon College did not have to contribute an enormous sum of money" during his editorship, "because I found ways of making money that Mr. Ransom had never thought of. . . . It still did not close the gap, but it was . . . a better situation." This is a misinterpretation of the Kenyon's financial state which was, admittedly, extremely confused. During Macauley's editorship Kenyon College contributed some \$24,700.00 annually towards The Kenyon Review. While taking into account the devaluation of the dollar and the considerable rise in production costs, comparing the \$85,000.00 the College spent on the Kenyon during Ransom's twenty-one years as its editor to the \$170,000.00 during Macauley's seven years of service, one must conclude that Macauley was quite wrong in thinking that he made it "a better situation" financially for Kenyon College.¹⁰

Macauley tried hard to make good the Kenyon's losses. In the autumn of 1962 he raised the subscription price, which had remained

steady at \$4.00 since 1949, to \$5.00. He sold the subscription list to list brokers, doubled the number of pages sold to advertisers from 30 in 1959 to 60 in 1966, and also raised advertisers' rates. He increased the Kenyon's circulation from just over 2,000 in 1959 to about 6,000 in 1964, a level it maintained until its demise; and whereas in 1950 the magazine was sold in some 30 countries, by 1964 it had readers in nearly 60 countries. Macauley also made an arrangement with Seymour Lawrence, Director of the Atlantic Monthly Press, which was very similar to Ransom's contract with Random House. Furthermore, he sold the Kenyon's back issues as well as, like Ransom, books received for reviewing.¹¹

Ransom's only interference with Macauley's Kenyon Review had been his attempt to give it a comfortable financial basis; to this end he had applied, in vain, to the Rockefeller and Ford foundations. Macauley adopted Ransom's policy of approaching possible donors jointly with the other three literary quarterlies as the "Four Reviews." He played a leading role in these joint projects, which consolidated the connections among these reviews, but did not bring in money. Fortunately, there existed no danger to the Kenyon's survival under Macauley, for President Lund had promised to "underwrite it for some years at least regardless of what Foundations may do."¹²

Without the help of foundations, Macauley managed to raise the Kenyon's income from \$11,208.00 in 1959-1960 to \$22,607.21 in 1962-1963. These are the only exact figures Macauley gave with respect to the magazine's income, but one may safely assume that its overall annual revenue during his editorship did not rise beyond \$25,000.00. Taking his very few rough estimates of the Kenyon's expenses into consideration, one finds that from about 1962 onwards the magazine was

short two or three thousand dollars a year, excluding salaries. But salaries were a considerable item and rose sharply over the years. Macauley was appointed at \$8,000.00 a year; by February 1966 he was earning \$12,400.00. Lanning had started out with a part-time job at \$4,350.00 a year and in 1966 was making \$10,600.00 as a full-time assistant editor. By 1969 the editors' salaries totalled as much as \$27,000.00. Then there was the salary of the part-time secretary, which came to about \$3,500.00 in 1966. Printers' salaries also went up and, concomitantly, printing costs, which boomed anyway as paper had become much more expensive too. As the number of the Kenyon's pages increased from 672 in 1959 to 784 in 1965, the highest ever, to drop again to 720 in 1966--now to be divided over five issues instead of four--, this too added to the mounting expenses.¹³

The contributors' rates for poetry were as low during the Kenyon's last decade as they had been in the early forties, namely 50 cents a line. The rates for critical prose also remained virtually the same: the Kenyon still paid \$10.00 per page; however, a second appearance was now rewarded with \$17.00 per page. For fiction The Kenyon Review usually paid its best prose rate of \$17.00, in special cases, with big name authors, a little more. In the early sixties the Kenyon was, as Macauley noted, still "competitive" with respect to fiction; but in 1967, after the best-selling magazines had raised their rates of payment considerably, Lanning complained that the Kenyon's rates for fiction were "not good at all in the open market (where payments run from \$750 to \$3000 or more)." Two years later he thought the Kenyon again reasonably competitive . . . because the outlets for stories are steadily shrinking. But we are not competitive where non-fiction is concerned."¹⁴ This indicates an interesting change in the literary

marketplace.

Rates for illustrations were low, too, "\$15 for a spot drawing . . . and \$50 for a cover." Nevertheless, payment for illustrations took up a sizeable part of the budget. From Macauley's first issue the Kenyon's cover had been changed; Moholy-Nagy's simple, bi-coloured, characteristic cover was rejected in favour of a new cover for every issue. And, as from Macauley's second issue, illustrations accompanied each story. These changes were chiefly meant to "emphasize the somewhat different editorial direction." Macauley noted them in a letter of March 14 to Lund stating "a few points of policy' he had in mind for his Kenyon Review. In this important letter he also emphasized that he would 'try to get as much fresh and original writing in poetry and fiction as possible;" "would try to include writing . . . outside the field of pure literary study;" and "would include . . . new writing from abroad."¹⁵

But if Macauley wanted to change The Kenyon Review considerably, he did not want to frighten away its faithful readers. Therefore he asked Ransom's advisory editors--Cleanth Brooks, Eric Bentley, Peter Taylor, Lionel Trilling, Robert Penn Warren--to stay on. The presence of the familiar names of Ransom's advisors on the masthead would imply their confidence in the new editor and help carry over the transition from Ransom's volumes to Macauley's. Brooks and Taylor resigned, but the others yielded in the end to Macauley's repeated requests to stay on. Besides Ransom's advisory editors Macauley also invited new foreign advisors in order to keep in closer touch with writing from abroad. A young Brazilian critic, Leo Gilson Ribiero, the British writer Raymond Williams, and George Steiner, a naturalized American, born in France, at the time teaching in Great Britain, all served on Macauley's board

of advisory editors.

Eric Bentley, and, particularly, George Steiner showered Macauley with imaginative and shrewd suggestions. Steiner proposed, for instance, a novella contest; he proposed that Macauley publish a special issue on the relationship between modern literature and music, or one on the classics; he brought writers to Macauley's attention and suggested to British writers that they contribute to The Kenyon Review. He commented critically or admiringly on particular articles and issues, and also remarked acutely on the overall poor quality of the magazine's poetry, on the lack "of a certain unity, a certain presence of voice and manner," and warned against a growing "slickness." But if Macauley often asked his advisory editors specific questions, he seldom listened to their answers, let alone to proposals he had not solicited. Ransom, on the other hand, had hardly ever asked advice, but had followed up many of the suggestions spontaneously submitted by his advisors. So, whereas the advisory editors during Ransom's and Rice's days, in particular from about 1942 to 1950, had inspired and enriched The Kenyon Review, the advisory editors under Macauley were uninfluential, although he had initially intended, particularly with respect to his foreign advisors, to make liberal use of their suggestions. Macauley's masthead looked impressive enough with the illustrious names of Lionel Trilling and Robert Penn Warren, but was, in fact, a facade. George Lanning had never seen any point in having a board. "It was a trend of the time. Everybody had an advisory staff, so we had one too," he explained in 1981. "They were no damn good at all." 16

On December 26, 1962 Trilling handed in his resignation and Macauley seized upon this to disband the entire board of advisory

editors. Trilling, who had once regarded Macauley as "the great white hope of the Quarterly world" and who in September 1959 had found himself 'quite in accord with the general direction" Macauley had envisaged for the Kenyon, had come to believe that under Macauley's editorship the magazine had not represented "any particular intention or tendency" which engaged his "especial commitment or interest;" he therefore felt it to be "a kind of misrepresentation" to continue to have his name associated with the magazine in an advisory capacity. In contrast to his 1959 letter, in which he had described Ransom's Kenyon as "too special, too 'literary,' too technical, too nearly academic," Trilling now spoke of his "strong general sympathy with the critical movement that John was undertaking to advance." Macauley, who had come to see his advisors as nuisances, was quick to find himself "quite in sympathy" with Trilling's "remarks about the anomaly of the situation" and agreed to omit his name from the masthead quietly. He informed the other advisory editors that Trilling had resigned and suggested that "perhaps it would be better . . . not to print the advisors' names on the masthead."¹⁷ Their names disappeared from Kenyon's Spring 1963 issue.

A new name, Ronald Berman, under a new title, "editorial associate," appeared on that issue's masthead and stayed there until the magazine's demise. Ronald Berman had joined the Kenyon College English department in 1962. His Kenyon status was that of "a volunteer editor serving without compensation and working on his own time;" his duties were 'finding reviewers for particular titles, suggesting possible projects, and serving as first reader on many manuscripts." He also wrote numerous reviews for the magazine on subjects as diverse as Augustan verse, Max Eastman, and Leslie Fiedler, as well as a

trendy, unimpassioned article on sex in the poetry of the Earl of Rochester. Berman's close association with the Kenyon did not improve the magazine's popularity with the other members of the English department. As recently as 1982 one of them, Gerrit Roelofs, still flared up at mention of Berman, "a guy who was terribly ambitious and . . . on the make." Under the editorship of Ransom and Rice the relationship between The Kenyon Review and Kenyon College as represented by Gordon Keith Chalmers had not been ideal, but Ransom's and Rice's active participation in the life of the College through their teaching, and their close friendship with Charles Coffin, head of the English department, together with Ransom's extraordinary gifts for diplomacy, had kept friction and jealousy to a minimum. Macauley, however, had separated The Kenyon Review so totally from the Kenyon community that it, as Roelofs saw it, "could have been edited in Timbuktu for all its connection with Kenyon College. . . . In fact, one of the standard jokes was to call it The Kenya Review edited by Nairobi Macauley."¹⁸ The complete breach between the magazine and the College, the mutual dislike and distrust, led to the Kenyon's isolation. It had hardly any supporters in the College when it needed them sorely at the end of the sixties, when its reason for being was called into question.

Macauley succeeded in his objective, expressed at the start, to include in his Kenyon Review "some new writing from abroad." He initiated the series "Through Foreign Eyes" which intended "to try to discover the concept of America and Americans as it is derived from [American] writing." But after only four essays--on Japan, Poland, Brazil, and Scandinavia--Macauley abandoned this series and turned down solicited articles because most of them were boringly similar. Another indication of his ambitious aim to make the Kenyon more international

and cosmopolitan was the column "Excursion" which first appeared in January 1966 and was continued by George Lanning during his editorship. "Excursion" was intended to be a "section . . . that touched lightly, sometimes caustically on various matters."¹⁹ In order to shake off the Kenyon's stigma of being staid and academic, the editors invited for this series personal sketches from writers abroad, but if most of the nine articles that appeared were indeed speculative and meandering, they also made for insipid and superficial reading.

Besides these two series, random articles on foreign countries, from Germany to China, often written by foreign contributors, regularly appeared. The Irish got most attention, with Frank O'Connor until his death in 1966 as a main contributor and with the Spring 1964 number as a special Irish issue. Judging Macauley's attempts to give The Kenyon Review a broader orientation than Ransom's had had, we must conclude that while he succeeded in doing so, this was to the discredit, rather than to the credit of the magazine. One reader wrote to Andrew Lytle, then editor of The Sewanee Review, that the Kenyon had "slipped" under Macauley. "So many of his 'international spreads' seem not worth it to me."²⁰ The series "Through Foreign Eyes" and "Excursion" had quite miscarried; moreover, the articles on the different countries--with the exception of Ireland--were so incidental, that if they were not superficial in themselves, they gave only a very partial image of the country in question.

Macauley was successful in adding an international flavour to the important fiction department of his Kenyon Review. Of the eighty some stories he published, about thirty had foreign settings or were written by foreign contributors. Whereas Ransom was a poet, Macauley was a novelist and short story writer. Whereas most of Ransom's critical

essays dealt with poetry or criticism, most of Macauley's essays dealt with fiction. Whereas Ransom published a Kenyon Review anthology of criticism, The Kenyon Critics (1951), Macauley published a Kenyon Review anthology of short stories, Gallery of Modern Fiction (1966).²¹ And just as Ransom's main concerns had been mirrored brightly in the Kenyon, so was Macauley's love of fiction. On average, he devoted almost one third of the magazine's pages to fiction, publishing twelve or thirteen stories a year, whereas Ransom at most had published seven, and his stories were usually shorter and took up about one seventh of the Kenyon's contents.

Himself a good judge of fiction, Macauley rated Ransom's capacities as fiction editor decidedly too low when in 1978, in an article reminiscing about "The Kenyon Review, 1939-1970," he remarked:

Fiction was always one of John Ransom's blind spots. He considered it an interesting semi-art, necessary but usually tedious, and he did not read it often. . . .

I respected criticism and wanted to keep up that Review tradition--but with rather more maverick critics than John Ransom had printed. I also wanted to do well by the poets, though knowing that my editorial insight could never equal his. But chiefly I hoped that the Review could display some of the new talents in fiction. The late 1950s and early 1960s were a promising time for fiction writers. . . .

Under Ransom's editorship, the Review had tended to favor southern fiction: Robert Penn Warren's, Flannery O'Connor's, or Andrew Lytle's. My theory was--and is--

that a good literary magazine ought to be about ten years ahead of general acceptance, as experience has proved. . . .

So in the 1960s I hoped to find the unknown generation of the 1970s—or at least some worthy part of it. Most literary magazine editors share this hope and almost all of us are doomed to half-success.²²

This article clearly shows Macauley's priorities, but, as this study has shown, it can hardly be called an objective assessment of Ransom's Kenyon Review. Macauley had succumbed to existing prejudices, as is plain from his remarks that Ransom had not published "maverick" critics, that "[f]iction was one of his blind spots," and that what fiction he published was Southern. In fact, during Ransom's editorship many of America's best writers of fiction came from the South and Ransom published them not because they were Southern, but because they were good.

Macauley did not discover any writers of fiction who have gone on to great fame, but he published many early stories by promising young or unknown writers. If they did not make a breakthrough in the end, Macauley's Kenyon at any rate fulfilled one of the important functions of a literary magazine, which is to encourage young talents by publication. Among the numerous American unknowns who got their chance in Macauley's magazine we find Avram Davidson, Vincent G. Dethier, Harriet Gail, Elizabeth Paris, and James M. Stitt. The names of the Southern writers Georgia McKinley and Nancy Huddleston Packer, as well as those of Nancy Potter and William Wiser, all of whom appeared more than once in The Kenyon Review, may sound more familiar, but they too

have not established much of a reputation for themselves. John Stewart Carter is an American Kenyon discovery who with his richly textured and vividly imagined stories rose to spectacular critical and popular fame. His novel Full Fathom Five (1965), which consisted mainly of two of Carter's long Kenyon stories, was a huge success: it received the Houghton Mifflin Award and a fiction prize from the Chicago Friends of Literature; it became the Book of the Month Selection for January 1965 and a best-seller.²³ Carter's fame proved transient, however, for if his fiction initially dazzled his readers into blind admiration, it became apparent after its first brilliancy had faded that it was too clearly imitation Fitzgerald. Among the few American writers who published early stories in The Kenyon Review and who have gone on to lasting fame are Thomas Pynchon and Joyce Carol Oates.

Quite a number of the foreign writers of fiction whom Macauley introduced to the American reading public are Irish, for instance, Benedict Kiely, Julia O'Faolain, and Sheila Negig. The British writer Hilary Corke published both linguistically virtuous stories as well as poetry and amusing criticism in the Kenyon, but this has not brought him fame. However, many of the writers from abroad whom Macauley published early in their careers have become well-known internationally. Cases in point are Olivia Davis, Nadine Gordimer, Ruth Praver Jhabvala, Doris Lessing, Clarice Lispector, V.S. Naipaul, and Christina Stead.

With few exceptions, the stories Macauley published underscored his claim that "most of the possible range of the short story in our particular time [has] more or less settled within the limits of traditional good prose and good structure. The 'experimental' story--those elaborate games of language and sensibility so favored in the

preceding period--has little to offer but repetition and . . . sounds dated and old-fashioned today." In his emphasis on "traditional good prose and good structure" and in his dislike of the "experimental" story Macauley clearly follows in Ransom's footsteps.²⁴ It is plain, too, that although the quantity of Macauley's fiction surpassed Ransom's, there was little difference in quality. The themes and settings of the stories in Macauley's Kenyon did differ; they were generally less restricted than those in the earlier magazine. In step with the times, no subject was taboo or could be too explicitly portrayed. Paranoia, sex of all varieties, Jews, and blacks were depicted in settings ranging from Vernon, Indiana to Africa and India. Also, whereas, with respect to fiction, Ransom had usually kept from making or suggesting extensive changes, Macauley edited freely, usually to the satisfaction of his authors. As had been the case in Ransom's Kenyon, a considerable number of the contributors in fiction, more than a third, were women.

Some of the stories were published in a new section, "Department KR: A Section of Briefer Comment," which appeared for the first time in the spring of 1961 and became a regular feature of the Kenyon until its demise. In its intention "to be more informal than the rest of the magazine" and "to publish topical pieces" "Department KR" did not differ much from "Excursion," but in its actual realization "Department KR" was more varied. Nevertheless, Macauley's belief that "our Department in the back of the magazine" was "generally better read than the front" was a misconception; those replying to a 1965 questionnaire agreed on one thing only, namely that this section should be abolished. The few stories and poems that appeared in "Department KR" form its most palatable part. Nearly twenty per cent of the "Department"

consisted of petty communications; the essays in this section also were trivial rather than timely. Macauley incorporated the Kenyon's film criticism in this department. William S. Pechter succeeded Parker Tyler in 1961, but his discussions pale beside the brilliant criticism of his predecessor, whom he discredited disdainfully as "not writing film criticism while allegedly writing film criticism."²⁵ After 1963 various other critics commented on the movies, but their work too remained far below the high standard Tyler had set in Ransom's Kenyon. Two or three articles on drama also appeared in this section. The few other articles on this subject appeared elsewhere in the magazine; the three essays written by Ransom's contributors Eric Bentley and Ernest Borneman stand out. In contrast to movie and drama criticism, the articles on painting and sculpture in the later Kenyon could bear comparison with those published in Ransom's time. This was thanks to Ransom, however, for he discovered and first published Alfred Werner, who became the regular art critic for Macauley's and Lanning's magazine.

It is plain from the Kenyon's emphases on fiction and foreign cultures, and from new ventures such as "Excursion" and "Department KR" that Macauley was an active editor who tried hard to impress his personality on the magazine. The editorial column "Standpoint" was particularly meant to sound the Kenyon's new voice. Appearing for the first time in Macauley's second issue, the Spring 1960 number, this column commented on events in the literary world such as Pulitzer prizes, visits from foreign authors, or books of great topical interest, and on contributors to and articles in the Kenyon. Its tone was highly informal, chatty even, emphasizing Macauley's wish for a more popular, less highbrow magazine than Ransom's had been. It was in

"Standpoint" that Macauley stated his editorial policies explicitly. The first "Standpoint" announced that the new Kenyon Review would print "a larger variety and greater amount of fiction than in the past." Marking the first anniversary of Macauley's magazine, the Winter 1961 "Standpoint" was devoted almost completely to editorial intentions, Macauley making very much the same points as he had done in his letter to President Lund some three years earlier. Besides being informative, "Standpoint" usually made for good reading, particularly when Macauley was much vexed. The column was discontinued after four instalments. Macauley had sufficiently expounded his editorial beliefs; discussing irritant books took up too much of his time and it was hard to be witty always; moreover, the "short signed pieces" he had invited for this column were not submitted. The "Standpoints" constituted about half of Macauley's contributions. Unlike Ransom and Rice he figured but infrequently in his own pages. "'Let Me Tell You about the Rich . . .'" is his only full-length article; he also is the probable author of four reviews, one unsigned and three under the pseudonym of Zoilus.²⁶

Again unlike Ransom, Macauley did not cultivate a regular core of Kenyon Review writers of criticism and usually did not publish more than three or four articles of those critics he valued most. If the multitude of Macauley's critics with their widely diverging viewpoints, subjects, and styles gave the Kenyon the desired broadness of range, the magazine also became so miscellaneous in nature that it lost its character. Many of those who contributed relatively regularly such as Eric Bentley, Ronald Berman, Hilary Corke, Frank O'Connor, and Alfred Werner have already been mentioned. Philip Young, a pupil of Austin Warren's, was Macauley's foremost and most frequent contributor in criticism. His "Fallen from Time: The Mythic Rip Van Winkle" and "The

Mother of Us All: Pocahontas Reconsidered" are two classic examples of myth criticism at its best. Two of his articles dealt with Hemingway. In the autumn of 1964, in "Our Hemingway Man," Young first cheerfully demolished about all the criticism that had appeared on Hemingway since 1960 and then went on to an admiring discussion of Hemingway's own posthumously published A Moveable Feast (1964). In his very personal essay "Hemingway and Me: A Rather Long Story" Young faced the question whether his study Ernest Hemingway (1952, rev. ed. 1966) had not been a factor in Hemingway's decision to commit suicide.²⁷

The advisory editor George Steiner also contributed rather often. Among his major articles we find a lively, early article on the Hungarian Marxist critic Georg Lukács, which led off Macauley's inaugural issue; an article "in celebration" of Robert Graves's art; and one lamenting "the retreat from language to alternate expressive forms." Steiner ceased to appear in The Kenyon Review after Macauley had abruptly informed him that he had abolished the board of advisory editors. George P. Elliott deserves mention because his essays are characteristic of the informal tone of Macauley's Kenyon Review. His "A Brown Fountain Pen" and "A Piece of Lettuce" are fusions of (partly invented) personal recollections and straightforward discussions of writers such as William Blake and H.G. Wells. Nelson Algren's contributions, two instalments of his impressionistic book of travels, Who Lost an American? (1963), likewise are representative of this informality of tone.²⁸

Yet, with few exceptions, the handful of old-fashioned, more objectively critical articles Macauley published are at least as memorable as the experimental, subjective accounts he favoured. This is particularly true for his Modern Authors Series, a series which was

meant to "give the general reader an informal but comprehensive introduction to a man of letters who has made a secure place for himself in the literature of the twentieth century." Arthur Mizener opened this series of generally appreciative though not uncritical discussions of--mainly--British and American novelists with "A Dance to the Music of Time: The Novels of Anthony Powell" in Macauley's maiden issue. John A. Meixner and R.W. Lid each discussed Ford Madox Ford in his second issue; George Steiner wrote on Robert Graves in his third; and Jerome Thale treated C.P. Snow in his fourth. Marcus Klein's "A Discipline of Nobility: Saul Bellow's Fiction," leading off the Spring 1962 number, has become a classic example of well thought out Bellow criticism. Jonathan Baumbach's "The Economy of Love: The Novels of Bernard Malamud," appearing in the summer of 1963, pinpointed early and precisely Malamud's main concerns, even if Baumbach perhaps put too much emphasis on the father figures in his fiction. Although Josephine Herbst's "Nathanael West" in the Autumn 1961 issue was rather repetitious, and although Edward Hyams' "Peyrefitte" in the Summer 1962 issue was full of generalizations, on the whole the Modern Authors Series was one of Macauley's better ventures. However, in his zeal to dissociate his innovated, modern Kenyon from Ransom's, Macauley stretched the truth considerably when he implied, as he did in promotion leaflets, that his predecessor had mainly published articles about "Yeats, Lawrence, Shakespeare, and Donne."²⁹

Unlike Ransom, Macauley "did not like special issues particularly" and published only two, one of them the Irish issue mentioned earlier. The other, the Winter 1964 number, marked Kenyon's hundredth issue and its twenty-fifth anniversary, and was dedicated to Ransom, who had turned seventy-five, and to the memory of Rice. It was, perhaps,

Macauley's greatest editorial triumph. In March 1963 Macauley had sent out invitations for contributions to this special issue to many of Ransom's friends and regular contributors, most of whom had not appeared in the Kenyon since his retirement. Many accepted gladly, partly because Macauley had promised them special high rates, but mainly because, as R.P. Blackmur put it, they wanted "very much to do something for the 100th number . . . more especially for the John Ransom than the mere 100th."³⁰ As before, some of those who accepted initially, later reneged; as before, Tate was one of them, as were Francis Fergusson and Lionel Trilling.

Macauley's editorial read in part: "Literary journalists often repeat the falsism that the Review was solely an organ of the 'New Critics.' The truth is that in 1939 almost any kind of intelligent critic was new---and over the years the Review has been hospitable to all varieties of them. In honor of Mr. Ransom, we have brought together a collection of new writing by his old friends. Those represented here are some of the critics, poets, and fiction writers who helped make his volumes of the Review so illustrious. It is, in a way, a family reunion." Almost twice as thick as an ordinary issue, the Ransom issue broke up into two parts, one, the "family reunion," the other, a symposium about W.H. Auden's new poem "A Change of Air." The poetry section of the reunion part was truly reminiscent of the Kenyon's golden years. John Berryman contributed "Three Dream Songs;" Robert Lowell wrote "Five Poems for John Crowe Ransom;" Randall Jarrell submitted "Woman;" and Howard Nemerov "The Human Condition." Robert Graves and Richmond Lattimore, belonging to Macauley's Kenyon rather than to Ransom's, also contributed poetry. Jean Stafford, Peter Taylor, and Robert Penn Warren, all in the family, contributed fiction,

as did the newcomer Nadine Gordimer.³¹

In the critical department of this anniversary issue we find Eric Bentley's discussion of "Bertolt Brecht's First Play;" Richard Blackmur's transparent treatment of "The Charterhouse of Parma;" and Richard Ellmann's condemnation of the current disproportionate search for Yeats's sources. Leslie Fiedler contributed a prejudiced, yet sparkling survey of modern poetry, from Blackmur to the Beats, with, at Macaulay's request, a laudatory paragraph about Ransom's poems. Cleanth Brooks's essay "W.H. Auden as a Critic" was the prologue to the Auden symposium, which was "part of a series of such symposia which ha[d] been appearing in New World Writing." George P. Elliott discussed "A Change of Air" by combining New Criticism and speculation; Karl Shapiro began his reaction by cautioning that "[n]obody in his right mind is going to horse around with an Auden poem," but nevertheless had a go at it; and Stephen Spender concentrated on problems of grammar in the poem. W.H. Auden, replying to his critics, confessed that he felt "a little sad . . . that none of them seems to have spotted the kind of poem it is--namely a parable," and analysed his own poem. The issue was concluded by Ransom himself. As one of the "old and happy gang" of regular contributors to his Kenyon, Ransom discussed Wallace Stevens, "a major poet whose magnitude has been dawning only gradually upon us."³²

The Kenyon's twenty-fifth anniversary, Ransom's seventy-fifth birthday, and the overall brilliance of this special issue were noted in the press. At home, in a long article, Newsweek remarked that The Kenyon Review "was edited by Ransom with such distinction that both it and the college are associated with literary excellence by intellectuals throughout the English-speaking world." In Great

Britain, The Times Literary Supplement recalled the Kenyon's first years, and showered compliments: "the Kenyon has led the way in a revolution in American literary criticism" and the "Sewanee . . . the Partisan . . . and . . . the Hudson Review . . . have all broadened a tradition that is essentially the Kenyon's creation."³³

Most of the credit given in these and other articles went to Ransom's Kenyon only. Whatever Macauley tried, patchwork instead of personality characterized his magazine. His experiments in the review section corroborate this. In his first issue he started the column "Once Over Lightly," a "section of brief reviews of books by Kenyon Review contributors or associates," only to abandon it after one appearance. In 1962 he revived Ransom's "Shorter Reviews," published them irregularly, and, after some two years, gave them up, as Ransom had done, because they usually came down to mere synopses. In January 1966 Macauley started the "Bad Books Department." This column appeared only once under his editorship; its reviewers only railed, they did not analyse. And although Macauley proudly announced that his review department intended "to provide the reader with guidance not only in the book but in the record market," the addition of reviews of records could not eliminate the general futility of the review section.³⁴

Futile, too, was the poetry section and doubly so when one calls to mind the distinction of the poetry during the Ransom years. The poet most frequently published, five times in all, was David Posner, a Kenyon College graduate, but he never gained recognition beyond The Kenyon Review. James Dickey, Leonard E. Nathan, and William Stafford each appeared four times. Although Macauley did not discover any of these distinguished poets, he published them early. Their poems were the highlights of the Kenyon's poetry section. Brewster Ghiselin is

the only one to merit mention among those few poets who appeared three times; by the time that Macauley first published him, in the winter of 1963, he had long since made a name for himself. Leaving aside the special Ransom issue, among the fifteen or so poets who appeared twice, Jean Garrigue and Howard Nemerov, both faithful contributors to Ransom's Kenyon, are most renowned. Jack Gilbert is the only poet of this group whom Macauley published when he was still a long way from fame; others, such as Robert Pack or Lewis Turco were familiar presences in the literary reviews and had books of verse to their names before they appeared in Macauley's Kenyon Review.

By far the majority of the poets in Macauley's magazine appeared only once. Consequently, as in his departments of fiction and criticism, continuity was virtually absent. And, as in the case of the poets he published more often, Macauley preferred to print those who had earlier appeared in other magazines. This suggests that, as he himself admitted, Macauley was not too sure of his own judgement of poetry. Again, most of the major poets among those who appeared only once--Richard Eberhart, Robert Lowell, Muriel Rukeyser, Delmore Schwartz, Robert Penn Warren--belong to Ransom's Kenyon. Ransom himself also contributed a poem, "Master's in the Garden Again," a heavily revised version of "Conrad in Twilight," which he had written some forty years earlier. And while the early publication of John William Corrington and L.E. Sissman is to Macauley's credit, as a rule the few poems by hardly known poets that he published were poor. The verse is "downright feeble," George Steiner pointed out to Macauley in the summer of 1961; "[w]hy not swallow pride and ask the good poets for some work." In 1962 he still found the "verse very weak" and emphasized that "[p]oetry must always be the crown." But Macauley

turned a deaf ear. Although he had set out to "get as much fresh and original writing in poetry . . . as possible," it is plain that as a poetry editor he was neither keen nor daring and usually followed fashions set by others.³⁵

By the publication of criticism treating themes beyond the purely literary and of criticism written in a subjective or slickly sophisticated way; by initiating new sections such as "Department KR" and "Excursion;" and, particularly, by the publication of a large amount of creative, rather than critical writing Macauley had tried to give the academic and mechanically edited Kenyon of Ransom's last years a more lively, a more popular personality. But considering Macauley's notion that "a good literary magazine ought to be about ten years ahead of general acceptance," it is deplorable that the Kenyon was not actively shaping a literary sensibility any longer, but was now to a large extent being shaped passively by the latest literary fashions. The Kenyon Review illustrated how, by the late fifties, as Irving Howe has put it, the "lines of separation that had defined intellectual life--lines between high and middle-brow, radical and acquiescent, serious and popular--were becoming blurred." Then, in the sixties, political and social issues--the civil rights movement, Vietnam, the first stirrings of the feminist movement--far more than literary ones, which had made the Kenyon so central in its great days, came to engage the intellectuals, but, like Ransom, Macauley excluded politics from The Kenyon Review. "I felt that a quarterly was not very au courant as far as politics [are] concerned," Macauley explained in 1982; "you have to be in London, Washington, Paris or whatever to be close to good political writers and good political thinking. So I didn't want to compete with magazines like Encounter or Partisan Review who did the

job probably much better than I could have."³⁶ Besides, Macauley himself was quite simply not interested in politics.

Change for the Worse

When in 1966 A.C. Spectorosky, who "thought that the REVIEW was printing the best fiction in any American magazine," asked Macauley to become Playboy's fiction editor at a salary that more than doubled his present wages, Macauley decided to give this half-heartedly sophisticated girly magazine a try.³⁷ He got Lund to grant him a year's leave of absence should he regret this step and want to return to Gambier.

The conclusion to Macauley's career as the editor of The Kenyon Review was in violent contrast to its auspicious beginnings. In 1960 everybody had wholeheartedly endorsed the changes Macauley made. In February 1960 Hilton Kramer, editor of Arts, had told Macauley that his "new editorial policy [was] sure to excite a much more urgent interest in the magazine than has been possible for a long time;" he had particularly welcomed the Kenyon's "new worldliness." In July 1960 Seymour Lawrence had expressed his "great pleasure and delight" in "a new Kenyon . . . concerned with contemporary creative work rather than the more scholarly articles and the New Critics school." Austin Warren, who revered Ransom, had thought Macauley was "doing an admirable job of editing."³⁸

However, the enthusiasm with which the literary world had initially greeted Macauley's new magazine had decreased drastically within a few years. His attempt to shake off the academic yoke had failed signally, as the trend in the universities--and in the other literary quarterlies--had likewise been to move away from criticism to creative

writing, from serious to sophisticated writing, and from appealing to a highbrow elite to appealing to a middlebrow multitude. Paradoxically, then, Macauley's Kenyon was much more deeply branded by the academy than Ransom's and Rice's magazine, avant-garde almost in spite of itself, had ever been, excepting its last few years. Consequently it was heavily attacked, particularly by those inside the flourishing and outspoken counterculture of the sixties and also by many who missed the wild and free spirit of the little magazines of the twenties and thirties. "Is it reasonable to expect these academic . . . editors, acquiescent signers of McCarthyite Loyalty Oaths, recipients of sweet manna from countless foundation cornucopias . . . to present in their magazines any semblance of progressive revolutionary writing?," Leslie Woolf Hedley, poet and editor at the Inferno Press asked rhetorically. Robert Bly, in a leaflet promoting his own magazine The Sixties, spoke of the Kenyon as a "museum," as "oddly unfitted for MODERN life;" and the critic Beverly Gross compared the "gut commitment" of the colourful littles to the timidity of the pale literary quarterlies which she saw as cankerous outgrowths of the academy. Theodore Solotaroff, in his well-considered "The Red Hot Vacuum," praised the Kenyon and Partisan reviews for having "had an incalculable effect in strengthening literary thought in America and, to some extent, artistic performance" in the forties and fifties, but found them "much changed" in 1964. "The former ideas and values linger on as vague dispositions, without the energy or clarity they once had."³⁹

It is clear that not only The Kenyon Review, but all literary quarterlies were damned and doomed. Macauley, not a brilliant, but certainly a hard-working, adventurous editor, had come to head the Kenyon at an impropitious time. In his vivid cultural history of the

sixties, Gates of Eden (1977), Morris Dickstein pointedly sketched the diminishing role of the reviews on the literary scene:

with outlets for political action and practical change unavailable, the fifties had proved very congenial to reflection, to the long view of things. . . . But the sixties began . . . with . . . freedom rides in the South, lunch-counter sit-ins, and civil rights demonstrations. . . . The humanist vision and the democratic creed were already finely honed; the time had come to push again for their practical enactment. Thus it happened that newsprint broadsheets like the Village Voice, in closer touch with the ongoing tumultuous flow of the new culture, displaced the once-preponderant quarterlies like Partisan Review as key voices of the sixties. . . . [T]hroughout our culture journalism and political controversy took on an energy and immediacy that had belonged in the fifties to the world of art and criticism.⁴⁰

The eagerness and excitement with which the reviews had once been awaited and read, had now completely disappeared; instead of a keen pleasure, reading a literary review was more often a dull duty. Some of the passion that they had inspired in the forties was generated in the sixties by the re-emergence of the little magazine. Kindled by dissatisfaction with the literary establishment, and, often, with the political establishment too, the little magazine boom of the sixties was eased into being by the general accessibility of inexpensive means

of reproduction. So, with, on the one hand, the new journalistic interlarding of political and literary interests advanced on the instant in such different magazines as The New York Review of Books, Rolling Stone, or The Village Voice, each of which reached a wide public; and with, on the other hand, the latest, wildest, most idiosyncratic interests preached in the evanescent little magazines, each of which reached a minute but devoted public, the sedate quarterlies were played out. Looking back from the vantage point of the late seventies, Macauley himself gave similar reasons to explain his defection to Playboy:

In the mid-1960s, I began to have a sense that the purely literary review was becoming outmoded. . . . It arrived four times a year, two hundred pages heavy, and demanded some long evenings of attention. . . . Along with that, there was the plain fact that Americans . . . were concerned far less with imaginative writing than with politics, social questions, factual writing of all sorts. . . . Readers wanted to know immediately what Norman Mailer had felt at the peace march last week in Washington. . . .

The quarterly review . . . in its responsible role as culture-bearer, is constantly encroached on. Its news value is gone. Its function as a developer of new talent has been lessened by the quicker receptivity of the commercial press.⁴¹

"For these reasons and some personal ones" Macauley left Kenyon

College.

When he did, he put President Lund on the spot; the College had no other choice but to make George Lanning acting editor until Macauley had decided whether his position with Playboy would be permanent. On February 1, 1967 he wrote that he would stay in Chicago. His major consideration was financial: Macauley mentioned "a monetary difference of about \$250,000 over the next twelve years." Yet, he had the future of the Kenyon and, for that matter, of Lanning at heart for he suggested him as his successor. But whereas Lund had obediently followed Ransom's lead when choosing his successor, he ignored Macauley's counsel. Feeling that Lanning lacked "(1) a comprehensive vision of policy, and the vigor to achieve it; (2) a sufficiently large circle of contacts within literary circles; and (3) recognized stature," he had consulted Robert Lowell as early as the autumn of 1966 when Macauley had only just left "for the He[f]ner circus." Lowell suggested the British writers Donald Davie and John Wain, and the President duly approached, first, Davie and, later, Wain. Though both had initially been "flattered" and "dazzled," each turned down the offer when he learned its financial terms--an annual salary of \$12,500.00. Wain refused elegantly: "When, over twenty years ago, I first began to read the Kenyon Review, it would have seemed merely fantastic if anyone had told me that I should live to be invited to the post of editor." Nevertheless, he did "not want to leave Oxford" and could not "really reconcile the two occupations of writer and editor."⁴²

As the end of the academic year was swiftly approaching, Lund realized that it would be well-nigh impossible now to find an editor from within the academic world. Consequently, he decided to make

Lanning the Kenyon's official editor for a period of two years, at an annual salary of \$13,000.00, starting from July 1, 1967. Hearing of this plan, Macauley, though "glad" for his former assistant, whom he himself had suggested as the major candidate, veered round and spoke of "all the old doubts about lack of firmness." The President too still lacked faith in Lanning's editorial abilities; the two-year contract was to give the College "time to take some careful soundings, later to invite consultation, and then to decide whether to kill [The Kenyon Review] off or the new direction we should take."⁴³ The writing was on the wall. Already before Lanning had taken up his post as the main editor, the thought of killing the Kenyon had raised its ugly head, not to be beaten down ever again.

During the interim period when Lanning was the acting editor he had been assisted by the British writer Wallace Hildick, who had been offered \$10,000.00 for being his associate editor from November 1966 till September 1967. In his early forties, Hildick already had some twenty children's books, some novels for adults, books of criticism, and numerous articles to his name. He was an imaginative, hard working editor. Unfortunately, his and Lanning's personalities clashed so strongly that Hildick tendered his resignation after only three months. Lund managed to pacify them somewhat and Hildick stayed on, doing most of his work at home. On April 23, 1967, however, Hildick resigned definitively. He gave "Dear George" his version of his own contribution and his opinion that Lanning was too timid and spiritless to be the editor of a literary magazine.

The magazine is now, for the first time in many issues,
back on schedule, with prospects of the June number

coming out at the advertised time and material for several subsequent numbers already in hand. Regarding the . . . strengthening of the European viewpoint, we have, as a direct result of my efforts, my experience, and the wideness of my contacts, been able to commission or attract first-time contributions from some of the most eminent writers across the Atlantic. These include:

Angus Wilson	Leonard Woolf
T.F. Powys	William Golding
Frank Swinnerton	C.H. Rolph
Christopher Ricks	Phyllis Bentley
Robert Liddell	H.E. Bates
Margery Fisher	Mario Picchi
Alan Burns	P.N. Furbank

. . .

On this side of the Atlantic I have also been active, inducing writers like William Saroyan and Geoffrey Wagner to make first-time contributions--quite apart from spotting a number of publishable manuscripts . . . and initiating projects like the forthcoming symposium on the short story.

That is the record. Naturally, I am proud of it. . . . But it has only been achieved because of a firm and passionate devotion to the highest possible international standards, and I have . . . been disturbed . . . by your own willingness . . . to sacrifice these standards . . . for the sake of a

purely local, purely parochial . . . peace and
quietness.⁴⁴

After Hildick had resigned, Lanning approached his former Kenyon College classmate Ellington White, who had edited the student publication Hika; he had received his Master's degree from Johns Hopkins University. Lanning had first asked him in 1966, but then White had not been able to leave his teaching post at Hollins College, Virginia at short notice. Now White was approached in time, offered a salary of \$12,000.00, \$2,000.00 more than the year before, and promised an appointment for two years instead of one. White accepted and his name first appeared on the Kenyon's September 1967 masthead. Simultaneously, the British writer Michael Mott, instructor in English at Kenyon College, became poetry editor and was joined in this capacity, four issues later, by Jean Farley, poet and wife of White. When, after two years, Mott left Kenyon College, his place was taken by Philip Church, also a member of the English department.

It was plain from the first that Lanning as the major editor lacked force and initiative; he did not at all desire to make the magazine his own, thinking "the direction we were going in was the direction we . . . should go in."⁴⁵ In practice, Lanning's inclination to play it safe led him to adopt Macauley's Kenyon integrally, but, as he--and, for that matter, White--lacked Macauley's editorial drive, the decline of The Kenyon Review accelerated. Lanning continued or revived his predecessor's worst experiments--"Excursion," the "Shorter Reviews," the "Bad Books Department." Macauley's "Standpoint" was renamed "Front Matter," but whereas Macauley had used his column as a kind of stopgap, Lanning dutifully published "Front Matter" every issue, beginning with

January 1967, whether he had something to say or not. Lanning also took over "Department KR" and, again following Macauley, put topical, informal subjects first; memoirs and reminiscences, preferably light in tone, came second. He kept on Alfred Werner as the Kenyon's art critic and continued Macauley's policy of barring politics from the magazine.

Fiction remained the Kenyon's main section, although Lanning published fewer stories than Macauley had done. They now took up about one fourth of the magazine's contents rather than one third. Like Macauley, he published well written, conventional fiction, printing realists rather than post-modernists and traditional Europeans rather than the innovative Latin Americans. Unlike Macauley, however, he published established rather than unknown authors. Mainly thanks to Mott and Farley, the poetry under Lanning's editorship was a shade better than the poetry Macauley had published, yet it could not bear comparison to the Ransom years. Lanning printed about forty poets in his seventeen issues, but he generally published only one short poem per poet. Clearly, continuity was still lacking; the poems published were so incidental that the Kenyon's readers could not get an informed sense of the poets. Ransom had devoted almost three times as much space to poetry, had given each poet far more scope, and had printed them regularly. Thus he had enabled promising writers to develop their talents and to become known and so had decisively fostered the careers of poets such as John Berryman, Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell, and Josephine Miles.

If Lanning, like Macauley, considered criticism less important than fiction, as always, critical articles and reviews took up most of the Kenyon's contents. While following the main lines of Macauley's policies in criticism, Lanning here had some practical ideas of his

own. He tried, for instance, to have an annual round up of mystery books and he planned a ghost issue. Both projects failed. The most ambitious project of his editorship, The International Symposium on the Short Story, "a symposium on both the literary and economic health of the story in many parts of the world," was thought up by Hildick and effected after his departure. Famous authors from all over the world were asked to write about the state of the story in their countries--among those approached who refused were Kay Boyle, John Cheever, Graham Greene, Doris Lessing, and Alain Robbe-Grillet. In the end, fourteen countries were represented, most of them by more than one writer; in all, thirty articles appeared in this symposium. As all contributors had received the same general statement to respond to, and as most of them were short story writers, their answers are virtually identical. From Japan to Yugoslavia they come down to a predictable defence of the vitality of the short story and to a lament about its near unsaleability. No less than fifteen per cent of the Kenyon's final eight issues was devoted to these repetitious, trivial articles, most of which, as even Ellington White acknowledged, were "very weak." The symposium, he admitted, "was not at all successful."⁴⁶

Besides all the insipid pages taken up by the symposium, "Excursion," and "Front Matter," the deathblow to the magazine was its tame book review section, covering over one fifth of each number. The insignificance of the review section under both Lanning and Macauley is in stark contrast to its distinction under Ransom, who believed that good reviews in their "extreme economy" "are sometimes all the more wonderful in their easy deployment of critical principles." Lanning considered the review section "a pain in the neck," and his fear to abolish the one section "he was never really happy with" shows his

impotence as an editor. Also, the Kenyon completely passed by the newest developments in American literary criticism--for instance, the fast growing emphasis on theoretical speculation blown over from Europe, the nativist debate on the black aesthetic, or personalist confessional modes of approach found no room in The Kenyon Review. Whereas with respect to criticism Ransom's magazine had determined the literary climate in America, publishing the best, often innovative critics, during its final decade the Kenyon hardly knew what was going on in this field and generally published mediocre conformists.⁴⁷

If, in the end, Macauley's Kenyon failed--both because he made it too much of a miscellany, so that it lost its decisive voice, and because he became its editor at an infelicitous time--he had at least tried to wake up the sluggish Kenyon of Ransom's last years by vigorously changing its direction. By the time he left, it was clear that although his magazine had printed some good fiction, it was no longer influential and had become, in fact, an academic visiting-card. Yet, instead of sharply changing the Kenyon's direction, Lanning had followed Macauley's editorial policies, but emphasized the worst aspects because he lacked imagination, discernment, daring. Lanning published established names and deferred to middle-of-the-road preferences, while the early Kenyon had published talented young writers and dictated its readers' tastes; Lanning looked for celebrities to endow his magazine with distinction, while in Ransom's days The Kenyon Review had conferred prestige upon its authors.

It is telling that Lanning quoted with approval a student who, after intensive study, had found that "'literary magazines . . . are not written just with highbrow professors in mind.'" Even more so than Macauley, who had tried to direct his magazine at the "average non-

academic reader," Lanning tried to broaden the Kenyon's base, to move away from seriousness in order to enlarge the magazine's popular appeal, hoping to attract as many readers as possible. With Ransom, of course, "making the Review good" had come first; in 1945 he had felt "morally impelled" to reprimand Eric Bentley for his commercialism. Lanning, by contrast, was proud to report that subscriptions were coming in from high schools and that his magazine was used "in classroom work and not merely as supplemental reading." He was proud, too, of the fact that the Kenyon was representative "of only one of the fashions of the day: non-commitment." Boasting that the magazine was "[w]idely ranging" and "completely modern without being frenziedly fashionable," Lanning did not realize that he was fast spilling its lifeblood.⁴⁸

The End of a Tradition

Lanning's Kenyon Review was criticized for its sad record in creative and critical writing. Wylie Sypher thought that the magazine had "not moved with the times," that it had been "too cautious about using avant-garde criticism." Robert Penn Warren thought it needed "to be more flexible and experimental," while it seemed to Allen Tate that it needed "to find a great editor and let him make his own plans."⁴⁹ Robert Lowell was most damning--and perceptive:

The old Kenyon concentrated on criticism, printed too much as people said, yet set a very high standard, and was surely a much better magazine than the present Kenyon, very weak on criticism and reviews. It is a

little difficult to know what the Review now stands for; not only in criticism, but in fiction and poetry. Values, a furrow, a consistency--these are what it lacks. Perhaps the times forbid much improvement, and surely the best editor in the world might have trouble at this moment. Still, I feel something might happen. It isn't the proportions, I think, or having pieces on current events, tho this might work. It's having a very keen-minded editor; such are so hard to find or attract.⁵⁰

These are passages from some of the answers to a form letter sent out, in the summer of 1968, by Patrick Cruttwell of the English department to a number of American writers and scholars, asking them to comment on the position of literary reviews in general and of The Kenyon Review in particular. Cruttwell had sent out this letter as the head of a committee instituted by Lund "to study The Kenyon Review and its possible future." The President himself had long been thinking of "a review still literary but more particularly political and concerned with current social and intellectual interest as is the Partisan Review—only the point of view would be right-of-center." By February 1968 he had come to the conclusion "that the Review should not be killed, but that a new direction . . . was in order."⁵¹

In the meantime, however, Lund's leadership qualities had come under discussion. Weary of the recriminations and of the College, he resigned in April 1968. Within a month a new President, William Caples, a businessman to the backbone, was elected; he started office in August. Unlike Lund, Caples believed that The Kenyon Review "should

be kept as a literary review or discontinued;" he was initially inclined to keep the Kenyon alive. However, after a few months, when he had a better sense of the hostility the Kenyon community felt towards its magazine and after he had read the report by Cruttwell's committee, Caples changed his mind. Although the committee had decided to present the President with options only and not to urge on him any particular line of action, it could be read between the lines that the committee wanted the Kenyon to continue as "a unique asset to the College of such powerful value." The committee reported that the answers it had received to its form letter commonly emphasized that the demise of the Kenyon would be regretted "very keenly." It was felt that the Kenyon "could still perform a useful function for American letters." But the answers also showed a "sense of disappointment with the present condition of the Review" and noted a decline in quality "largely because of . . . loss of defined stance." The correspondents had suggested that the magazine "be more vigorous, more enterprising, and in closer contact with new developments in literature." On the other hand, they admitted that all literary quarterlies were "suffering from a slump;" indeed, some correspondents, the committee reported, were inclined to think that there was "something inherently old-fashioned, by now, in the 'literary quarterly.'" In February 1969, severing passages from their context in the Cruttwell report, Caples spoke of the magazine's "present mediocre state" and stressed that "Kenyon could get a bad reputation from such association." Consequently he wanted to "[k]ill it, change it, or sell it" rather than follow the committee's fourth option, namely to let the Kenyon continue as it was.⁵²

Meanwhile, sensing the danger they were in, Lanning and White had

submitted money-saving emergency proposals such as eliminating the Kenyon's art work and abandoning its fifth issue; in the hope of meeting Caples' wish that the magazine be connected to the College again they even offered to teach a seminar on the writing of fiction. By this time the probable suspension of The Kenyon Review had led to an unexpected initiative: two members of the English department proposed a project which came down to their reducing their teaching loads in order to edit the Kenyon within a severely limited budget. This plan, which would have made the magazine degenerate even further into a purely academic publication, was rejected outright.

On December 9, 1969 it was summarily "RESOLVED, That in order to eliminate the outgo of funds caused by the continued publication of The Kenyon Review, the Administration of the College be . . . charged with suspending publication of the magazine as expeditiously as possible; the Administration to determine the manner in which suspension of the publication shall be handled, and further that Kenyon College will maintain ownership of The Kenyon Review."⁵³ The \$40,000.00 or more the College now lost annually on a magazine which had declined rapidly and was surviving on its reputation obviously was at the bottom of the decision to discontinue the Kenyon. However, it is safe to speculate that the ill will that had arisen at Kenyon College when Macauley took over and which had spread like wildfire when he left for Playboy had been instrumental too.

The abrupt demise of The Kenyon Review meant the immediate dismissal of its editors. Ellington White had more or less decided to leave Kenyon College anyway. Editing had left him no time for his own writing, furthermore, he was fed up with the interminable wars with the English department. 'Thank God I'm back in Virginia,' he wrote in

November 1970. "The last three years in Gambier were the worst I have ever spent."⁵⁴ But to Lanning the magazine's termination came as a great shock.

I can recall when [Caples] called me in to tell me that the magazine was . . . "suspended." . . . [H]e said: "Kenyon College has been supporting the arts for 32 years and I figure that is long enough." . . . There were rumours before, but I . . . discounted those more than I should have, because from the time I was an undergraduate at Kenyon, it was said that the Review was imminently going to fold. . . . I was appalled, not simply at the prospect of another job, but . . . at such an off-hand way of dismissing 32 years of real achievement.⁵⁵

To dismiss Lanning, who had devoted nearly two decades of his life to the College, so summarily was singularly inelegant. Equally inelegant, but less painful, was the way in which the final issue, number 128, was tacked on to the preceding volumes. Had the Kenyon ended with number 127, the final issue of volume 31, it would have made a reasonably clear break. But by the time the administration decided to discontinue The Kenyon Review, issue 128 was already in press. It was distributed, because Kenyon College disliked waste. Readers were informed of the demise of their magazine by an unsavoury insert written by the administration. As the exorbitant costs of the Kenyon would "penalize areas in [the College's] excellent programs," it read, publication had been suspended. It ended: "We know you share our deep

disappointment in this suspension. The loyalty and support you have given to the Review are sincerely appreciated by Kenyon College and the Review editors and staff.⁵⁶

Refunds were not mentioned. One of the reasons for this omission was that Kenyon College was busy trying to sell The Kenyon Review. In November 1969, before the decision to discontinue had been made definite, Caples had suggested to Lanning that he contact people who might wish to buy the magazine. Lanning left no stone unturned. Many institutions, among them Ohio State University, the Swallow Press, and the University of South Carolina Press, were interested in taking over the Kenyon integrally, entered into negotiations with Kenyon College, but found the magazine too expensive.

After the dismissal of the editors, the administration of the College approached literary magazines in the hope of selling only the Kenyon's subscription list at great profit; the College expected them, first, to pay a considerable amount of cash and, second, to fill the magazine's unexpired subscriptions which came to over 8,000 single copies. Charles Newman, editor of TriQuarterly, one of the magazines interested in the list, pointed out that Kenyon College was "asking us to pay a minimum of \$23,000 for the use of a list which we could have rented from you for several hundred dollars a year ago," adding "that as Kenyon was perhaps the most important literary review in this country for some time . . . it is a disservice to its memory to dispose of its list in such a way." In deference to "the continuity of the tradition of literary reviews to which the Kenyon Review contributed so mightily," Newman suggested that he send one free issue of TriQuarterly to "all subscribers not duplicated on our list" or "renting your list at the old rates."⁵⁷

Kenyon College rejected Newman's proposals, for it had more irons in the fire. December, Partisan Review, and The Yale Review also had expressed interest in Kenyon's subscription list, but, on learning the College's inordinate demands, they too withdrew. Indeed, the College's attempts to bleed the Kenyon white seem unrealistic; some thirty years earlier The Kenyon Review itself had received the subscription list of The Southern Review free of charge, in addition to \$600.00 for filling its unexpired subscriptions. Meanwhile, Kenyon College had been discussing plans for a new Kenyon Review, run jointly, with East Texas State University. East Texas knew that The Kenyon Review would bring "tremendous prestige" to its new doctoral programme and therefore was extremely accommodating, willing to pay for practically anything. However, when it realized that Kenyon College wanted to retain total editorial control and was "just looking for a sugar daddy," East Texas retracted its offer.⁵⁸

Kenyon College had been as careless about the quantities of mail that had been amassing as it had been about everything else in connection with the Kenyon's discontinuance. Bills and requests for refunds, for back issues, for permission to reprint, but also new manuscripts and new subscription orders had been piling up since December 1969; however, it was not until September 1970 that someone was appointed to try and sort out this mess. It remains doubtful whether the magazine's outstanding bills were ever paid or whether its subscribers ever received a refund. Yet, in all, the College was quite pleased with the swift way in which, in the words of one alumnus, it had handled the "wilful destruction of Kenyon's only remaining claim to national attention."⁵⁹

Kenyon's new President, William Caples, who had been responsible

for the demise of The Kenyon Review, was pleased to report "very little unfavorable comment on suspension of publication, practically none from faculty and students." It is true, at Kenyon hardly anybody mourned, not even Ransom, who was not much interested in the outside world any longer. But outside Gambier others were "deeply sorry," "distressed," or "terribly upset." Howard Allen was "dismayed" and referred to the killing of the Kenyon as "an act of senseless vandalism," as "one more corrosive element in the deterioration of Kenyon's public image."⁶⁰ David Madden was "enraged and shocked and saddened" by the fact that the College had "axed" The Kenyon Review.

THE KENYON REVIEW made literary history. Most writers write the way they do today (the good ones, that is) and most teachers teach literature as they do today because of the essays, the poetry, and fiction in that small circulation magazine. . . .

No literary history of the United States can fail to account for the Kenyon Review; henceforth that history will note that the College's new president killed the Review. . . .

All the good writers in this country . . . will remember Kenyon from now on, not as the college that produced the Kenyon Review, but as the college that tossed it into the junk heap.

This letter is not intended to persuade you to change your mind; the mind that could conceive of such an infamy in the first place is not likely to be swayed; for that reason few writers will bother to

write to you personally; thus, you will, quite possibly, feel none of the contempt I am talking about. But because I do not believe that any man is completely lacking in conscience, I am addressing yours. Although you won't change your mind, at least you can feel guilty.⁶¹

Nadine Gordimer, Russell Kirk, Jerome Mazzaro, and William Phillips were among those who, in private correspondence, expressed their regret in a less outspoken manner. Phillips, for instance, wrote: "Makes you feel that maybe an era has ended, which I suppose is the case." In public, in her foreword to The Best American Short Stories (1971), Martha Foley commented: "The Kenyon Review—one of the most important magazines this country has ever seen or will ever see—is no more. Infuriating as might have been some of its theories of the 'new criticism' (in my opinion), the magazine never faltered in its respect for the highest standards in literature, and the short stories it published were usually magnificent." Clearly, Caples' complacency about the virtual absence of anger at the demise of the Kenyon was misplaced. Yet the outrage was not as violent as one might have expected in the case of a review that has been called "perhaps the most prestigious literary magazine of the century." But, then, the times when the death of any literary review—now the academy incarnate—was deeply felt had long since passed; besides, the mediocrity of The Kenyon Review in its late years was not worth weeping over. Those who mourned, mourned the Kenyon of Ransom and Rice, not the Kenyon of the sixties. Even Macauley, Lanning, and White, remembering The Kenyon Review in the eighties, kept veering away from their own editorships

and time and again reverted to the Kenyon of the forties and fifties under Ransom.⁶²

When The Kenyon Review was revived in 1979, four decades after its birth, the new editors referred to Ransom's and Rice's magazine as an ideal they hoped to approach, though not to copy.⁶³ The history of this new series will have to be written by someone else--if it ever deserves a history. This study has shown, it is hoped, that the era for literary reviews proper passed in the mid-fifties. Fortune telling is risky, but in our age of chips, computers, and artificial intelligence one is hard pressed to find indications that in the foreseeable future literary reviews are again to become as powerful as they once were. It is not that literary reviews, even now, are totally useless. If they are at present, in a narrow sense, university publications, for a small university or college the review still is an important means of advertising and public relations; if of a decent standard the literary review enhances its sponsor's image. It confers the same advantages on its contributors, who are mainly academics: to contribute an article to a reputable review means to have published an advertisement for oneself.

Nowadays, then, the function of a literary review is to be an academic trade journal. This falls poignantly short of the ideal, voiced by T.S. Eliot, that "a literary review should maintain the application, in literature, of principles which have their consequences also in politics and in private conduct; and it should maintain them without tolerating any confusion of the purposes of pure literature with the purposes of politics or ethics. . . . It is the function of a literary review to maintain the autonomy and disinterestedness of literature--not to 'life,' as something contrasted to literature, but

to all the other activities, which, together with literature, are the components of life." Explaining why great creative epochs are so rare, Matthew Arnold wrote that "for the creation of a master-work of literature two powers must concur, the power of the man and the power of the moment and the man is not enough without the moment."⁶⁴ When Ransom founded The Kenyon Review, man and moment met.

NOTES

Quotations from manuscript sources reproduce the original unless, for clarity's sake, corrections have been made in square brackets. With respect to references to The Kenyon Review it should be noted that only numbers of volumes, and not of issues, have been given. For more complete, if not always accurate bibliographical information concerning the Kenyon's first twenty-five years the reader is referred to Elizabeth Browne, comp., Kenyon Review Index: 25 Year Cumulative Compilation, 1939-1963 (New York: AMS Reprint Company, 1964).

The following abbreviations have been used throughout the notes.

Magazines

AS: American Scholar

HR: The Hudson Review

KC: Kenyon Collegian

KR: The Kenyon Review

PR: Partisan Review

SoR: The Southern Review

SR: The Sewanee Review

SRL: Saturday Review of Literature

TLS: The Times Literary Supplement

Manuscript Collections

Barzun Papers: Jacques Barzun Papers, Columbia University Library, New York, New York

Berryman Papers: John Berryman Papers, University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Bishop Papers: John Peale Bishop Papers, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey

Blackmur Papers: Richard Blackmur Papers, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey

Van Wyck Brooks Papers: Van Wyck Brooks Papers, University of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Burke Papers: Kenneth Burke Papers, Pennsylvania State University Library, University Park, Pennsylvania

Cairns Papers: Huntington Cairns Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Carter Papers: Thomas Henry Carter Papers, Washington and Lee University Library, Lexington, Virginia

Chase Papers: Richard Chase Papers, Columbia University Library, New York, New York

Corman Papers: Cid Corman Papers, Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin, Texas

Cowley Papers: Malcolm Cowley Papers, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois

Davidson Papers: Donald Davidson Papers, Vanderbilt University Library, Nashville, Tennessee

Deutsch Papers: Babette Deutsch Papers, Berg Collection, New York

Notes

- Public Library, New York, New York
- Duncan Papers: Robert Duncan Papers, Washington University Library, St. Louis, Missouri
- East Texas Papers: Oral History Papers, East Texas State University Library, Commerce, Texas
- Engle Papers: Paul Engle Papers, University of Iowa Library, Iowa City, Iowa
- Fletcher Papers: John Gould Fletcher Papers, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas
- C.H. Ford Papers: Charles Henri Ford Papers, Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin, Texas
- F.M. Ford Papers: Ford Madox Ford Papers, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, New York
- Garrigue Papers: Jean Garrigue Papers, Berg Collection, New York Public Library, New York, New York
- GF Papers: Grants for France Papers, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Tarrytown, New York
- Ginsberg Papers: Allen Ginsberg Papers, Columbia University Library, New York, New York
- Hillyer Papers: Robert Hillyer Papers, Brown University Library, Providence, Rhode Island
- HR Papers: Hudson Review Papers, Hudson Review Office, New York, New York
- Jarrell Papers: Randall Jarrell Papers, Berg Collection, New York Public Library, New York, New York
- KC Collection: Kenyon College Collection, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Tarrytown, New York
- KC Papers: Kenyon College Papers, Kenyon College Archives and President's Office, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio
- KR Papers: Kenyon Review (1939-1970) Papers, Chalmers Memorial Library, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio
- KRns Papers: Kenyon Review, New Series (1978-) Papers, Kenyon Review Office, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio
- LMS Papers: Literary Magazines Study Papers, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Tarrytown, New York
- Lowell Papers: Robert Lowell Papers, Harvard University Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Lytle Papers: Andrew Lytle Papers, Vanderbilt University Library, Nashville, Tennessee
- Matthiessen Papers: F.O. Matthiessen Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut
- Miles Papers: Josephine Miles Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California
- Mizener Papers: Arthur Mizener Papers, Vanderbilt University Library, Nashville, Tennessee
- Moore Papers: Merrill Moore Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- O'Donnell Papers: George Marion O'Donnell Papers, Washington University Library, St. Louis, Missouri
- PR Papers: Partisan Review Papers, Boston University Library, Boston, Massachusetts
- Porter Papers: Katherine Anne Porter Papers, University of Maryland Library, College Park, Maryland
- Random House Papers: Random House Papers, Columbia University Library, New York, New York
- Ransom Papers: Ransom Family Papers, Tennessee State Library and

Archives, Nashville, Tennessee

Rexroth Papers: Kenneth Rexroth Papers, Washington University Library, St. Louis, Missouri

Rice Papers: Philip Blair Rice Papers, Chalmers Memorial Library, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio

Roethke Papers: Theodore Roethke Papers, University of Washington Library, Seattle, Washington

Schwartz Papers: Delmore Schwartz Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut

Scott Papers: Winfield Townley Scott Papers, Brown University Library, Providence, Rhode Island

Shapiro Papers: Karl Shapiro Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

SoR Papers: Southern Review (1935-1942) Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut

SR Papers: Sewanee Review Papers, Sewanee Review Office, University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee

Stallknecht Papers: Newton P. Stallknecht Papers, Indiana University Library, Bloomington, Indiana

Stallman Papers: Robert Wooster Stallman Papers, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Virginia

Stewart Papers: Randall Stewart Papers, Vanderbilt University Library, Nashville, Tennessee

Tate Papers: Allen Tate Papers, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey

Van Doren Papers: Mark Van Doren Papers, Columbia University Library, New York, New York

Van Duyn Papers: Mona Van Duyn Papers, Washington University Library, St. Louis, Missouri

VQR Papers: Virginia Quarterly Review Papers, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Virginia

Warren Papers: Robert Penn Warren Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut

Watkins Papers: Vernon Watkins Papers, Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin, Texas

Zabel Papers: Morton Dauwen Zabel Papers, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois

¹ Janssens, The American Literary Review: A Critical History 1920-1950 (The Hague: Mouton, 1968); the only other standard work about literary reviews is Frederick J. Hoffman, et al., The Little Magazine: A History and a Bibliography (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1946); more recent works are E. Anderson and M. Kinzie, eds., The Little Magazine in America: A Modern Documentary History (Yonkers, N.Y.: Pushcart Press, 1978) and Bill Henderson, ed. The Art of Literary Publishing: Editors on Their Craft (Wainscott, N.Y.: Pushcart Press, 1980); these two books are compilations of impressions and reminiscences of different editors and, if generally interesting, are not profound investigations into the functions of literary magazines and as such only of minor use for this study; useful and important articles about literary magazines are Monroe K. Spears, "The Present Function of the Literary Quarterlies," Texas Quarterly, III, 1 (Spr 1960), 33-50, and George Core, "The Sewanee Review and the Editorial Performance," Yearbook of English Studies, X (1980), 101-115; of a much earlier date, but essential to any investigation of literary reviews are T.S. Eliot, "The Idea of a Literary Review," Criterion, IV, 1 (Ja 1926), 1-6; Tate, "The Function of the Critical Quarterly," Essays of Four Decades (London: Oxford University Press, 1970) pp. 45-55; this essay was first published in 1936, Trilling, "The Function of the Literary Magazine," The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society (New York: The Viking Press, 1950) pp. 93-103; this essay was first published in 1946; of course, numerous other articles treating literary reviews as a group or as individuals have been valuable for this study and will be referred to wherever applicable.

² Tate, "The Function of the Critical Quarterly," p. 55; Tate, "The State of Letters," SR LII, 4 (Aut 1944), 608-614; Brooks and Warren, "Introduction," Stories from the Southern Review, eds. Brooks and Warren (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1953), p. xiv.

³ An example of nostalgia for the littles of the twenties is Beverly Gross, "Culture and Anarchy: What Ever Happened to Lit Magazines?," Antioch Review, XXIX, 1 (Spr 1969), 43-75.

⁴ Macdonald, "Letters," PR X, 4 (Jl-Ag 1943), 382.

⁵ Derwent May, "The Little Magazine--VII: The American Big Four," TLS April 25, 1968, 434.

⁶ Spears, "The Present Function of the Literary Quarterlies," 40; Gilbert, Writers and Partisans: A History of Literary Radicalism in America (New York: Wiley, 1968), Shapiro, "Partisan Review: The Forging of a Jewish-American Literary Aesthetic" (Unpubl. diss., University of Rochester, 1980); examples of articles dealing directly with Partisan Review are: Frederick Crews, "The Partisan," New York Review of Books, November 23, 1978, 3-10; Leslie A. Fiedler, "Partisan Review: Phoenix or Dodo?," Perspectives USA, XV, (Spr 1956), 82-97; S.A. Longstaff, "Partisan Review and the Second World War," Salmagundi, XLIII, 1 (Wtr 1979), 108-129 (Longstaff is at work on a history of Partisan Review); and Ian Hamilton, "Family Feuds," The Little Magazines: A Study of Six Editors (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1976) pp. 99-124; examples of books and memoirs about the New York intellectuals are: Alexander Bloom, Prodigal Sons: The New York

Intellectuals & Their World (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Maarten van Rossem, Het Radicale Temperament: De Dubbele Politieke Beking van een Generatie Amerikaanse Intellectuelen (Utrecht: HES, 1983); Abel, The Intellectual Follies: A Memoir of the Literary Venture in New York and Paris (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984); Barrett, The Truants: Adventures among the Intellectuals (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, 1982); Howe, A Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1982); Kazin, Starting out in the Thirties (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1965) and New York Jew (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978); Phillips, A Partisan View: Five Decades of the Literary Life (New York: Stein and Day, 1983); and Podhoretz, Making It (New York: Random House, 1967); (among the publications in book form that became available after the completion of this thesis are: Terry A. Cooney, The Rise of the New York Intellectuals: Partisan Review and Its Circle, 1934-1945 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986) and Alan M. Wald, The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930's to the 1980's (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987)); as we are flooded by articles about the New York intellectuals it seems needless to give a few random examples here; Rubin, untitled review of Young, Gentleman in a Dustcoat: A Biography of John Crowe Ransom (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976), New Republic, CLXXVI, February 12, 1977, 23; Clarke, "John Crowe Ransom: Editor" (Unpubl. diss., Texas Christian University, 1972).

⁷ Wall, "Little Magazines: Notes towards a Methodology," in Literature, Society and the Sociology of Literature: Proceedings of the Conference Held at the University of Essex, July 1976, eds. Francis Barker, et al. (Colchester: University of Essex, 1977), p.105.

⁸ Bentley to Macauley, September 9 [1959]. KR Papers.

⁹ Arnold, "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Matthew Arnold: Poetry and Prose, ed. John Bryson (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1967), p. 361.

¹ Ransom, "The Gordon Keith Chalmers Memorial Library at Kenyon," American Oxonian, L, 2 (Ap 1963), 93. This article notes that Chalmers received his B.A. in English literature from Oxford in 1928; however, Thomas Boardman Greenslade, Kenyon College: Its Third Half Century (Gambier, Ohio: Kenyon College, 1975), p. 65, asserts that Chalmers obtained his Master's degree there.

² Cummings to Chalmers, April 1, 1937. Quoted in Greenslade, Kenyon College, p.67.

³ According to Thomas Daniel Young, Gentleman in a Dustcoat: A Biography of John Crowe Ransom (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976), p. 297, Chalmers had first tried to persuade Frost himself to come to Kenyon College; Tate, "Teacher and Friend," John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters, eds. D. David Long and Michael R. Burr, supplement to the Kenyon Collegian, LXXXX, 7 (1964), 18.

⁴ The following persons were members of the Fugitive group: John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren, Donald Davidson, Merrill Moore, Jesse Wills, Ridley Wills, Laura Riding, Walter Clyde Curry, Sidney Miron Hirsch, James Frank, Alec Stevenson, William Yandell Elliott, William Frierson, Stanley Johnson, and Alfred Stark. For a comprehensive and well written history of the group see Louise Cowan, The Fugitive Group: A Literary History (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1959); Hirsch to Ransom, October 31, 1930. Ransom Papers; Ransom, Poems About God (New York: Holt, 1919).

⁵ Alexander Karanikas, Tillers of a Myth: Southern Agrarians as Social and Literary Critics (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), contains much valuable information about the Agrarian movement. One should take this book with several grains of salt, however, as Karanikas is biased against the Agrarians. For a different view, particularly with respect to the shift to Southernism of the Fugitives Davidson, Ransom, Tate, and Warren, see Daniel Joseph Singal, The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919-1945 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), pp. 200-201, 398. Singal argues that the importance of the Scopes trial has been overvalued, the first issue of The Fugitive, a magazine mainly devoted to poetry, appeared in April 1922; its final number was published in December 1925: the Fugitives now found the magazine too time-consuming; anonymous, "Announcements," Fugitive, II, 6 (Ap-May 1923), 34.

⁶ Telephone-interview with Warren, August 17, 1983. Warren called the Agrarians "very different animals . . . who agreed about practically nothing," and repeatedly stressed that Ransom was not interested in Agrarianism as politics; Herbert Agar and Tate, eds., Who owns America? A New Declaration of Independence (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1936). Twelve Southerners, I'll Take My Stand (1930; rpt. New York: Harper and Row, 1962), was the first Agrarian volume. The "Twelve Southerners" were in order of appearance: John Crowe Ransom, Donald Davidson, Frank Lawrence Owsley, John Gould Fletcher, Lyle H. Lanier, Allen Tate, Herman Clarence Nixon, Andrew Nelson Lytle, Robert Penn Warren, John Donald Wade, Henry Blue Kline, and Stark Young; Ransom to Tate, April

6, 1936; Ransom to Tate, September 17 [1936]. Tate Papers.

7 David McDowell and John Nerber, for instance, left Vanderbilt for Kenyon College in 1937; Peter Taylor followed in 1938 as his parents initially did not want their son to leave the South. Lowell left Harvard for Kenyon College instead of Vanderbilt in order to study under Ransom, and Jarrell, a student of Ransom's at Vanderbilt, became an instructor in English at Kenyon at Ransom's intercession; a memo by Chalmers written in May 1937 mentions these figures. KC Papers.

8 Tate to Lytle, November 28, 1940. Lytle Papers; Tate's open letter to Kirkland is quoted in Young, Gentleman in a Dustcoat, p. 274.

9 Tate to Lytle, May 29, 1937. Lytle Papers; Tate to Kirkland, June 7, 1937; Eliot to Tate [June 1937]; Zabel to Tate, May 27, 1937. Tate Papers; Porter to Lytle, June 6, 1937. Lytle Papers.

10 For an extensive account of the stir caused by Ransom's departure see Young, Gentleman in a Dustcoat, pp.272-288; Lytle to Tate, June 4, 1937. Tate Papers.

11 Ransom to Mrs. J.J. Ransom, October 29 [1937]. Ransom Papers; Ransom to Tate, October 29 [1937]. Tate Papers.

12 Chalmers to Trustees, December 24, 1937. KC Papers.

13 Ransom to Tate, November 4, 1937; Ransom to Tate, [n.d.]. Tate Papers.

14 Ransom to Tate, November 22 [1937]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Chalmers, December 8 [1937]. KC Papers; Ransom to Tate, December 10 [1937]; Ransom to Tate, November 19 [1937]. Tate Papers.

15 Tate to Lambert Davis, December 22, 1937. VQR Papers; Ransom to Tate, January 1, 1938. Tate Papers.

16 Chalmers to Rice, January 14, 1938; Chalmers, "Philip Blair Rice." Unpublished memorial speech, 1956. Rice Papers; Rice, "Out of the Wasteland," Symposium, III, 4 (O 1932), 422-442.

17 Ransom to Tate, May 28 [1938]. Tate Papers.

18 Ransom to Tate, May 28 [1938]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Davis, May 2, 1938. VQR Papers; Ransom to Rice, May 20 [1938]. Rice Papers.

19 Ransom to Tate, June 22 [1938]. Tate Papers.

20 Ransom to Davis, May 2, 1938. VQR Papers; Ransom to Charles W. Pipkin, Dean of the Graduate School at Louisiana State University, June 1 [1940]. SoR Papers; Ransom to Rice, June 4 [1938]. Rice Papers; Jarrell to Margaret Marshall [January 4, 1946], writes: "I helped Ransom and [Philip] Rice with the Kenyon Review for its first year. . . . I read the manuscripts submitted, corrected proof, suggested reviewers, and so on." Randall Jarrell's Letters: An Autobiographical and Literary Selection, ed. Mary Jarrell (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985), p. 152. However, no other evidence exists to support Jarrell's

claim.

21 Ransom to Chalmers, January 20, 1938. KC Papers.

22 Ransom to Tate, May 20 [1938]; Ransom to Tate, May 28 [1938]. Tate Papers.

23 Ransom to Chalmers, June 8, 1938. KR Papers.

24 Chalmers to Rice, May 28, 1938. Rice Papers.

25 Ransom to Tate, May 28 [1938]; Ransom to Tate, June 22 [1938]. Tate Papers.

26 Ransom to Tate, May 28 [1938]. Tate Papers. Already on May 20, when the future of the Kenyon was still uncertain, Ransom had asked Tate to serve as an advisory editor; Chalmers to Ransom, July 19, 1938; Ransom to Chalmers, July 31 [1938]. KC Papers; Ransom to Tate, June 22 [1938]. Tate Papers; Chalmers to Rice, May 28, 1938. Rice Papers; Ransom to Tate, June 22 [1938]. Tate Papers. Both Seldes and Moore were closely associated with The Dial.

27 Ransom to Rice, August 10 [1938]. Rice Papers. Actually, Ransom is mistaken here: Rosenfeld used to be with The Dial; Ransom to Tate, October 1, 1938. Tate Papers; Ransom to Van Doren, September 14, 1938. Van Doren Papers; Ransom to Tate, July 12, 1942. Tate Papers.

28 Ransom to Fletcher, March 7, 1934. Fletcher Papers; minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees of Kenyon College, March 19, 1938. KC Papers. The lion's share of the money came from Kenyon's Trustees. It was decided at this Board Meeting that the funds for the Kenyon would be "kept in a separate account and that no financial obligation should be imposed upon the College." During Ransom's editorship Kenyon College indeed only subsidized the Kenyon to the amount of a few thousand dollars, that is, not counting salaries.

29 The budget figures are taken from a letter by Ransom to Chalmers, June 8, 1938. KR Papers. Rice's salary of \$800.00 was somewhat more than one-quarter of the \$3,000.00 he earned. Johnson's salary of \$1,000.00 constituted two-thirds of his total earnings.

30 Budget statement, July 1, 1939. KR Papers; Phillips, "Poor and Pure," The Art of Literary Publishing: Editors on Their Craft, ed. Bill Henderson (Wainscott, New York: The Pushcart Press, 1980), p.184; Blackmur, "Literary Magazines Study." Unpublished manuscript. LMS Papers. This 43-page report resulted in his less extensive "The Economy of the American Writer," SR III,2 (Spr 1945), 174-185; Spears, "The Present Function of the Literary Quarterlies," Texas Quarterly, III, 1 (Spr 1960), 40. Phillips notes that "readers are calculated differently, usually for our kind of publication, about eleven readers per copy" ("Poor and Pure," p.184).

31 Lanning, "Ransom as Editor," John Crowe Ransom: Critical Essays and a Bibliography, ed. Thomas Daniel Young (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), pp. 216-218.

- 32 Sweeney to Norman Johnson, November 7, 1939. KR Papers.
- 33 Rice, "Report of the Managing Editor" [April 5, 1940]. KR Papers.
- 34 Ransom to Tate [early January 1939]. Tate Papers; Cowley to Rice, December 29, 1938. KR Papers.
- 35 Circular to prospective contributors, September 28, 1938. KR Papers; Pound to Ransom, October 15, 1938, The Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941, ed. D.D. Paige (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950) p. 318.
- 36 Jarrell, "The Winter's Tale," KR I, 57-59; Lowell, "The Cities' Summer Death" and "The Dandelion Girls," KR I, 32-33.
- 37 Ransom to Van Doren, October 20 [1938]. Van Doren Papers.
- 38 Ransom to Mrs. J.J. Ransom, March 5, 1939. Ransom Papers; Ransom to Tate, April 15 [1939]. Tate Papers.
- 39 Ransom to Tate, April 15 [1939]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Mrs. J.J. Ransom, March 5, 1939. Ransom Papers; Ransom to Tate, May 13 [1939]. Tate Papers.
- 40 Telephone-interview with Warren, August 17, 1983.
- 41 Ransom to O'Donnell, December 25, 1939. O'Donnell Papers.
- 42 Ransom to Tate, December 10 [1937]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Davidson, September 28, 1938. KR Papers; Ransom to Tate, October 10 [1937]; Ransom to Tate, October 29 [1937]. Tate Papers. Ransom himself published few close readings of poetry; in an interview of October 11, 1982 Bentley voiced his admiration for the way Ransom closely scrutinized poetry in class and lamented the fact that most of Ransom's essays were theoretical rather than practical.
- 43 Ransom to Tate, June 22 [1938]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Rice, August 10 [1938]. Rice Papers; Ransom to Tate [Spring 1940]. Tate Papers.
- 44 Ransom, "Criticism Inc.," The World's Body (1938; rpt. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), pp. 342-349. This essay was first published in Virginia Quarterly Review, XIII (Aut 1937), 586-602. Lambert Davis, its editor, wrote to Ransom on October 20, 1937 that "Criticism Inc." had excited much comment and had gained the magazine sixty new subscribers. VQR Papers.
- 45 Ransom, "Wanted: An Ontological Critic," The New Criticism (Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1941), p. 301; Howard Mumford Jones, "The Uninfluentials," SRL XXIV, October 11, 1941, 20; Alfred Kazin, "Criticism at the Poles," On Native Grounds (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1942), pp. 446, 440; Joseph E. Baker, "The Philosopher and the 'New Critic,'" SR L, 2 (Ap-Ju 1942), 171; Ransom, "Criticism, Inc.," p. 345.
- 46 In a letter of July 8 [1948] to his wife, Richard Chase describes a conversation that took place during the first session of the Kenyon School of English when Ransom and others tried to answer the question:

Who are the New Critics? An unknown person has dated this letter 1949, but Chase served at the School in 1948 only. Chase Papers; for instance during the interviews with Brooks on August 17, 1982 and with Warren on August 17, 1983; Blackmur, "A Burden for Critics," in Lectures in Criticism, Bollingen Series XIV (New York: Pantheon Books, 1949), pp. 187-209; Ransom, "Poetry: I. The Formal Analysis," KR IX, 436; Ransom, The New Criticism. Part of his chapter on Richards is devoted to Empson, Richards' "pupil;" on pages 128 to 132 Ransom deals with Empson's overemphasizing ambiguity; Tate, "The Critic's Business," KR XI, 16.

47 Ransom, The New Criticism, pp. 45, 212, 140; B.J. Leggett, "Notes for a Revised History of the New Criticism: An Interview with Cleanth Brooks," Tennessee Studies in Literature, XXIV (1979), 1-35.

48 Core, "The Dominion of the Fugitives and Agrarians," The American South, ed. L.D. Rubin Jr. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), p. 300; "American Scholar Forum on the New Criticism [Part Two]," AS XX, 2 (Spr 1951), 221.

49 Frederick A. Pottle, "The New Critics and the Historical Method," Yale Review, XLIII, 1 (S 1953), 15. Further on in this essay Pottle admits that the New Critics are not totally lacking in historical scholarship, but then disapproves of their too selective application of it; R.G. Davis, in "The State of American Writing," a symposium held by PR XV, 8 (Ag 1948), 867; Douglas Bush, "The New Criticism: Some Old-fashioned Queries," PMLA LXIV, 2 (Mr 1949), 19-20; Howard Mumford Jones, "The Uninfluentials," SRL XXIV, October 11, 1941, 20.

50 Not completely objective, but still a good defence of the New Criticism is Cleanth Brooks, "The Formalist Critics," KR XIII, 64-81.

51 Atlas, Delmore Schwartz: The Life of an American Poet (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1977), p. 142; Schwartz to Tate, March 14, 1938. Tate Papers, Webster, The Republic of Letters: A History of Postwar American Literary Opinion (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), p. 252; Kazin, Contemporaries (Boston: Little, Brown, 1962), p. 497.

52 Podhoretz, Making It (New York: Random House, 1967).

53 See note 46. In this same letter Chase mentions that Ransom called Trilling and others "cultural critics; Howe, A Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1982).

54 Mizener to Atlas, 1975. Quoted in Atlas, Delmore Schwartz, p. 158.

55 Interview with David McDowell, December 4, 1981.

56 Eliot, "The Idea of a Literary Review," Criterion, IV, 1 (Ja 1926), 3; memo by Marshall to David Stevens, October 19, 1943; Blackmur, "Literary Magazines Study," p. 20. Unpublished manuscript. LMS Papers.

57 "Report of Mr. John Crowe Ransom, Editor" [April 1940]. KR Papers.

- 58 Ransom to Tate, October 18 [1938]. Tate Papers; Ransom, "Introduction," The Kenyon Critics, ed. Ransom (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1951), p. x.
- 59 Ransom, "The Teaching of Poetry," KR I, 81-82. Note that the critics Ransom names are all New Critics, that he equates "the living art" with poetry only, and that he speaks of the "passionate enjoyments" of criticism.
- 60 Ransom, "Was Shakespeare a Philosopher?," KR I, 75-80. Ransom had published "Shakespeare at Sonnets" in SoR III, 3 (Wtr 1938), 531-553. In this essay Ransom compares Shakespeare's sonnets to Donne's lyrics and argues that Donne's poems are to be preferred as they are much more logical and systematical. In a "Postscript" to the 1968 edition of The World's Body Ransom admits to a "bad lapse of judgment" with respect to "Shakespeare at Sonnets."
- 61 Blackmur, "Mature Intelligence of an Artist," KR I, 96, 97; Rice, "Twenty-five Directions," KR I, 109-111; Winters, "Poetry of Feeling," KR I, 106; Ransom to Tate, May 23 [1941]. Tate Papers.
- 62 Ransom to George Marion O'Donnell, January 31, 1939. O'Donnell Papers; Schwartz, "The Two Audens," KR I, 39; Rahv, "Franz Kafka: The Hero As Lonely Man," KR I, 67.
- 63 Ransom to Bishop, December 4, 1940. Bishop Papers; Bishop, "The Sorrows of Tom Wolfe," KR I, 9.
- 64 Ransom, "The Teaching of Poetry," KR I, 79.
- 65 Lowell, "The Cities' Summer Death" and "The Dandelion Girls," KR I, 32-33; Jarrell, "The Winter's Tale," KR I, 57-59.
- 66 Rosenfeld, "The Advent of American Music (I)," KR I, 46-56; Ford, "A Paris Letter," KR I, 18-31; Ransom to Ford, October 13 [1938]. F.M. Ford Papers; Ford to Ransom, October 21, 1938. KR Papers; Ransom to Ford, November 2, 1938. F.M. Ford Papers.
- 67 Haggin, "Genius Limited and Yearning," KR I, 107-108; Cheney, "Painter of the Half-World," KR I, 93-96; Venable, "Russell's Theory of History," KR I, 102-104; Baker, "The Shattered Door," KR I, 90-93; Ransom to Tate [December 1938]. Tate Papers; Chevalier, "Gallic Pageant," KR I, 84-86; Millspaugh, "Private and Public Verse," KR I, 87-89.
- 68 Anonymous, "Kenyon and the Arts," Cleveland News, December 27, 1938; Ted Robinson, "Philosopher of Folly's Column," Plain Dealer, December 27, 1938, page number unknown; Richard Croom Beatty, "The Kenyon Review," Vanderbilt Alumnus [XXV?] (Ja-F 1939), unnumbered page.

- ¹ Ransom, "Apologia for Modernism," KR II, 248,249; Ransom to Tate, October 11, 1939. Tate Papers; Brooks to Davidson, May 29, 1940; Austin Warren to Ransom, April 20, 1940. KR Papers.
- ² Ransom, "Ubiquitous Moralists," KR III, 95-100.
- ³ Richards to Rice, July 11, 1941. KR Papers; Ransom to Burke, March 29, 1941. Burke Papers; Ransom to Tate, May 23 [1941]; Ransom to Tate, February 27 [1943]. Tate Papers.
- ⁴ Burke, "Key Words for Critics," KR IV, 130, 131, 132.
- ⁵ Ransom to Burke, September 8, 1941; Ransom to Burke, November 17 [1941]; Ransom to Burke, December 5, 1941. Burke Papers; Ransom, "An Address to Kenneth Burke," KR IV, 219-237.
- ⁶ Burke to Tate, April 28, 1942. Tate Papers.
- ⁷ O'Donnell, "Faulkner's Mythology," KR I, 285-299; Tate to O'Donnell, January 24, 1945. O'Donnell Papers; Malcolm Cowley, ed., The Portable Faulkner (New York: Viking Press, 1946).
- ⁸ Jarrell, "Texts from Housman," KR I, 260-271; Jarrell, "The Age of Criticism," Poetry and the Age (New York: Vintage Books, 1953), pp. 63-86.
- ⁹ Empson, "Basic English and Wordsworth," KR II, 447, 452.
- ¹⁰ Warren, "Katherine Anne Porter," KR IV, 29.
- ¹¹ Ransom, "Yeats and his Symbols," KR I, 309-322; Vivas, "Lawrence's Problems," KR III, 83-94; Austin Warren, "Edward Taylor's Poetry: Colonial Baroque," KR III, 355-371; Winters, "T.S. Eliot: The Illusion of Reaction (I)," KR III, 7.
- ¹² Winters, "T.S. Eliot: The Illusion of Reaction (II)," KR III, 238.
- ¹³ Schwartz to Tate, January 27, 1941. Tate Papers; Ransom to Winters, November 18, 1941; Winters to Ransom, October 5, 1941; Ransom to Winters, December 1, 1941; Norman Johnson to Winters, October 8, 1938. KR Papers; Winters, "The Poems of Theodore Roethke," KR III, 514-516; Cox, "Winters on Eliot," KR III, 498-500.
- ¹⁴ Tate, "The Poet and Her Biographer," KR I, 203; Jarrell, "The Morality of Mr. Winters," KR I, 213-214; Warren, "Arnold vs. the 19th Century," KR I, 217, 219; mentioned in a letter by Jarrell to Warren [n.d.]. SoR Papers.
- ¹⁵ Ransom, "One Thousand Sonnets," KR I, 229-231; Ransom to Moore, November 14 [1938]. Moore had donated \$100.00 and had pledged \$100.00 annually for the next three years. Moore Papers.
- ¹⁶ Ransom, "Constellation of Five Young Poets," KR III, 378, 380; Winters, "The Poems of Theodore Roethke," KR III, 514-516; Ransom to Tate, May 23 [1941]. Tate Papers.

- 17 Brooks, "Poet or Sage," KR I, 325, 326; Brooks, "The Whole of Housman," KR III, 106, 107; Jarrell, "Texts from Housman," KR I, 260-271.
- 18 Brooks, "Form and Content," KR IV, 244, 246.
- 19 Rahv, "Paleface and Redskin," KR I, 251-256; Schwartz, "The Isolation of Modern Poetry," KR III, 209-220; Ransom to Schwartz, September 30, 1940. KR Papers.
- 20 Trilling, "Sherwood Anderson," KR III, 293-302; Trilling, "E.M. Forster," KR IV, 160-173.
- 21 Interview with McDowell, December 4, 1981; Trilling, "Greatness with One Fault in It," KR IV, 102.
- 22 Symons, "Obscurity and Dylan Thomas," KR II, 61-71; Berryman, "The Loud Hill of Wales," KR II, 482. Berryman's quotation of Symons is to be found on page 71 of Symons' article; two other reviews published in the Autumn 1940 issue were reprinted in The Kenyon Critics, ed. Ransom (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1951): Eleanor Clark, "The Myth of Sainthood," 485-488 and Richard Eberhart, "Q's Revisions," 496-499.
- 23 Ransom to Eliseo Vivas, June 10 [1940]. KR Papers; Chevalier, "Andre Malraux: The Return of the Hero," KR II, 35-46; Ransom, "Andre Malraux' Novels," KR II, 93.
- 24 Schwartz to Ransom, August 18, 1940. KR Papers; Schwartz, "Neither Historian Nor Critic," KR III, 122-123; James Atlas, Delmore Schwartz: The Life of an American Poet (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1977), pp.298-300, quotes a disturbed letter dated February 8, 1952 in which Schwartz asks Brooks's forgiveness for this review; Warren, "Homage to Oliver Allston," KR IV, 259.
- 25 Macdonald, "Kulturbolchewismus Is Here," PR VIII, 6 (N-D 1941), 442-451; Ransom, "On the Brooks-MacLeish Thesis," PR IX, 1 (Ja-F 1942), 40.
- 26 Aaron, "Parrington Plus," KR IV, 102-106; Macauley, "Good-bad Novels," KR IV, 124-126; Palmer, "History without Philosophy," KR III, 383-386 and "The Hero as Judge," KR IV, 247-250; Chalmers, "Rediscovery of a Radical," KR III, 388-392; Troy, "On Rereading Balzac: The Artist as Scapegoat," KR II, 333-344; Thompson, "Bert Brecht," KR II, 319-329; O'Brien, "Poet on Horseback," KR IV, 75-86.
- 27 Schwartz, "The Criterion, 1922-1939," KR I, 437-449. This article appeared simultaneously in Purpose, XI, 4 (Aut 1939), 225-237; Schwartz to Ransom, April 25, 1939. KR Papers; Atlas, Delmore Schwartz, pp. 153-154; Rice, "Foreign Periodicals," KR I, 472.
- 28 Ransom to Brooks, August 8 [1939]; Ransom to Brooks, January 11 [1940, wrongly dated 1939]. SoR Papers.
- 29 Tate, "Miss Emily and the Bibliographer," Essays of Four Decades (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 150, 153, 143, 148;

Russell Fraser, A Mingled Yarn: The Life of R.P. Blackmur (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1981), pp. 194-195, describes Blackmur and Tate at Princeton; Ransom, "Mr. Tate and the Professors," KR II, 350.

30 Brooks to Ransom, April 13, 1940. SoR Papers.

31 Ransom to Mizener, November 19 [1940]. Mizener Papers.

32 Ransom, "Concerning the Symposium," KR II, 477.

33 Brooks, "Literary History vs. Criticism," KR II, 403-412; Mizener, "Scholars as Critics," KR II, 412-422; Trilling, "Literature and Power," KR II, 439, 440; Saunders, "The Graduate Student in English," KR II, 432, 433.

34 Cox, "If We Care Enough," KR II, 426, 427; most of the essays in The Southern Review part of the symposium were also directed against the historical-biographical approach, but their overall quality was perhaps somewhat higher.

35 Wheelwright to Rice, October 14, 1940; O'Brien to Rice, November 16, 1940; Winters to Ransom, November 12, 1940. KR Papers; Trilling to Rice, November 17, 1940. Rice Papers; Bentley, "Editors in Person: Little Magazines," KR IX, 285.

36 Ransom to Wheelwright, October 3, 1939. KR Papers; Ransom to Burke, September 24 [1942?]. Burke Papers; Marten ten Hoor, "The Nazis Purge Philosophy," KR III, 335-343; Ernest Nagel, "Recent Philosophies of Science," KR III, 303-319; Rice, "George Santayana: The Philosopher as Poet," KR II, 460-475; a small representative selection of philosophy in the book review section gives us Austin Warren on Humanism and the Imagination by G.R. Elliott in "Humanism Ten Years After," KR I, 336-339; Rice on Logic: The Theory of Inquiry by John Dewey as well as on critiques of Dewey by Sidney Hook and Paul A. Schilpp in "Dewey and His Critics," KR II, 121-124; Justus Buchler on both Schilpp's The Philosophy of George Santayana and Santayana's The Realm of Spirit in "The Naturalism of Santayana," KR III, 249-253; and Wheelwright on two books on Nietzsche in "The Lonely Philosopher," KR IV, 112-115.

37 Vivas, "The New Encyclopedists: I. Pro," KR I, 168; Roelofs, "The New Encyclopedists: II. Contra," KR I, 171, 175; Rice, "The New Encyclopedists: III. Considerations," KR I, 176-182.

38 Ransom to Tate, April 14 [1941]; Ransom to Tate, March 29, 1939. Tate Papers; Ransom, "The Arts and the Philosophers," KR I, 198; Morris, "Science, Art, and Technology," KR I, 416, 421, 422; Ransom, "The Pragmatics of Art," KR II, 76-87.

39 Wheelwright, "On the Semantics of Poetry," KR II, 263-283; Miles, "More Semantics of Poetry," KR II, 502-507.

40 Rice, "A Word About Naturalism," KR IV, 87.

41 Vivas, "The New Naturalism," KR III, 459; Wheelwright, "The Failure of Naturalism," KR III, 462; Barrett, "Christianity and Modern Man," KR III, 503-508; Vivas, "Reply to Mr. Wheelwright," KR IV, 93.

- 42 Wheelwright to Rice, December 18, 1941. KR Papers.
- 43 Wheelwright to Ransom, January 21, 1942. KR Papers; Wheelwright, 'Religion and Social Grammar,' KR IV, 202-216; Russell, "Non-Materialistic Naturalism," KR IV, 364.
- 44 Wheelwright to Ransom, October 18, 1942. KR Papers; Ransom to Rice, August 4 [1942]. Rice Papers; Schorer, "Mythology (For the Study of William Blake)," KR IV, 366-380; Ransom, "Mr. Russell and Mr. Schorer," KR IV, 406, 407; Ransom, "The Inorganic Muses," KR V, 284.
- 45 The final version was Vivas, "Lawrence's Problems," KR III, 83-94; Ransom to Vivas, June 10 [1940]. KR Papers; Ransom to Burke, January 4, 1941. Burke Papers; Ransom, "Muses and Amazons," KR III, 242, 241, 240.
- 46 Coulborn, "The American Culture: I. The Polity," KR III, 143-160; Bishop, "The American Culture: III. The Arts," KR III, 179-190; Ransom to Bishop, December 4, 1940. Bishop Papers; Kluckhohn, "The American Culture: II. The Way of Life," KR III, 178, 175, 162; Ransom to Bishop, December 20, 1940. Bishop Papers.
- 47 Symons, "A London Letter: The Wartime Literary Situation," KR II, 253-256; anonymous, "Kenyon Review Goes Tabloid in War Froth," Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, October 9, 1940, page number unknown; Mann, "Karl May: Hitler's Literary Mentor," KR II, 397, 400; Aldrich to the editors, October 25, 1940. KR Papers; ten Hoor, "The Nazis Purge Philosophy," KR III, 335-343.
- 48 Read to Ransom, April 11, 1939. KR Papers; Read, "The Present State of Poetry: I. In England," KR I, 359-369; O'Brien, "The Present State of Poetry: II. In France," KR I, 384, 378; Warren to Tate, December 14, 1939. Tate Papers; Warren, "The Present State of Poetry: III. In the United States," KR I, 384-398.
- 49 Ransom to Tate, October 11, 1939; Ransom to Tate, November 9 [1939]. Tate Papers.
- 50 Rice, "Psychoanalysis: The Second Wave," KR II, 226, 227; Vivas, "The Legacy of Sigmund Freud: III. Philosophical," KR II, 185.
- 51 Martin, "The Legacy of Sigmund Freud: I. Therapeutic," KR II, 135-152, Trilling, "The Legacy of Sigmund Freud: II. Literary and Aesthetic," KR II, 153, 156. This essay was reprinted in Trilling's The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society (New York: The Viking Press, 1950), Robert P. Casey, "Exodus: Freudian Version," KR II, 239-242; Auden, "For Sigmund Freud," KR II, 30-34.
- 52 Ransom, "The Younger Poets," KR III, 492; Ransom to Ford, March 25, 1939. C. H. Ford Papers; quoted in Amy Bonner, "The Poetry Market: A Survey of American Periodicals," Poetry, LIV, 3 (Je 1939), 167.
- 53 Ransom, "The Younger Poets," 492-493.
- 54 Ransom to Rukeyser, July 3, 1939. KR Papers; "Younger Poets," KR III, 397-420; Nemerov, "Notes on a New England Winter," KR III, 408-

410; Herschberger, "Poems," KR III, 416-420; Philip Rahv to Ransom, October 17, 1941. KR Papers; "New Verse by Brave Poets," KR IV, 352-356. Note that the "Younger Poets" appeared under different headings; "Verse by Two Poets," KR V, 376-383; Ransom to Tate, May 16, 1943. Tate Papers.

55 Lowell, "Winter in Dunbarton" and "Mr. Edwards and the Spider," KR VIII, 63-65.

56 Jarrell, "The Long Vacation" and "The Skaters," KR IV, 45-47; Jarrell, "For an Emigrant," KR II, 190-194; Jarrell, "The Winter's Tale," KR I, 57-59; Jarrell to Rice [n.d.]. Rice Papers.

57 "For an Emigrant" first appeared in book form in Jarrell's portion of Five Young American Poets. He included only one other poem from this 1940 New Directions publication in his Selected Poems (New York: Knopf, 1955).

58 Berryman, "Letter to His Brother" and "Nineteen Thirty-Eight," KR I, 257-259; Berryman, "At Chinese Checkers," KR III, 191-195. Schwartz to Berryman, May 8, 1940, wrote: "I think 'At Chinese Checkers' is easily your best poem; that is, if I am not too much flattered to say." Letters of Delmore Schwartz, ed. Robert Phillips (Princeton, N.J.: Ontario Review Press, 1984), p.96. Young, "Earth's History" and "Death by Rarity," KR II, 443-444; Young, "Summer Day" and "The Pattern," KR III, 320-321; Miles, "Quiet and Firmer," "On Page," and "Wading," KR III, 352-354; Rukeyser, "A Turning Wind," KR I, 399-404; Kees, "For My Daughter" and "Poem," KR II, 194-195; Prokosch, "Two Poems," KR II, 309-311; Fitzgerald, "Colorado," KR IV, 177-178; Taylor, "The Furnishings of a House," KR I, 308.

59 Schwartz, "Shenandoah, or, the Naming of the Child," KR III, 271-292; Ransom to Tate, April 14 [1941]. Tate Papers. From Letters of Delmore Schwartz, ed. Phillips, pp. 107-110, it appears that Schwartz had first offered "Shenandoah" to Partisan Review.

60 Van Doren, "The Seven Sleepers," "Latter Day," "Northern Philosopher," and "Northern Minstrel," KR IV, 174-177; Moore, "Four Quartz Crystal Clocks," "What Are Years," and "A Glass-Ribbed Nest," KR II, 284-288; Stevens, "Variations on a Summer Day," KR II, 72-75; MacNeice, "Picture Galleries" and "The Dowser," KR III, 31-33; Thomas, "If my head hurt a hair's foot . . .," KR I, 283-284; Lorca, "Walking Asleep" and "The Interrupted Concert," trans. Rolfe Humphries, KR I, 144-147; Williams, "Frederico Garcia Lorca," KR I, 148-158.

61 Tate, "Trout Map," KR I, 404-405; Tate to Mark Van Doren, September 18, 1939. Van Doren Papers; Warren, "Love's Parable," KR II, 186-188; Warren, "Original Sin: A Short Story," KR IV, 174-180; James Justus, The Achievement of Robert Penn Warren (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), p. 54; Blackmur, "Before Sentence Is Passed," KR III, 63-68; Ransom, "Address to the Scholars of New England," KR I, 406-408; Ransom to Tate [Summer 1939]. Tate Papers; Roberta Teale Swartz, "To the Regent (On the Late Secessions)," KR II, 189.

62 Ransom to Winfield Townley Scott, May 29, 1939. Scott Papers; Ransom to John Gould Fletcher, July 3, 1939. Fletcher Papers; Ransom to Robert

Wooster Stallman, March 26, 1940. Stallman Papers.

63 Ransom to Tate, January 7 [1939]. Tate Papers.

64 Ransom to Tate, April 25, 1941. Tate Papers; Goodman, "Frances," KR III, 473-478; Schwartz, "An Argument in 1934," KR IV, 62-74; Clark, "The Ball," KR II, 289-295; Ransom to Chalmers, June 13, 1940. KC Papers; Ransom to Tate [Summer 1940]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Ruth Herschberger, March 27, 1942. KR Papers; Southard, "Give Me Time," KR IV, 195-201.

65 Atlas, Delmore Schwartz, p. 56.

66 Seldes, "Stage and Film," KR I, 205-208; Mizener, "The Elizabethan Art of Our Movies," KR IV, 181-194; Ransom to Mizener, December 15, 1941. Mizener Papers; Kirstein, "About Dancers," KR I, 222-223; Fergusson, "The Modern Temper in an Aisle Seat," KR II, 376-379; Beiswanger, "Broadway Letter," KR IV, 264.

67 Rosenfeld, "Music Chronicle," KR II, 125-128; KR II, 380-383; and KR III, 260-263.

68 Woodward, "The Changing Ethos of Contemporary Music," KR II, 51.

69 Mellers, "On Writing about Music," KR III, 444, 443; Ransom, "The Aesthetics of Music," KR III, 494-497; Bentley to Jacques Barzun, September 18 [1944]. Barzun Papers.

70 Lewis, "Picasso," KR II, 197, 204, 203, 201; Porter, "Wyndham Lewis on Picasso," KR III, 500, 501, 502. The publication of Porter's letter had been a last-minute decision. A few days before the issue in which it appeared was to go to press, on August 16 [1941], Ransom had written to Rice that they were shorthanded on reviews. He therefore suggested a "communications section" as a stopgap. The futility of such a section in a quarterly is proven here: topicality, essential in a correspondence column, is hard to achieve. Ransom realized this, moreover, the Kenyon generally was too cramped for space anyway, and so the communications section never became a regular feature. Rice Papers.

71 Newhall, "The Photography of Moholy-Nagy," KR III, 344-351; Ransom, "The Mimetic Principle," The World's Body (1938; rpt. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), p. 209; Ransom, "Moholy-Nagy's New Arts," KR III, 374.

72 Paul and Percival Goodman, "Frank Lloyd Wright on Architecture," KR IV, 7-28.

73 The poems by Tate are: "The Trout Map," KR I, 404-405; "Jubilo" and "More Sonnets at Christmas (Ten Years Later)," KR V, 184-188; and "Seasons of the Soul," KR VI, 1-9. His first article is "A Note on Autotelism," KR IX, 13-16. The earlier mentioned review is "The Poet and Her Biographer," KR I, 200-203.

74 Nemerov, in John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters, eds. D. David Long and Michael R. Burr, supplement to the Kenyon Collegian, LXXXX, 7 (1964), 24; Dillon, "The 'Little Magazine'

Gimmick," Poetry, LXXI, 1 (O 1947), 43; O'Brien to Ransom, February 1, 1941. KR Papers; Jarrell to Rice [Sum 1941]. Rice Papers.

75 Weaver to Chalmers, December 11, 1941. KC Papers.

76 Chalmers to Robert Lester, Secretary of the Carnegie Corporation, October 1, 1941. KC Papers; Marshall to Blackmur, January 23, 1941. KC Collection, Ransom to Tate, April 24, 1944. Tate Papers.

77 Ransom to Tate, January 28, 1942. Tate Papers.

78 Ransom, "War and Publication," KR IV, 218.

79 Ransom to Tate, February 6 [1942]. Tate Papers.

80 Ransom to Laughlin, April 6, 1942. KC Papers.

81 Interview with Brooks, August 17, 1982.

82 Ransom to Warren and Brooks, January 7, 1942. KC Papers. Louisiana State University, for equal representation, basically was to pay for the completion of the Southern's subscriptions only. This proposal was made exactly two weeks before the date mentioned in A.J. Montesi, "The Southern Review (1935-1942): A History and Evaluation," (Unpubl. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1955), and G.A.M. Janssens, The American Literary Review: A Critical History 1920-1950 (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), p. 261. Both books give comprehensive reports on the relation between the Kenyon and Southern reviews. Thomas W. Cutrer, The Southern Review and the Baton Rouge Literary Community: 1935-1942 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1984), concentrates on the community rather than on The Southern Review; Warren and Brooks to Tate, February 18, 1942. Tate Papers; Tate to Andrew Lytle, March 2, 1942. Lytle Papers.

83 Warren and Brooks to Tate, February 18, 1942; Tate to Warren and Brooks, February 16, 1942. Tate Papers; Tate to Warren, March 2, 1942. SoR Papers.

84 Ransom to Tate, [June 2, 1942]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Brooks, April 19 [1940]. SoR Papers.

85 From the budget statement sent to the Rockefeller Foundation at the end of 1943 it appears that Frazer gave \$1,000.00, Church \$500.00, and the readers \$334.00. KC Collection.

86 Burke to Ransom, February 7, 1942. KR Papers; Warren to Ransom, October 22, 1938; Ransom to Warren, October 17, 1938. SoR Papers.

87 Anonymous, "Cultural Priorities," New York Herald Tribune, March 29, 1942, Section II, 6.

88 Ransom, "'Kenyon Review' to Continue," letter dated July 17, 1942, to the New York Herald Tribune; Ransom, "We Resume," KR IV, 405; Ransom, "'Kenyon Review' to Continue."

- 1 Chalmers to the Trustees of Kenyon College, December 24, 1937. KC Papers, Ransom to Tate, September 22 [1938]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Mrs. J.J. Ransom, March 5, 1939. Ransom Papers; Ransom to Tate, February 27 [1943]. Tate Papers; Ransom to John Gould Fletcher, October 2, 1939. Fletcher Papers; Ransom to Josephine Miles, March 30, 1940. Miles Papers; Ransom to Justin O'Brien, January 27, 1941. KR Papers; moreover, Ransom dedicated The New Criticism (Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1941) to Rice.
- 2 Interview with McDowell, December 4, 1981; Ransom, memo to Chalmers, December 16, 1941. KC Papers; Trilling to Rice, March 15, 1942. Rice Papers.
- 3 Donald Davidson to Tate, March 10, 1938. Tate Papers; Tate to Mark Van Doren, December 21, 1937. Van Doren Papers; Ransom to Arnold Stein, June 22, 1956. KR Papers; in an interview with Helen and Elizabeth Forman of October 19, 1981, Helen Forman said: "if there is one thing Pappy [as Ransom was called by most of his intimates] liked, it was a good argument."
- 4 Ransom to Chalmers, February 25, 1944. Rice was on a Guggenheim in New York City. KC Papers; Ransom to Rice, September 11 [1944]. Rice Papers; in KR VII, 2, we find among others: Bentley, "The Drama at Ebb," 169-184; Brecht, "Gedichte aus dem Exil," 198-207; Chase, "The Sense of the Present," 218-231; Rahv, "Modernizing James," 311-315; Mizener, "Mr. Auden's Tennyson," 315-318; Blackmur, "Notes on Eleven Poets," 339-352.
- 5 Ransom to Tate, July 12, 1942. Tate Papers; interview with Brooks, August 17, 1982.
- 6 Ransom to Tate, July 12, 1942. Tate Papers; Vivas to Ransom, September 8, 1942. KR Papers; on February 23 [1945] Bentley wrote to Rice: "Trilling wrote me that he had patched things up with KR; so much to the good. I think one of his worries was . . . that you didn't consult him on policy or submit material to him. He felt, for example, that he might have contributed to keeping P. Magg out of K.R." Magg published "Education for the Age of Labor," KR VI, 632-644. In this essay he severely criticizes The New School for Social Research. Rice Papers.
- 7 Ransom to Engle, January 11 [1944]. Engle Papers.
- 8 Ransom to Brooks, November 22 [1939]. SoR Papers; Whitehall's first contribution was a review of A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles (Volume 1), edited by W.A. Craigie and J.R. Hulbert, entitled "America's Language: A to Dew," KR II, 212-225; Ransom to Rice, December 13 [1943]; Ransom to Rice, September 11 [1944]. Rice Papers. Thomas Daniel Young in Gentleman in a Dustcoat: A Biography of John Crowe Ransom (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976), p. 380, assumes wrongly that the Kenyon's first Fellow was Bentley, followed by Whitehall, Riker, and Warren.
- 9 Bentley, A Century of Hero-Worship: A Study of the Idea of Heroism in Carlyle and Nietzsche, with Notes on Other Hero-Worshippers of Modern

Times (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1944); Bertolt Brecht, The Private Life of the Master Race, trans. Bentley (New York: James Laughlin, 1944); Ransom to John Marshall, March 25, 1944. KC Collection.

10 Bentley to Barzun, September 18 [1944]. Barzun Papers.

11 Ransom to Chalmers, December 14, 1948. KR Papers.

12 Ransom to David Stevens, February 22, 1945. KR Papers.

13 Bentley to Stevens, January 13 [1945]. KR Papers.

14 Bentley to Stevens, February 27, 1945; Ransom to Stevens, March 5, 1945. KR Papers; Blackmur, "Literary Magazines Study," p. 5. Unpublished manuscript. LMS Papers.

15 Warren, "A Poem of Pure Imagination," KR VIII, 391-427.

16 Marshall to Ransom, January 16, 1946; Ransom to Chalmers, December 14, 1948. KR Papers.

17 Grant Webster, The Republic of Letters: A History of Postwar American Literary Opinion (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), p. 105; KR V, 4 is the James issue; KR VI, 3 and KR VI, 4 are the Hopkins issues; KR XIV, 2 is the Dante issue; and KR XVIII, 2 is the special issue on "English Verse and What It Sounds Like."

18 Ransom to Chalmers, August 27, 1943. KR Papers; Ransom to Tate, May 16, 1943. Tate Papers; Warren to Henry Moe of the Guggenheim Foundation, October 17, 1941. SoR Papers; Warren mentions a Southern Review James issue in his letter of April 15, 1941 to the other editors of The Southern Review. SoR Papers. However, according to Schwartz to Blackmur, August 16, 1942, it was Blackmur's "essay on The Sacred Fount, which seemed to have suggested to [Ransom] a James number in 1943." Letters from Delmore Schwartz, ed. Robert Phillips (Princeton, N.J.: Ontario Review Press, 1984), p.127.

19 Warren to the other editors of The Southern Review, April 15, 1941. SoR Papers; Warren to Ransom, September 16, 1942; Warren to Ransom, December 15, 1942. KR Papers.

20 Warren to Tate [Spring 1943]. Tate Papers; Rahv to Zabel, August 10, 1943. Zabel Papers.

21 The contents of the Henry James issue, KR V, 4, are: Porter, "The Days Before," 481-494; Fergusson, "James's Idea of Dramatic Form," 495-507; Barzun, "James the Melodramatist," 508-521; John L. Sweeney, "The Demuth Pictures," 522-532; Matthiessen, "James and the Plastic Arts," 533-550; Austin Warren, "Myth and Dialectic in the Later Novels," 551-568; Daiches, "Sensibility and Technique (Preface to a Critique)," 569-579; Vivas, "Henry and William (Two Notes)," 580-594; and Blackmur, "In the Country of the Blue," 595-617.

22 Ransom to Porter, September 27, 1943. Porter Papers; Porter to Ransom, June 3, 1943. KR Papers; Fergusson, 498.

- 23 Barzun, 509.
- 24 Daiches, 578-9; Vivas, 581; Blackmur, 597.
- 25 Ransom, "E.M. Forster," KR V, 620, 621.
- 26 Moore to Rice, October 1, 1943. KR Papers; Marshall to Stevens, January 3, 1944. KC Collection; Wilson to Tate, October 22, 1943, Edmund Wilson, Letters on Literature and Politics 1912-1972, ed. Elena Wilson (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977), p. 400.
- 27 On October 12 [1942] Brooks wrote to Ransom: "I shall be happy to undertake the Hopkins number, if you would like for me to." The letter quoted in the text was written on September 22, 1943. KR Papers.
- 28 Brooks to Ransom, November 5, 1943; Brooks to Ransom, February 18 [1944]; Brooks mistakenly calls Schoder Schoden in his letters. KR Papers.
- 29 Ransom to Mizener, May 13 [1944]. Mizener Papers.
- 30 The contents of the Hopkins issues are: in KR VI, 3: Brooks, "Gerard Manley Hopkins," 321; Herbert Marshall McLuhan, "The Analogical Mirrors," 322-332; Whitehall, "Sprung Rhythm," 333-354; Miles, "The Sweet and Lovely Language," 355-368; Austin Warren, "Instress of Inscap," 369-382; in KR VI, 4: Lowell, "The Hopkins Centennial: A Note," 583-586; Austin Warren, "Monument Not Quite Needed," 587-589; Mizener, "Victorian Hopkins," 590-606.
- 31 McLuhan, 324; Lowell to Ransom, July 10 [1944]. KR Papers; Whitehall, 353; Mizener, 601.
- 32 Miles, 359, Brooks to Ransom, May 2 [1944]. KR Papers; Warren, "Monument Not Quite Needed," 588.
- 33 Lowell, 583; Ransom to Mizener, August 23, 1944. Mizener Papers; Mizener, 606.
- 34 In Gerard Manley Hopkins (Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1945) by the Kenyon Critics two new articles appeared. Austin Warren wrote a biographical introduction, "Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-1899)," and F.R. Leavis contributed "Metaphysical Isolation," which had appeared in Scrutiny. Austin Warren's review of the Hopkins biography by Eleanor Ruggles was left out. The final review on Hopkins was by John Pick, entitled "More About Hopkins;" it appeared in KR XI, 155-159.
- 35 Editor's note to J.E. Hardy, "Lycidas," KR VII, 99; on September 14 [1944] Bentley wrote to Jacques Barzun: "The second [suggestion] is a series of Reconsiderations of classics. In a way my Ibsen-Wagner article begins the . . . series." Barzun Papers; Bentley, "The Theatres of Wagner and Ibsen," KR VI, 542-569; Bentley, "Chekhov as Playwright," KR XI, 226-250; Ransom to Mizener, April 18, 1945; Ransom to Mizener, April 25, 1945. Mizener Papers.
- 36 Bentley, "The Theatres of Wagner and Ibsen," 542, 544; Bentley,

"August Strindberg," KR VII, 540-560. Some of Bentley's "Reconsiderations" appeared in his The Playwright as Thinker (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1946).

37 Ransom, "A Poem Nearly Anonymous," The World's Body (1938; rpt. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), pp. 1-28; Hardy, "Lycidas," KR VII, 100; Symons, "Restoration Comedy," KR VII, 185-197; Bentley, "The Views of Mr. Symons," KR VII, 477; Sypher, "Arabesque in Verse," KR VII, 457.

38 Brooks, "Wordsworth and the Paradox of the Imagination," The Well Wrought Urn (1947; rpt. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1975), pp. 124-150; Brooks, "The Intimations of the Ode," KR VIII, 80, 82; Robert Heilman, "Baton Rouge and LSU Forty Years After," SR LXXXVIII, 1 (Ja-Mr 1980), 139, recalls, probably referring to Understanding Poetry: "Brooks told me that Warren had said that applying their method to Wordsworth was like 'manicuring an elephant';" Ransom, "Poetry: I. The Formal Analysis," KR IX, 436-456.

39 Warren, "A Poem of Pure Imagination," KR VIII, 391-427; Warren to Ransom, August 23, 1945. KR Papers.

40 Ransom to Rice, September 21 [1945]. Rice Papers; Warren, "A Poem of Pure Imagination," 421; James H. Justus, The Achievement of Robert Penn Warren (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), pp. 121, 123.

41 Leavis to Ransom, April 25, 1946. KR Papers; Leavis, "Doctor Johnson," KR VIII, 637, 651, 655. This essay was reprinted in The Common Pursuit (1952; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1976), pp. 97-115.

42 Bentley, "This Is the New Criticism," KR VIII, 672; Leavis, "'The Kenyon Review' and 'Scrutiny,'" Scrutiny, XIV, 2 (D 1946), 134; Bentley, ed., The Importance of Scrutiny (New York: New York University Press, 1948). This book is dedicated to Ransom.

43 Chase, "The Brontës: A Centennial Observance," KR IX, 488, 497; Levin, "Flaubert: Portrait of the Artist as a Saint," KR X, 28-43.

44 Ransom, "The Literary Criticism of Aristotle," KR X, 382-402; Ransom, "Poetry: I. The Formal Analysis," KR IX, 436-456.

45 Ransom, "The Formal Analysis," 436.

46 Ransom, "The Formal Analysis," 440; in a letter to Morton Dauwen Zabel, March 8, 1949, Ransom denigrates his own achievement when he describes "Criticism, Inc." as "too general and too merely tactical for your purpose." Zabel's "purpose" was the second and revised edition of Literary Opinion in America, which was published by Harper and Row in 1951. "Criticism as Pure Speculation" was Ransom's contribution. Zabel Papers.

47 Ransom, "Poetry: II. The Final Cause," KR IX, 640-658; Palmer edited The Sewanee Review from 1946 to 1952; Ransom to Palmer, April 24 [1948]. SR Papers; Ransom, "The Literary Criticism of Aristotle," KR X,

395; Fitzgerald, "Critics on Criticism," KR XIII, 138, 139.

48 Warren, "The Love and the Separateness in Miss Welty," KR VI, 246-259; Warren, "Melville the Poet," KR VII, 208-223; Warren, "Hemingway," KR IX, 1-28; Warren, "Pure and Impure Poetry," KR V, 228-254; Ransom, "The Inorganic Muses," KR V, 288.

49 Blackmur, "Commentary by Ghosts," KR V, 467-471; Blackmur, "Notes on Eleven Poets," KR VII, 348; Ransom to Lowell, December 12 [1945]. Lowell Papers; Blackmur to Tate, March 29, 1945; Blackmur to Tate, January [24?], 1945. Tate Papers.

50 Jarrell, "The Humble Animal," KR IV, 411, 410; Moore to Rice, October 11, 1942. Rice Papers; Mizener, "Poetry from Right to Left," KR V, 154, 158, 156, 157, 155, 154; Ransom to Mizener, September 20 [1943]. Mizener Papers.

51 Matthiessen, "American Poetry Now," KR VI, 688, 692; Matthiessen, "Eliot's Quartets," KR V, 161-178; Ransom, "The Inorganic Muses," KR V, 298-299; Schorer, "The American Novel," KR IX, 636; Schorer, "Technique as Discovery," HR I, 1 (Spr 1948), 67-87.

52 Brooks, "Cantankerous and Other Critics," KR VI, 283, 286; Brooks to Ransom, February 18 [1944]. KR Papers; Whitehall, "Linguistic Patriot," KR VIII, 156-160.

53 Bentley reviewed, for instance, Cleanth Brooks and Robert Heilman, Understanding Drama, KR VIII, 333-337; Hanns Sachs, Freud, Master and Friend, KR VII, 521; and Frank Lloyd Wright, When Democracy Builds, KR VIII, 160-163; Bentley, "Editors in Person: Little Magazines," KR IX, 280, 282, 284, 285.

54 From the Autumn 1942 issue to the Autumn 1948 issue Ransom reviewed eleven books. Among them we find Harry Levin, James Joyce: A Critical Introduction, KR IV, 430-432; Kenneth Patchen, Memoirs of a Shy Pornographer, KR VIII, 171; and Eudora Welty, Delta Wedding, KR VIII, 503-507. During this period Rice reviewed eight books. Among them were Muriel Rukeyser, Willard Gibbs, KR V, 310-312; and Vladimir Nabokov, Nikolai Gogol, KR VII, 355-356.

55 Trilling's review of Psychology of Sex Relations by Theodore Reik appeared in KR VIII, 177-178; Trilling, "Artists and the 'Societal' Function," KR IV, 425-430. In this review he also discusses Philo Buck, Jr., Directions in Contemporary Literature and N. Elizabeth Monroe, The Novel and Society; Ransom to Burke, June 28, 1942. Burke Papers.

56 Trilling, "A Derivative Devil," KR VII, 497-502; Wallis, "Satan and Denis de Rougemont," KR VI, 150-156. Wallis also reviewed Isidore Ducasse Lautréamont, Les Chants de Maldoror, trans. Guy Wernham, KR VI, 294-300, and Søren Kierkegaard, Either/Or, KR VI, 464-469. Moreover, Wallis contributed an article, "The Blood of a Poet," on Cocteau's film Le Sang d'un Poète, KR VI, 24-42; "Contributors," KR VI, 319; Trilling to Rice, April 25, 1947. Rice Papers; Trilling, "The Life of the Novel," KR VIII, 659; Trilling, "Manners, Morals, and the Novel," KR X, 17. From Trilling to Rice, April 25, 1947 it appears that initially Trilling had wanted to call the later essay "That Corpse Is Here

Again." Rice Papers.

57 Ransom to Berryman, July 7 [1945]. Berryman Papers; Berryman, "F. Scott Fitzgerald," KR VIII, 110, 111.

58 Rahv reviewed, for instance, Virginia Woolf's The Death of a Moth and books by E.M. Forster and David Daiches on Virginia Woolf in KR V, 147-151, and F.O. Matthiessen, Henry James: The Major Phase, in KR VII, 311-315; Rahv, "Lost Illusions," KR VI, 288-292 is on Koestler's Arrival and Departure; Ransom, "Artists, Soldiers, Positivists," KR VI, 278; Phillips, "A Tract for the Time," KR VII, 709.

59 Rosenfeld, "Aesthetics Without Experience," KR XI, 321-325; Rosenfeld reviewed, for instance, Paul Goodman, The Facts of Life, KR VII, 709-712, and James T. Farrell, The League of Frightened Philistines, KR VII, 718-719; Howe, A Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1982), p. 133; Rosenfeld, "Dry Watershed," KR VIII, 315, 313; Burke to Tate, April 14, 1946. Tate Papers.

60 Burke, "The Temporizing of Essence," KR VII, 616-627; Ransom to Burke, May 29, 1945. Burke Papers; "Contributors," KR VII, 4, unnumbered page; Ransom, "Mr. Burke's Dialectic," New Republic, CXIV, February 18, 1946, 257-258.

61 Burke to Ransom, December 15, 1945. KC Papers; Burke to Ransom, March 10, 1946. Burke Papers.

62 Burke to Ransom, May 8, 1946. Burke Papers.

63 Rice, "The Semiotic of Charles Morris," KR IX, 303-311; Ransom to Burke, August 25, 1948. Burke Papers; Burke, "The Imagery of Killing," HR I, 2 (Sum 1948), 151-167; Ransom, "The New Criticism," KR X, 687.

- 1 Southard, "Speculation: I. The Religious Poetry of Robert Penn Warren," KR VII, 655. In "Speculation: III. Art and the Human Economy," KR VII, 683-688, Ransom termed Agrarianism "a phantasy" and even "a heavy punishment." Southard again took an Agrarian stand in "Escape to Reality," KR VIII, 136-139.
- 2 O'Donnell, "The Pieties of Evelyn Waugh," KR IX, 400-411; Lebowitz, "The Everlasting Mr. Huxley," KR VII, 135-138; Fitts, "The Hellenism of Robinson Jeffers," KR VIII, 682.
- 3 "Three Portraits from Gide's Journal," trans. Dupee, KR VI, 91-100; André Gide, "An Introduction to Goethe's Theatre," trans. Cowley, KR VI, 161-179; Ransom to Cowley, February 22, 1945. Cowley Papers; Valéry, "The Existence of Symbolism," trans. Cowley, KR XIX, 425-447.
- 4 Gide, "Paul Valéry," KR VIII, 277-290; "Contributors," KR VIII, 346; Hytier, "At Valéry's Funeral," trans. Mathews, KR VIII, 274-276; Leighton, "Valéry: La Poésie Engagée," KR VIII, 295, 294; Roditi, "Paul Valéry: Poetics as an Exact Science," KR VI, 398-408.
- 5 Fowlie, "François Mauriac," KR V, 189; Isère, "Des Revues Françaises Après la Libération," KR VIII, 510; Monnier, "Joyce's Ulysses and the French Public," trans. Sylvia Beach, KR VIII, 430.
- 6 Rice to Marshall, March 4, 1947. GF Papers.
- 7 Rodell, "Maxwell Anderson: A Criticism," KR V, 273; Savage, "The Aestheticism of W.B. Yeats," KR VII, 118-134; Ransom, "The Severity of Mr. Savage," KR VII, 114.
- 8 Bentley to Mizener, July 25 [1945]; Ransom to Mizener, August 11 [1945]. Mizener Papers.
- 9 Ransom to Trilling, April 11, 1944, Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom, eds. Thomas Daniel Young and George Core (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), p. 314; Tate to Schwartz, September 23, 1943. Tate Papers.
- 10 Tate to Blackmur, September 23, 1943. Tate Papers; Wilson to Tate, September 28, 1943, Wilson, Letters on Literature and Politics 1912-1972, ed. Elena Wilson (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977), p. 399; Schwartz to Tate, September 29, 1943. Tate Papers; Leighton, "Criticism from Oxford," KR VI, 146-150; Leighton, "Roman Criticism and English Translation," a review of Clowns and Angels by Wallace Fowlie and Coronal by Paul Claudel, KR VI, 461-464.
- 11 Ransom to Tate, July 17 [1946]. Tate Papers; Warren to Cowley, July 18, 1946. Cowley Papers.
- 12 Tate to Ransom, July 22, 1946; Tate to Ransom, August 30, 1946; Ransom to Tate, September 19 [1946]. Tate Papers.
- 13 Ransom to Tate, August 22 [1946]. Tate Papers.
- 14 Tate to Ransom, August 30, 1946; Warren to Tate, October 28, 1946.

Tate Papers.

15 Ransom to Tate, September 12 [1947]. Tate Papers; Chase, "The Stone and the Crucifixion: Faulkner's Light in August," KR X, 539; Bowling, "Faulkner: Technique of The Sound and The Fury," KR X, 552-566.

16 Trilling, "The Sense of the Past," The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society (New York: The Viking Press, 1950), p. 181; Horace Gregory, "Dr. Leavis' English School," KR VI, 485-489; Lincoln Reis, "Pedagogue and Person," KR VII, 487-490; Ransom, review of José Ortega y Gasset, Mission of the University, KR VII, 524-525; Ransom, review of Millet, The Rebirth of Liberal Education, KR VIII, 176-177.

17 Tate to Blackmur [early 1944]. Tate Papers.

18 Ransom, "The Inorganic Muses," KR V, 282, 284; Tate to Mizener, March 1, 1943. Mizener Papers; Ransom to Tate, February 27 [1943]. Tate Papers.

19 Ransom, "Art Worries the Naturalists: Who in Turn Worry the Arts with Organism, Fusion, Funding," KR VII, 283; Ransom, "The Literary Criticism of Aristotle," KR X, 382; Ransom to John Palmer, August 24 [1948]. SR Papers.

20 Eliseo Vivas, for instance, reviewed S.K. Langer, Philosophy in a New Key, in "On Symbolism," KR V, 301-304; Philip Wheelwright acclaimed Werner Jaeger, Paideia, in "The Hellenic Ideal," KR VIII, 154-158; and Sidney Hook admired Ernst Cassirer, An Essay on Man, in "Man and the Universe of Symbols," KR VII, 335-338.

21 Clark, "Death of a Thinker: A Note on the French Novel 1925-1940," KR III, 322-334; Clark, "Existentialist Fiction," KR VIII, 674-678; Bentley, "Jean-Paul Sartre, Dramatist," KR VIII, 66-79; William G. O'Donnell, "Kierkegaard: I. The Literary Manner," KR IX, 35-47; Grene, "Kierkegaard: II. The Philosophy," KR IX, 48-69; Grene, "L'Homme Est Une Passion Inutile: Sartre and Heidegger," KR IX, 185; Flint to Ransom [Spring 1947]. KR Papers; Grene, "Two More Existentialists: Karl Jaspers and Gabriel Marcel," KR IX, 382-399.

22 Ransom, "The Inorganic Muses," KR V, 278-300; Herschberger, "The Structure of Metaphor," KR V, 433-443; Ransom, "Positive and Near-Positive Aesthetics," KR V, 443-447; Aldrich, "Pictorial Meaning and Picture Thinking," KR V, 403-412; Walter, "The Composer in Search of Freedom and Progress," KR V, 100-113; Hemphill, "The Discourse of Music," KR V, 413-432; interview with Helen and Elizabeth Forman, October 19, 1981; Pepper, "The Outlook for Aesthetics," KR VIII, 179-187.

23 "We Announce," KR VII, 4, unnumbered page; Bentley, "The Drama at Ebb," KR VII, 174, 184; Friess, "The Importance of Religion," KR VIII, 630; Palmer, "On the Agenda of Political Theory," KR IX, 552-562.

24 Foxx, "China Letter," KR IX, 113-133; Southard to Ransom, October 8, 1946. KR Papers.

25 Williams to Ransom, January 3, 1947. KR Papers.

26 The war is further mentioned in, for instance, C.G. Wallis, "Satan and Denis de Rougemont," KR VI, 150-156, and in Andreas Dorpalen, "Towards a Better World," KR VI, 308-312; Ransom, "Artists, Soldiers, Positivists," KR VI, 276, 277.

27 Ransom, "Artists, Soldiers, Positivists," 276; Ransom to Stevens, June 15, 1944, Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom, eds. Young and Core, p.316; Stevens to Ransom, June 17, 1944, Letters of Wallace Stevens, ed. Holly Stevens (London: Faber and Faber, 1966), p. 468; Stevens, "Esthétique du Mal," KR VI, 489-503; Jarrell, "Reflections on Wallace Stevens," Poetry and the Age (New York: Vintage Books, 1953), p. 126; Ransom to Stevens, August 18, 1944, Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom, eds. Young and Core, p. 317.

28 As for Ransom's personal involvement: his son Reavill served in the war, and he tried to persuade his daughter Helen to become a Wac. Interview with Helen and Elizabeth Forman, October 19, 1981; Ransom to Burke, January 4, 1941. Burke Papers; Jarrell, "The Germans Are Lunatics" and "Losses," KR VII, 442-443; Morse, "Soldier Sewing on Chevrons" and "Another Soldier, . . . From the Aleutians," KR VII, 443-446; Whittemore, "Home Abroad," "On the Death of Someone Close," "This Is It," and "Hester Prynne," KR VII, 447-449; DeJong, "State of Soul in Grand Rapids" and "Sentimental Theme," KR VII, 454-455; Ransom to Mizener, May 14 [1945]. Mizener Papers; Van Doren, "April, 1942," KR V, 182-184; Schwartz to Van Doren, April 8, 1943. Van Doren Papers.

29 Jarrell, "The Rising Sun," KR IX, 260-261; Lowell, "Mary Winslow," "At a Bible House," and "The First Sunday in Lent," KR VIII, 613-616; Moss, "Ten Poets," KR IX, 294; Ransom to Lowell, October 5 [1945]. Lowell Papers.

30 Ransom to Garrigue, November 3, 1943. KR Papers; Garrigue, "Conjectural Domain" and "Discourse," KR VI, 66-68. In the same issue we find Garrigue's review of Warren, At Heaven's Gate, 135-138; Jarrell, "The Carnegie Library, Juvenile Division," KR VI, 64-65; Rukeyser, "The Dream-singing Elegy," KR VI, 59-63; Garrigue, "False Country of the Zoo," KR VIII, 567-569; Ransom to Miles, March 30, 1940; Miles to Ransom, June 30, 1940. KR Papers; Miles, "Sonata from Above," "Confidence," "Funeral," "Nosce Te Ipsum," "None," "The Disturbed," "Look," and "Midwatcher," KR VI, 394-397; Miles, "Aboriginal," "Kind," "Expectation," "An Apprehension," "Riddle," "Countenance," and "Yield," KR IX, 569-573.

31 Schwartz, "The Starlight's Intuitions Pierced the Twelve," KR VI, 383-385. This poem appeared in the not very successful Vaudeville for a Princess (New York: New Directions, 1950) under the title "Starlight Like Intuition Pierced the Twelve;" Atlas, Delmore Schwartz: The Life of an American Poet (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1977), p. 291; Schwartz to Ransom, December 10, 1954, Letters of Delmore Schwartz, ed. Robert Phillips (Princeton, N.J.: Ontario Review Press, 1984), p.296; Ransom to Shapiro, April 14, 1945. KR Papers. It is not clear from the correspondence whether the 121 lines that were eventually published constitute Shapiro's first, or a second, extended submission; Shapiro, "Essay on Rime: Confusion of Personal Systems (From Part III)," KR VII, 378-381.

32 Tate, "Jubilo" and "More Sonnets at Christmas," KR V, 184-188; Tate to Mizener, February 5, 1943. Mizener Papers. Tate is exaggerating his period of poetic aridity, though: his "Trout Map," for instance, had appeared in KR I, 404-405; Tate to Donald Davidson, February 3, 1943. Davidson Papers; Ransom to Tate, December 10 [1942]. Tate Papers.

33 Ransom to Warren, July 7, 1943, Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom, eds. Young and Core, p. 311; Ransom to Tate, September 21 [1943]; Ransom to Tate, November 1 [1943]. Tate Papers; Tate, "Seasons of the Soul," KR VI, 1-9. The "other poetry" included the Garrigue poems mentioned in note 30. The dates on the November letters to Tate and Garrigue suggest that only after Ransom had decided to publish "Seasons of the Soul" separately did he resolve to include Garrigue's poems in the poetry section; Jarrell, "The Carnegie Library, Juvenile division," KR VI, 64-65; Warren to Tate, April 2, 1945. Tate Papers; Stevens to Henry Church, January 21, 1944, Letters of Wallace Stevens, ed. Holly Stevens, p. 461.

34 For instance: Brinnin, "With a Posthumous Medal" and "Gunnery Practice," KR VI, 198-199; Young, "Of Deed, Love, Death," KR VII, 69-70; Aragon, "Lancelot," trans. Sally Wood, KR VIII, 238-241; Brecht, "Poems of Exile," trans. H.R. Hays, KR VII, 198-207.

35 In The Achievement of Robert Penn Warren (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), p. 335, James H. Justus mistakenly assumes that "The Ballad of Billie Potts" was published in the 1944 Kenyon. The "Ballad" appeared in PR XI, 1 (Wtr 1944), 56-70. In "The Inklings of 'Original Sin,'" SRL XXVII, May 20, 1944, 10-11, Ransom remarks that Warren's poetry is superior to his fiction, which is too "naturalistic." He adds that this same naturalism mars "Billie Potts;" Ransom to Duncan, October 26, 1944. Duncan Papers; Duncan, "The Homosexual in Society," Politics, I (Ag 1944), 209-211; Duncan to Ransom [n.d.; draft]; Ransom to Duncan, December 6, 1944. Duncan Papers. In Jack R. Cohn and Thomas J. O'Donnell, "An Interview with Robert Duncan," Contemporary Literature, XXI, 4 (Aut 1980), 524, Duncan states: "The article on 'The Homosexual in Society' came out and I got a letter from Ransom, saying that he had not realized that [the poem] was a covert advertisement for homosexuality; Kenyon Review was not a journal accepting this sort of thing. And then I wrote back, 'Would you prefer an overt one?' And then . . . he said . . . he believed that homosexuals should be castrated so that they wouldn't breed more homosexuals. . . . So scratch a Southern gentleman and you'll find something awfully interesting. So I was out . . . at a point when I would have been in at the wrong place. When the issue came out I would have been in: Auden, Paul Goodman, Parker Tyler; I mean the place looked like a coffee klatsch. I'm glad I wasn't in there; I would have been read not as an advertisement but a conformist of the first water." The castration document Duncan refers to is Ransom's letter of December 6, 1944. Ransom wrote: "I cannot agree with your position that homosexuality is not abnormal. It is biologically abnormal in the most obvious sense. I am not sure whether or not state and federal law regard it so, but I think they do; I should not take the initiative in the matter, but if there are laws to this effect I concur in them entirely. There are certainly laws prohibiting incest and polygamy, with which I concur, though they are only abnormal conventionally and are not so damaging to a society biologically. But I don't throw

stones. I am very sorry to refuse publication." Whether this implies that homosexuals should be castrated is doubtful. Twelve years later Ransom had forgotten all about this correspondence and returned some of Duncan's poems with the note that though they seemed "a little heavy, a little contrived," Duncan was a "good prospect." Ransom to Duncan, August 14, 1957. Duncan Papers. Duncan never published poetry in the Kenyon.

36 Ransom to Chalmers, November 24, 1943. KR Papers; Stewart, The Prairie Schooner Story: A Little Magazine's First 25 Years (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1955), p. 169.

37 Ransom to Priscilla Heath, December 19, 1953; Ransom to Williams, June 3, 1941. KR Papers.

38 Ransom to Chalmers, November 24, 1943. KR Papers; Ransom to Tate, November 22 [1943]. Tate Papers; Chalmers to Doubleday, Doran, and Company, Inc., December 4, 1943. KC Papers.

39 Ransom to Tate, November 22 [1943]; Ransom to Tate, June 9 [1944]. Tate Papers; Ransom to Garrigue, June 15, 1944; Ransom to Garrigue, August 17, 1944; Ransom to Garrigue, July 5, 1944. Garrigue Papers; Garrigue, "The Snowfall," KR VI, 505-530.

40 Patton, "A Piece of Bread," KR VI, 531-541; Berryman, "The Lovers," KR VII, 1-11; Ransom to Berryman, May 12, 1945. Berryman Papers; circular letter by the editors of The Kenyon Review, May 12, 1945. Van Duyn Papers.

41 Ransom to Van Duyn, May 23, 1945. Van Duyn Papers; Van Duyn, "The Bell," KR VII, 598-615; Berryman, "The Imaginary Jew," KR VII, 539; Simpson, Poets in their Youth (New York: Random House, 1982), p. 106; "Thursday Out" was written in 1958 and published in Saul Bellow's short-lived journal The Noble Savage in the spring of 1961.

42 Elder, "You Can Wreck It," KR VIII, 571-592; Mizener, "You Never Go Back to Sleep," KR VIII, 593-612; Ransom to Mizener, July 2 [1946]. Mizener Papers; Elder to Ransom, November 8 [1946]. KR Papers.

43 Ransom to Tate, August 2 [1946]. Tate Papers.

44 Lytle, "Alchemy," KR IV, 273-327; Taylor, "Allegiance," KR IX, 188-200; Pasternak, "Aerial Ways," KR VIII, 463-476; Lavin, "A Wet Day," KR VI, 10-23; Macauley, ed., Gallery of Modern Fiction: Stories from The Kenyon Review (New York: Salem Press, 1966); Manning, "A Visit," KR VI, 418-424; Nin, "The Mouse," KR VIII, 266-273.

45 Rosenfeld, "The New Egypt," KR VIII, 376-390; Rosenfeld, "The Railroad," KR IX, 235-247; Rosenfeld, "The Party," KR IX, 572-607; Ransom to Katherine Anne Porter, September 9 [1947]. Porter Papers; Schwartz, "A Bitter Farce," KR VIII, 245-261; Schwartz to Ransom, October 28, 1945, Letters of Delmore Schwartz, ed. Phillips, p. 220; Ransom to Schwartz, June 19, 1945. KR Papers. This story was collected in his The World Is a Wedding (1948); Gottlieb, "Where Are You Roaming," KR VI, 260-274; Gottlieb, "The Norm," KR VII, 246-260.

- 46 Sender, "The Key," KR V, 201-218; Brecht, "The Caucasian Circle of Chalk, Act Five," trans. James Stern and W.H. Auden, KR VIII, 188-202.
- 47 Fergusson, short review of The Use of the Drama by Granville-Barker, KR VIII, 171-173; Fergusson, "Action as Passion: Tristan and Murder in the Cathedral," KR IX, 201-221; Viertel, "Bertolt Brecht: Dramatist," KR VII, 467-475; Viertel, "The Brecht Performance," KR VII, 690-692; Viertel, "The Group Theatre," KR VIII, 302-309; Barzun, "Bernard Shaw in Twilight," KR V, 338; Bentley, "Bernard Shaw's Politics (A Birthday Tribute)," KR VIII, 347-371; Ransom to Barzun, October 7, 1944. KR Papers.
- 48 Beiswanger's letters on Broadway appeared in KR IV, 264-271, KR V, 114-117, and KR VI, 318-320; Anderson's letters appeared in KR VIII, 477-483 and KR IX, 481-486; Bentley, "Monsieur Verdoux as 'Theatre,'" KR X, 705-716; Nobbe, "Theatre Letter," KR XI, 533-538.
- 49 Adorno, "A Social Critique of Radio Music," KR VII, 208-217; Sessions, "Sir Donald Tovey," KR VII, 504-507; Balet, "The Nuisance of Music 'Re-Creations,'" KR VII, 382-398; Balet, "The Humanity of Mozart," KR VII, 494-497; Haggin, "Music," Nation, CLXI, part II, August 11, 1945, 142; Bentley to Barzun [September 1945]. Enclosed are Haggin to Bentley [n.d.] and Balet to Bentley, September 12, 1945. Barzun Papers.
- 50 Gropius and Wagner, "Cities' Renaissance", KR V, 12-33; Rice to Gropius, September 30, 1942; Gropius to Rice, October 13, 1942. KR Papers.
- 51 Panofsky, "Renaissance and Renascences," KR VI, 201-236; Panofsky to Ransom, January 8, 1944; Panofsky to Ransom, January 29, 1944; KR Papers.
- 52 Panofsky to Rice, May 1, 1945; circulation report, October 1, 1947. KR Papers; Southard, "Images with Abstract Titles," KR V, 464-467; Adams, "Art Letter," KR V, 477; Charlot, "Pre-Hispanic Quota in Mexican Murals," KR VIII, 1-13; Graff, "Pictorial Tragedy," KR IX, 96-109.
- 53 Ransom to Tate, March 20 [1943]. Tate Papers; the figures are taken from a report dated September 29 on the circulation of the Autumn 1942 issue and a report dated September 22 on the circulation of the Autumn 1944 issue; Stanford is mentioned as a possible base for the Kenyon in a letter written by Rice from New York, January 20, 1944, to Charles Coffin, professor of English at Kenyon College. Rice Papers.
- 54 Ransom to John Marshall, August 13, 1947. KR Papers.
- 55 Ransom to Chalmers, December 14, 1948; Ransom to David Stevens, August 30, 1945. KR Papers.
- 56 "Grant in Aid to Kenyon College," January 10, 1944. Signed by, among others, Stevens. KC Collection; anonymous, "The Fugitive," Time, May 10, 1948, 70; anonymous, "Professor on a Hill," Newsweek, August 2, 1948, 73; Marshall to Ransom, April 3, 1947. KR Papers.

¹ Interview with Brooks, August 17, 1982.

² A prime example is William Elton's "Glossary of the New Criticism," Poetry, LXXIII (O 1948-Mr 1949), 151-162, 232-245, and 296-307; another is the American Scholar forum on "The Misery and Necessity of the Quarterly," with contributions by Ransom, Paul Bixler, Schwartz, and Irwin Edman, which appeared in AS XV, 4 (Aut 1946), 550-554; Peterson, "The Role of the Minority Magazine," Antioch Review, XXIII, 1 (Spr 1963), 67; William J. Newman, "The American Literary Reviews," Twentieth Century, CLV, 926 (Ap 1954), 342, 350; other examples of British articles mainly devoted to American literary reviews are "The Serious Literary Review," TLS September 17, 1954, lviii and "The American Scene," TLS August 24, 1951, xxxiv-xxxv. Both articles are anonymous.

³ Ransom to D'Arms, December 17, 1951. KC Collection.

⁴ Library of Congress Press Release No. 542, February 20, 1949: "The Pisan Cantos Wins for Ezra Pound First Award of Bollingen Prize in Poetry." Included in Fellows of the Library of Congress, et al., The Case Against the Saturday Review of Literature (Chicago: Poetry, 1949), pp. 29-30.

⁵ There has been much discussion about the Bollingen Award to Pound. Recently it has been discussed by, for instance, Howe, A Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1982), pp. 151-156; William McGuire, Bollingen: An Adventure in Collecting the Past (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1982), pp. 208-218; E. Fuller Torrey, The Roots of Treason: Pound and the Secret of St. Elizabeths (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984); and Thomas Daniel Young, "The Little Houses Against the Great," SR LXXXVIII, 2 (Spr 1980), 320-330; Barrett, "A Prize for Ezra Pound," PR XVI, 4 (Ap 1949), 344-347.

⁶ Hillyer, "Treason's Strange Fruit," SRL XXXII, June 11, 1949, 9-11, 28; Hillyer, "Poetry's New Priesthood," SRL XXXII, June 18, 1949, 7-9, 38; Hillyer, "Poetry's New Priesthood," 38.

⁷ Hillyer to [?] Foster, March 22, 1949. Hillyer Papers.

⁸ In an undated, late September or early October 1949 letter to Ransom Rice refers to Hillyer as "Nemo." Rice Papers; Lobdell, "Hillyer Sets Off Poetry Powder Keg with Pound Attack," KC LXXIV, September 30, 1949, 2, 4; interview with Lanning, October 21, 1981, the adjectives "muddled," "hysterical," "sordid," and "fascistic" are all from the one letter actually published in KC LXXIV, October 7, 1949, 2. Its author was Richard Thomas Gibson, a student at Kenyon College; Chalmers, "Controversy Unfortunate But Necessary," KC LXXIV, October 7, 1949, 2; Rice to Ransom [late September or early October, 1949]. Rice Papers.

⁹ "A Prepared Attack," letter to the editors of the Saturday Review of Literature, published in The Nation, December 17, 1949, 598-599.

¹⁰ Fellows of the Library of Congress, et al., The Case Against the Saturday Review of Literature; Winters to Harrison Smith of the

Saturday Review of Literature, December 10, 1949. Tate Papers; Warren to Rice, September 21, 1949. Rice Papers.

11 Rice to Williams, September 20, 1949. KR Papers; Pound to Rice [n.d.; envelope is postmarked September 26, 1949]. Rice Papers; Rice to Tate, November 15 [1949]. Tate Papers.

12 Ransom to Rice, December 3 [1949]; Ransom to Rice, December 14, 1949; Ransom to Rice, January 20 [1950]. Rice Papers; Rice to Tate, April 18, 1950. Tate Papers.

13 Shapiro, In Defence of Ignorance (1960; rpt. New York: Vintage Books, 1965), p. 268.

14 Blackmur, "Literary Magazines Study." Unpublished manuscript; Marshall, memo of September 11, 1946, entitled "Possible RF Assistance to the So-called Literary Magazines." LMS Papers.

15 Williams to Blackmur, November 11, 1946. LMS Papers.

16 Wilson to Blackmur, November 6, 1946. LMS Papers.

17 Bentley to Blackmur, November 10, 1946. LMS Papers.

18 Cowley to Marshall, April 28, 1947; Trilling to Marshall, March 25, 1947. LMS Papers.

19 Anonymous, "Editorial Statement," PR IV, 1 (D 1939), 3; for recent interesting material about Partisan Review, see Lionel Abel, The Intellectual Follies: A Memoir of the Literary Venture in New York and Paris (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), William Barrett, The Truants: Adventures among the Intellectuals (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, 1982), Howe, A Margin of Hope, and William Phillips, A Partisan View: Five Decades of the Literary Life (New York: Stein and Day, 1983).

20 J.E. Palmer, "Editorial," SR LIV, 4 (Aut 1946), 732; in "The State of Letters," SR LII, 4, (Aut 1944), 609, Tate writes: "Since World War I the only American literary magazine (in the tradition in which SR will continue) that had a large circulation, was The Dial," and in a form letter announcing his forthcoming editorship Tate mentions as a specific editorial aim "to continue . . . the recent service to letters performed by The Southern Review from 1935 to 1942." Cairns Papers.

21 Ransom to Burke, October 21, 1948. Burke Papers; Ransom to Rice, December 10 [1949]. Rice Papers.

22 Ransom, "The Kenyon School of Criticism: A Plan for an Educational Project in the Humanities." KR Papers.

23 Memo by Edward D'Arms entitled "Comments on Proposed Grant for School of Criticism Kenyon College," July 31, 1947; memo by Marshall of an interview with Blackmur, September 18, 1946; memo by Marshall, August 22, 1947. KC Collection; Trilling to Newton P. Stallknecht, May 8, 1972. Stallknecht Papers; Ransom to Matthiessen, November 26

[1946; wrongly dated 1948]. Matthiessen Papers.

24 Memo by Stevens of an interview with Chalmers, September 5, 1947; Ransom to Stevens, September 4, 1947; resolution by the Rockefeller Foundation to grant \$40,000.00 to Kenyon College for a School of English, October 17, 1947. KC Collection.

25 Anonymous, "Kenyon School of English," Kenyon Alumni Bulletin, VI, 2 (F-Mr 1948), 11.

26 Howard Babb to Marshall, Thanksgiving 1948. KC Collection; in a letter to Chalmers, December 14, 1948, Ransom quotes Coffin's remark "that his office seemed to be becoming an employment agency." KR Papers.

27 Matthiessen to Tate, September 11 [1948]. Tate Papers; Rahv to Morton Dauwen Zabel, September 16, 1949. Zabel Papers; Ransom to Matthiessen, December 1, 1947. Matthiessen Papers; memo by Stevens of an interview with Chalmers, October 26, 1949. KC Collection; the gossip, sometimes malicious running commentary on the 1948 session by "Trilling's star-pupil," as Chase was known at the School of English, clearly indicates the change from initial mistrust to friendship. "[T]he political sagacity . . . which one associates with Lionel are foreign to the Southerners and others. I am much distressed by the political innocence of the Fellows here this summer. . . . It is indeed difficult apparently to be a good literary critic and a good moralist. On the evidence offered by the New Critics in general I do believe if I had to choose I should want to be a moralist," Chase wrote to his wife on July 3 [1948; wrongly dated 1949]. But by July 18 [1948; wrongly dated 1949] he had come to speak of "my friends the Southern writers," who in practice "lean to the left" politically and "see in capitalism no power at all of establishing any kind of coherent culture in which individual life can have meaning." Chase Papers.

28 Interview with Helen and Elizabeth Forman, October 19, 1981.

29 Ransom to Marshall [Summer 1958]; Ransom to Chalmers, December 14, 1948. KR Papers; Chase to his wife, July 15 [1948; wrongly dated 1949]. Chase Papers; Austin Warren to Andrew Lytle, July 27, 1948. Lytle Papers.

30 Marshall to Chalmers, March 13, 1950. Copy in Tate Papers; Chalmers also had at first made the Senior Fellows and the Foundation enthusiastic for a plan in which one teaching Fellow was to stay at Kenyon College during the entire year, so that exceptionally bright students could get their Master of Arts degree at Gambier. But when Ransom made it very clear that he was not going to stand for Chalmers' appointing such a Fellow single-handedly, Chalmers huffily withdrew the resident Fellow proposal.

31 Tate to Chalmers, October 25, 1950. Tate Papers; Ransom to Chalmers, December 6, 1949; Trilling to Chalmers, December 18, 1949. KC Papers.

32 Ransom to Tate, April 9 [1952]. Tate Papers; "Literature and the Little Magazines," p. 12. Unpublished report of the Rockefeller

Foundation, November 1, 1955. KC Collection.

33 Ransom to Blackmur, January 1 [1956; wrongly dated 1955]. Blackmur Papers.

34 Rockefeller Foundation resolution to grant \$41,400.00 toward Kenyon Review fellowships, June 20, 1952. KC Collection.

35 "Kenyon Review Fellowships," KR XIV, 4, unnumbered page; Moore to the editors, November 8, 1952; Mizener to Ransom, November 19, 1952. KC Papers; Fergusson to Rice, October 21 [1952]. KR Papers; the appointment of four Fellows instead of three is easily explained: the majority of the chosen Fellows were unmarried and therefore cheap and the unused money went towards the appointment of the extra Fellows.

36 Howe, A Margin of Hope, p. 148; O'Connor to Marshall, August 28, 1955; O'Connor to Marshall, September 14, 1955. KC Collection; Watkins to Ransom, December 19 [1952]. KR Papers.

37 Ransom, "Poets and Flatworms," KR XIV, 159; Ransom, "Introduction," The Kenyon Critics: Studies in Modern Literature from the Kenyon Review, ed. Ransom (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1951), p. viii; Ransom, "The Formal Analysis," KR IX, 436; Ransom, "The New Criticism," KR X, 682.

38 "Statement," undated, typed letter in Tate Papers; Barrett, "The Critic's Business: A Present Tendency in American Criticism," KR XI, 4; Tate, "The Critic's Business: A Note on Autotelism," KR XI, 13; Blackmur, "The Critic's Business: For a Second Look," KR XI, 7, 8. Only a few months earlier, though, in "A Burden for Critics," which appeared in the Summer 1948 issue of The Hudson Review, Blackmur had severely attacked the New Criticism for being facile and limited; Chase, "The Critic's Business: New vs. Ordealist," KR XI, 13.

39 Ransom to Van Wyck Brooks, February 17, 1951. Van Wyck Brooks Papers.

40 Ransom to Rice, December 10 [1949]. Rice Papers.

41 Ransom and Rice to (among others) F.O. Matthiessen, December 27, 1949. Matthiessen Papers.

42 The symposium "My Credo" consists of the following articles: in the Autumn issue of Volume XII we find Leslie Fiedler, "Towards an Amateur Criticism," 561-574; Herbert Read, "The Critic as Man of Feeling," 575-580; Richard Chase, "Art, Nature, Politics," 580-594; and William Empson, "The Verbal Analysis," 594-601; in the Winter 1951 issue of Volume XIII we find Brooks, "The Formalist Critic," 72-81; Douglas Bush, "The Humanist Critic," 81-92; and Northrop Frye, "The Archetypes of Literature," 92-110; finally, in the Spring issue of Volume XIII we find Stephen Spender, "On the Function of Criticism," 207-217; Mizener, "Not in Cold Blood," 218-225; and Austin Warren, "The Teacher as Critic," 225-230.

43 Read, 575; Chase, 591; Empson, 597; Ransom to Mizener, September 7, 1950. Mizener Papers.

- 44 Ransom to Tate, September 6, 1950. Tate Papers; Brooks, 77, 74; Bush, 86; Ransom to David McDowell, March 1, 1951. Random House Papers.
- 45 Mizener, 225; Ransom to Tate, April 3 [1951]. Tate Papers.
- 46 Ransom to Mizener, September 7, 1950. Mizener Papers.

¹ Editor's note to Empson, "Donne and the Rhetorical Tradition," KR XI, 571; the Donne series consists of the following articles: Empson, "Donne and the Rhetorical Tradition," KR XI, 571-587; Arnold Stein, "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse," KR XIII, 20-36; Josephine Miles, "A Language of the Donne Tradition," KR XIII, 37-49; Stein, "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse (continued)," KR XIII, 256-278; D.W. Harding, "Coherence of Theme in Donne's Poetry," KR XIII, 427-444; Marius Bewley, "Religious Cynicism in Donne's Poetry," KR XIV, 619-646; Austin Warren, "The Very Reverend Dr. Donne," KR XVI, 268-277; R.M. Adams, "Donne and Eliot: Metaphysicals," KR XVI, 278-291; Charles Coffin, "Donne's Divinity," KR XVI, 292-298; L.L. Miller, "Communication," KR XVI, 505; and Empson, "Donne the Space Man," KR XIX, 337-399.

² Ransom to Randall Stewart, May 1 [1956]. Stewart Papers.

³ Empson, "Donne the Space Man," 338; Tyler to the editor, October 14, 1957. KR Papers.

⁴ Adams, "Donne and Eliot: Metaphysicals," 286; Miller, "Communication," 505.

⁵ The contents of the Dante issue, KR XIV, 2, are: Eliot, "A Talk on Dante," 178-188; Singleton, "The Other Journey," 189-206; Auerbach, "Farinata and Cavalcante," trans. W.R. Trask, 207-242; Fergusson, "Purgatorio, Canto XVIII: The Fruit of Philosophy," 243-255; Tate, "The Symbolic Imagination," 256-277; Fitzgerald, "The Style That Does Honor," 278-285; Blackmur, "Dante's Ten Terms for the Treatment of the Treatise," 286-300; and Maritain, "Dante's Innocence and Luck," 301-323.

⁶ A selection of Fergusson's works on Dante: Dante's Drama of the Mind: A Modern Reading of The Purgatorio (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1953); Dante (New York: Macmillan, 1966); Trope and Allegory: Themes Common to Dante and Shakespeare (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1977); Bentley to Rice, January 7 [1950]. KR Papers.

⁷ "A Talk on Dante" was published in The Adelphi, First Quarter, 1951; Vallette, "Lettres Anglo-Saxonnes," Mercur de France, MLXVII, July 1, 1952, 534; Ransom to Tate, March 19 [1952]; Rice to Tate, November 19, 1951. Tate Papers; Tate to Ransom, April 12, 1952. KR Papers; Fergusson to Tate, April 16, 1952. Tate Papers.

⁸ Tate to Ransom, April 12, 1952. KR Papers; Ransom to Tate, April 9 [1952]. Tate Papers; Fergusson to Ransom, February 7, 1952. KR Papers.

⁹ Tate to Ransom, April 12, 1952; Tate to Ransom, January 14, 1952. KR Papers; Fergusson to Tate, December 18, 1951. Tate Papers; Tate, "The Angelic Imagination: Poe and the Power of Words," KR XIV, 455-475; Tate, "The Symbolic Imagination," 260, 261.

¹⁰ Fergusson to Rice, January 25, 1952; Tate to Ransom, April 12, 1952; memo by Fergusson of the Dante issue [n.d.]. KR Papers; Fergusson to Tate, November 19 [1951]. Tate Papers; Auerbach, "Farinata and Cavalcante," 242.

- 11 Fiedler, "Green Thoughts in a Green Shade: Reflections on the Stony Sestina of Dante Alighieri," KR XVIII, 238-262; Fiedler in John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters, eds. D. David Long and Michael R. Burr, supplement to the Kenyon Collegian, LXXX, 7 (1964), 13; Fiedler to the editors, October 19, 1947; Fiedler to Ransom, November 4, 1947. KR Papers.
- 12 Fiedler, "Mann and His Critics," KR X, 349-354; Fiedler to Ransom, November 8, 1947. KR Papers; Fiedler, "The Fate of the Novel," KR X, 524, 527, 526; Fiedler, "Style and Anti-Style in the Short Story," KR XIII, 161, 170.
- 13 Fiedler, "Italian Pilgrimage: The Discovery of America," KR XIV, 359-377; Fiedler, "Introducing Cesare Pavese," KR XVI, 536-553; Fiedler to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers.
- 14 Howe, A Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1982), p. 181; Howe to Ransom, June 9, 1953; Howe to Ransom, December 8, 1952. KR Papers.
- 15 Howe, "Sherwood Anderson: An American as Artist," KR XIII, 193-203; Howe, "The Cost of Distraction," KR XI, 336-342; Ransom to David McDowell, June 12, 1952. Random House Papers; Young, "Joseph Conrad: II. Lingard's Folly: The Lost Subject," KR XV, 522-539.
- 16 Howe, "Joseph Conrad: I. Order and Anarchy: The Political Novels," KR XV, 505-521; Howe, "Joseph Conrad: III. The Political Novels (cont.)," KR XVI, 1-19; Howe to Ransom, June 9, 1953. KR Papers; Howe, "Dostoevsky: The Politics of Salvation," KR XVII, 42-68. Howe's Politics and the Novel, one of the fruits of his Fellowship, appeared in New York with the Horizon Press in 1957.
- 17 Lewis, "Casella as Critic: A Note on R.P. Blackmur," KR XIII, 458-474; Trilling to Ransom, March 9, 1951. KR Papers; Blackmur, "Madame Bovary: Beauty Out of Place," KR XIII, 485. This essay was reprinted in Blackmur, Eleven Essays in the European Novel (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964).
- 18 Lewis, "The Hero in the New World: William Faulkner's The Bear," KR XIII, 649; Lewis, "Fiction and Power: Some Notes on Ignazio Silone," KR XVII, 23-41; Lewis to Ransom, October 4, 1954. KR Papers; Lewis, "Poetry's Chevalier," KR XVI, 130, 129; Ransom to John Marshall, December 17, 1951. KC Collection.
- 19 From 1948 to 1958 Ellmann contributed the following articles to The Kenyon Review: "Robartes and Aherne: Two Sides of a Penny," KR X, 177-186; "The Ductile Universe of Henri Michaux," KR XI, 187-198; "Joyce and Yeats," KR XII, 618-638; "The Doctor in Search of Himself," KR XIV, 510-512; "The Art of Yeats: Affirmative Capability," KR XV, 357-385; "The Backgrounds of Ulysses," KR XVI, 3 (Sum 1954), 337-386; "A Portrait of the Artist as Friend," KR XVIII, 53-67; "Wallace Stevens' Ice-Cream," KR XIX, 89-105; "The Backgrounds of 'The Dead,'" KR XX, 507-528.
- 20 Auden, "Yeats as an Example," KR X, 187-195; Bentley, "Yeats as a

Playwright," KR X, 196-208; the contributors to "A Group of Irish Poems" were Valentin Iremonger, George M. Brady, Donagh MacDonagh, Roy McFadden, and Patrick MacDonogh.

21 Ellmann, James Joyce (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959; rev. ed., 1983); Ellmann to Ransom, January 25, 1954; Ellmann to Ransom, July 3, 1958. KR Papers; Empson, "The Theme of Ulysses," KR XVIII, 26-52.

22 Ellmann to Ransom, October 7, 1955; Empson to Ransom, October 25, 1955; Empson to Ransom, February 10, 1956. KR Papers.

23 Ellmann to Ransom, October 7, 1955. KR Papers; Ransom to Robert Wooster Stallman, January 31, 1956. Stallman Papers; Ransom to David McDowell, March 13, 1952. Random House Papers; Koch, "The Man and the Poet," KR XIV, 502-510; Ellmann, "The Doctor in Search of Himself," KR XIV, 510-512; Michaux, "In the Land of Magic," trans. Ellmann, KR XI, 173-186; Ellmann, "The Ductile Universe of Henri Michaux," KR XI, 187-198.

24 Ransom to Stallman, January 31, 1956; Stallman Papers; Nemerov, "Tradition," KR XVII, 408-424; Ransom to Marshall, November 29, 1954; Nemerov to Ransom, November 20, 1952. KR Papers.

25 During this period Nemerov placed seven poetry reviews with the Kenyon: "The Poets," KR X, 501-507; "Poets in the Dark," KR XII, 156-172; "The Generation of Violence," KR XV, 477-483, on Dylan Thomas; "Three in One," KR XVI, 144-154; "A Wild Civility," KR XVII, 476-484; and "Just a Good Poet," KR XVIII, 131-136, on Robert Graves. He also wrote a review of three novels by William Sansom, "Sansom's Fictions," KR XVII, 130-135.

26 Nemerov, "The Generation of Violence," 478.

27 Nemerov, "Just a Good Poet," 131, 133.

28 Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers; Jarrell, "Walt Whitman: He Had His Nerve," KR XIV, 63-79. Jarrell to Mary Von Schrader [January 1952] wrote that he had felt "right distressed" when he found out that "Mr. Ransom, dear sweet idiot that he is, had changed the title without telling me. My 'Some Lines from Whitman' had become (a quotation from later in the article) 'Walt Whitman He Had His Nerve.' . . . He meant well, but gee, gee!" Randall Jarrell's Letters: An Autobiographical and Literary Selection, ed. Mary Jarrell (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985), p. 315; Jarrell, "To the Laodiceans," KR XIV, 535-561; Lowell, in "Randall Jarrell," Randall Jarrell 1914-1965, eds. Lowell, Peter Taylor, and Warren (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1967), p. 104, wrote: "eulogy was the glory of Randall's criticism. . . . He left many reputations altered and exalted. I think particularly of his famous Frost and Whitman essays;" Ransom, "The Rugged Way of Genius," Randall Jarrell 1914-1965, p. 159.

29 This is apparent from an autumn 1951 promotion leaflet. KC Collection; Jarrell, "Texts from Housman," KR I, 260-271; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers.

- 30 Paul and Percival Goodman, "Frank Lloyd Wright on Architecture," KR IV, 7-28; Goodman, "The Father of the Psychoanalytic Movement," KR VII, 628-644; Goodman, "Kafka's Prayer," KR IX, 225-233; Goodman, "Notes on a Remark of Seami," KR XX, 547-553; Goodman, "Advance-Guard Writing, 1900-1950," KR XIII, 378.
- 31 Goodman, "French Uncle," KR IX, 477-480, on Le Corbusier; Goodman, "Jurisprudence vs. Psychiatry," KR XI, 700-702; Goodman, "An England Without Compromise," KR XIII, 714-719; Goodman, "They've Been Good Enough Long Enough," KR XVII, 144-148, on short stories; Goodman, "Tardy and Partial Recognition," KR X, 340-346 on Oscar Wilde; Roditi, "Communications: Wilde, Goodman, and Roditi," KR X, 699-700.
- 32 Goodman, "Bentley on Theater," KR XV, 662-668; Bentley to Ransom, December 19 [1953]; Trilling to Ransom, October 12, 1953. KR Papers; Ransom to Trilling, October 20, 1953, Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom, eds. Thomas Daniel Young and George Core (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), p. 372; Hoffman to Ransom, November 28, 1953. KR Papers; Hoffman, "Communication," KR XVI, 166-168.
- 33 Memo by Ransom concerning the appointment of his successor, November 23, 1957. KC Papers; Ransom to Tate, November 23, 1957. Tate Papers; Hyman, "The Critical Achievement of Caroline Spurgeon," KR X, 92-108; Knight, "A Communication," KR XI, 172; Hyman, "Some Bankrupt Treasures," KR X, 484-500; Beath, "Communications," KR XI, 313.
- 34 Hyman, "Dissent on a Dictionary," KR XII, 722; Voegelin, "Communications: Mr. Hyman and the Dictionary," KR XIII, 315; Herskovits, "Communications: Mr. Hyman and the Dictionary," KR XIII, 319-320; Hyman, "Communications: Mr. Hyman and the Dictionary," KR XIII, 321, 322; Morris, "Communications: Mr. Hyman and the Dictionary," KR XIII, 322.
- 35 Hyman, "The Language of Scottish Poetry," KR XVI, 20-37; Landis, "Communications: Hugh MacDiarmid," KR XVI, 334-335; Hyman, "Myth, Ritual, and Nonsense," KR XI, 455; Dickey in Interviews with Contemporary Writers: Second Series, 1972-1982, ed. L.S. Dembo (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983), p. 83; Chase to Ransom, June 24, 1949; Flint to Ransom, July 4, 1949. KR Papers.
- 36 Hyman's review of The Disguises of Love was not submitted to the Kenyon, but appeared in The Hudson Review, VI, 3 (Aut 1954), 417-422 and was entitled "Some Notes on the Albertine Strategy;" Hyman to Ransom, March 12, 1954. KR Papers.
- 37 Empson, "Emotion in Words Again," KR X, 579-601; Empson, The Structure of Complex Words (London: Chatto and Windus, 1951); Brooks, "Hits and Misses," KR XIV, 672, 673; Leavis to Ransom, November 19, 1948. KR Papers; Leavis, "Communications," KR XI, 315-316; Smith, "Communications," KR XI, 316-320; Empson, "Communications," KR XI, 672.
- 38 Empson, "Sense in the Prelude," KR XIII, 285-302; Empson, "Dover Wilson on Macbeth," KR XIV, 84-102; Empson, "Falstaff and Mr. Dover Wilson," KR XV, 213-262; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]; Ransom to Krieger, January 28, 1957. KR Papers; Ransom to Spears, November 19, 1952. SR

Papers.

- 39 Empson, "The Errors of King Lear," KR XI, 342-354; Empson, "The Pride of Othello," KR XVI, 163-166; Elliott, "Communications: Othello Is Saved," KR XVI, 335; Empson, "Tom Jones," KR XX, 217-249; Empson to Ransom, January 25 [1958; wrongly dated 1957]. KR Papers; Ransom to Blackmur, February 14 [1958]. Blackmur Papers.
- 40 Blackmur, "Ara Coeli and Campidoglio," KR XX, 337-361; Blackmur to Ransom, October 30, 1957. KR Papers; Ransom to Lund, November 6, 1957. KC Papers; Fraser, A Mingled Yarn: The Life of R.P. Blackmur (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1981); Boyers, R.P. Blackmur: Poet-Critic: Toward a View of Poetic Objects (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1980).
- 41 Ransom to Blackmur, May 16, 1956; Ransom to Blackmur, March 8, 1956. KR Papers; "[O]ne of your most distinguished writings" refers to "Emily Dickinson's Notation," KR XVIII, 224-237; "damned good" is "Anna Karenina: The Dialectic of Incarnation," KR XII, 433-456. Ransom to Blackmur, July 21 [1950]. Blackmur Papers; Ransom to Mizener, February 3 [1953]. Mizener Papers.
- 42 Blackmur, "Parody and Critique: Notes on Thomas Mann's Doctor Faustus," KR XII, 20-40; Blackmur, "Anna Karenina: The Dialectic of Incarnation," KR XII, 433-456; Blackmur, Madame Bovary: Beauty Out of Place," KR XIII, 475-503; Blackmur's other essays for the Kenyon during the period under discussion appeared in the following volumes: "The Politics of Human Power," KR XII, 663-673; "In the Hope of Straightening Things Out," KR XIII, 303-314; "Lord Tennyson's Scissors: 1912-1950," KR XIV, 1-20; "Toward a Modus Vivendi," KR XVI, 507-535; "The Substance That Prevails," KR XVII, 94-110; "Reflections of Toynbee," KR XVII, 357-370; and "Adams Goes to School," KR XVII, 597-623.
- 43 Flint to Ransom, November 18, 1950. KR Papers; Ransom to Rice, January 20 [1950]; Mann to Rice, March 24, 1950. Rice Papers.
- 44 Lanning, "Ransom as Editor," John Crowe Ransom: Critical Essays and a Bibliography, ed. Thomas Daniel Young (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), p. 216.
- 45 Ransom to Blackmur, July 21 [1950]. Blackmur Papers; Rahv to Tate, March 10, 1952. Tate Papers.
- 46 Ransom to Tate, September 6, 1950. Tate Papers; Blackmur to Ransom, October 13, 1950; Blackmur to Ransom, January 23, 1951. KR Papers.
- 47 Rahv to Tate, March 10, 1952. Tate Papers; Blackmur, "Lord Tennyson's Scissors: 1912-1950," 14; Tate to Ransom, January 19, 1952. KR Papers.
- 48 Blackmur, "Toward a Modus Vivendi," 520.
- 49 Ransom, "The Concrete Universal: Observations on the Understanding of Poetry. II," KR XVII, 401-402.

- 50 Blackmur, "Reflections of Toynbee," KR XVII, 357-370; Blackmur to Ransom, March 18, 1955. KR Papers; Blackmur, Henry Adams, ed. Veronica A. Makowsky (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1980); Ransom to Rice, July 4 [1955]. Rice Papers; Ransom to Blackmur, August 20, 1955; Marshall to Blackmur, January 3, 1956. Blackmur Papers.
- 51 Ransom, "Poets and Flatworms," KR XIV, 101; The Well Wrought Urn was reviewed in "Poetry: I. The Formal Analysis," KR IX, 436-456.
- 52 The following four essays by Ransom written during this period have already been extensively discussed: "Poetry: I. The Formal Analysis," KR IX, 436-456; "Poetry: II. The Final Cause," KR IX, 640-658; "The Literary Criticism of Aristotle (Reconsiderations, No. X)," KR X, 382-402; and "The New Criticism," KR X, 682-688; Ransom, "The Understanding of Fiction," KR XII, 201-202, 209, 208; Ransom to Rice, March 3 [1950]. Rice Papers; Rahv to Ransom, April 19, 1950. KR Papers; Rahv, "Fiction and the Criticism of Fiction," KR XVIII, 276-299.
- 53 Ransom, "William Wordsworth: Notes Toward an Understanding of Poetry," KR XII, 498-519; Trilling, "Wordsworth and the Iron Time," KR XII, 477-497; Ransom to Rice, March 3 [1950]. Rice Papers; Trilling to Rice, March 10, 1950. KR Papers.
- 54 Ransom to David McDowell, July 10 [1951]. Random House Papers; Ransom, "The Poetry of 1900-1950," KR XIII, 445-454; Goodman, "Advance-Guard Writing, 1900-1950," KR XIII, 357-380. Goodman's paper was not read before the Ohio English Association.
- 55 Ransom, "Poets and Flatworms," KR XIV, 159, 157; Ransom, "Why Critics Don't Go Mad," KR XIV, 331-339.
- 56 Ransom, "Editorial Comment: The Inorganic Muses," KR V, 278-300; Tate to Mizener, March 1, 1943. Mizener Papers; Brooks to Tate, April 13 [n.y.]. Tate Papers.
- 57 Ransom, "Why Critics Don't Go Mad," 333, 334, 335; Brooks to Tate, April 22 [1952]. Tate Papers.
- 58 Ransom, "Humanism at Chicago," KR XIV, 647-659; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers; Booth, "Communications: On the Aristotelian Front," KR XV, 299-301; Ransom, "Communications: Reply by the Author," KR XV, 301-304.
- 59 Ransom, "The Concrete Universal: Observations on the Understanding of Poetry. I," KR XVI, 554; Ransom, "The Concrete Universal: Observations on the Understanding of Poetry. II," KR XVII, 392, 384; in his "The Concrete Universal (1970)," which appeared in Beating the Bushes: Selected Essays 1941-1970 (New York: New Directions, 1972), and which was partly a rewrite of the 1954 essay, Ransom changed his mind again. He writes on page 175: "But the effects of poetry do not necessarily require of the critic a difficult 'philosophy' and a very special learning."
- 60 Rice, "A Letter from France," KR X, 143-153; Rice, "A Letter to a Frenchman," KR X, 473.

- 61 Rice, "Children of Narcissus: Some Themes of French Speculation," KR XII, 116-137; Rice, "Existentialism and the Self," KR XII, 304-330; Rahn to Rice, January 25, 1950; Gilbert to Rice, February 27, 1950; ten Hoor to Rice, February 14, 1950; Kluckhohn to Rice, February 14, 1950; Sweeney to Rice, April 19, 1953; Wahl to Rice, February 20 [1950]. Rice Papers.
- 62 Rice, "The Merging Parallels: Mann's Dr. Faustus," KR XI, 199-217. Rice's two other papers on Mann were a book review of The Transposed Heads, KR III, 508-510 and "Thomas Mann and the Religious Revival," KR VII, 361-377; in KR XII, 20-40, appeared Blackmur's "Parody and Critique: Notes on Thomas Mann's Doctor Faustus"; Mann to Mary Rahming, secretary for The Kenyon Review, April 22, 1949; Gass to Rice, January 13, 1950. Rice Papers; Flint to Rice, December 14 [1949]. KR Papers.
- 63 Rieff to Rice, August 30, 1954. Rice Papers; Rice, "The Intellectual Quarterly in a Non-Intellectual Society," KR XVI, 423, 421, 423, 426, 428, 429, 430; "Foreign Periodicals," KR I, 472-475 is Rice's only other paper on literary magazines and restricts itself to annotating the most important highbrow periodicals abroad.
- 64 Sweeney to Rice, October 15, 1954. Rice Papers.
- 65 Mizener, "The Scrutiny Group," KR X, 357; Ransom wrote to Mizener on May 24 [1946]: "My feeling is that your short story ["You Never Go Back to Sleep" in KR VIII, 593-612] . . . will presently get you out of an attitude which I have felt was academic; you have a career, a big one, which is less in the academic terms than we (I at any rate) have supposed;" Tate to Mizener, February 5, 1943. Mizener Papers; on February 22, 1946 Mizener wrote with respect to Tate's asking him to become the editor of the Sewanee: "I am not, by temperament, an editor; it bores me; I am a teacher and some not very well defined sort of writer by temperament." Besides, Mizener had committed himself to teach at Carleton College, Minnesota for several years and was earning far more than he could expect to get as the editor of The Sewanee Review. Tate Papers; Ransom to Mizener, March 14, 1949. Mizener Papers.
- 66 Mizener to Ransom, March 16, 1949. Mizener Papers.
- 67 Some of Mizener's contributions dealing with fiction are: "The Thin Intelligent Face of American Fiction," KR XVII, 507-524; "Truth Maybe, Not Fiction," KR XI, 685-688; "Amphibium in Old Kentucky," KR XII, 697-701; and "A Large Fiction," KR XIII, 142-147; Ransom to John Shuman, March 18, 1957. KR Papers; Ransom to Mizener, February 3 [1953]. Mizener Papers. The "highest compliments of the season" applied to Mizener's "Brilliant and Exasperating," KR XV, 162-167 on C. Aiken, Ushant: An Essay, and to "The Great Profession," KR XV, 306-310 on Blackmur, Language as Gesture. Mizener did not write on Levin's Marlowe for KR; Mizener, "Transformations," KR XVI, 473-482; Ransom to Mizener, February 28 [1954]; Ransom to Mizener, May 15 [1954]. Mizener Papers; Flint to Ransom, July 18, 1954. KR Papers.
- 68 Rice to Tate, October 25, 1949. Tate Papers; Tate, "A Note on Autotelism," KR XI, 13-16; Tate, "The Symbolic Imagination: A Meditation on Dante's Three Mirrors," KR XIV, 256-277; Tate, "The Angelic Imagination: Poe and the Power of Words," KR XIV, 455-475;

Tate, "Johnson on the Metaphysicals," KR XI, 379-394; "Homage to John Crowe Ransom," SR LVI, 3 (Sum 1948), 365-476; Koch, "The Poetry of Allen Tate," KR XI, 355-378.

69 Brooks, "The Formalist Critic," KR XIII, 72-81; Brooks, "Hits and Misses," KR XIV, 669-678; Brooks, "Recovering Milton," KR XV, 638-647; Austin Warren, "The Teacher as a Critic," KR XIII, 225-230; Austin Warren, "The Very Reverend Dr. Donne," KR XVI, 268-277; Austin Warren, "The Style of Sir Thomas Browne," KR XIII, 674-687.

70 Vivas, "Kafka's Distorted Mask," KR X, 51-69; Vivas, "Historian and Moralist," KR X, 346-349; Vivas, "The New Encyclopedists: I. Pro," KR I, 159-168; Vivas, "Theorists without Theory," KR XII, 161-165; Rice to Vivas, September 30, 1949. KR Papers; Ransom to Burke, February 28 [1949]. Burke Papers.

71 Croce, "Criticisms in Italy," KR X, 629-637; Ransom to Palmer, April 24 [1948]. SR Papers; Ransom, "The Literary Criticism of Aristotle (Reconsiderations, No. X)," KR X, 382-402.

72 Richards, "The Places and the Figures," KR XI, 25; Richards to Ransom, October 28, 1948; Richards to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers.

73 Burke, "Communications," KR XI, 310-311; Burke, "Three Definitions," KR XIII, 173-192; Ransom to Burke, February 7 [1951]. Burke Papers; Lansner, "Burke, Burke, the Lurk," KR XIII, 324-335; interview with Burke, August 16, 1983; Burke to Ransom, May 23, 1951. KR Papers.

74 Lansner to Rice, January 1, 1951. Rice Papers.

75 Trilling, "Manners, Morals, and the Novel," KR X, 11-27; Trilling, "Wordsworth and the Iron Time," KR XII, 477-497; Trilling, "Little Dorrit," KR XV, 577-590; Trilling, "The Legend of the Lion," KR X, 507-510; Trilling to Rice, July 2, 1952. KR Papers; interview with Bentley, October 10, 1982; during this period Rosenfeld contributed: "Aesthetics without Experience," KR XI, 321-325 on Arthur Koestler; "The Love of Zombies," KR XI, 497-500 on Charles Williams; "The Case against Pure Sensibility," KR XII, 543-547; "A Farewell to Hemingway," KR XIII, 147-155; "Liebestod," KR XV, 147-150 on Macaulay; and "Stephen Crane as Symbolist," KR XV, 310-314; Arendt, "Beyond Personal Frustration: The Poetry of Bertolt Brecht," KR X, 304-312; Arendt, "The Achievement of Hermann Broch," KR XI, 476-483.

76 Barrett, "Aristocracy and/or Christianity," KR XI, 489, 495; Brooks to Tate, August 5 [1949]. Tate Papers; Vivas to Ransom, July 15, 1949; Vivas to Ransom, August 12, 1949. KR Papers.

77 Valéry, "Things Left Unsaid," trans. Geoffrey, KR X, 228-239; Magny, "'Finally . . .,'" trans. Elizabeth Hardwick and John McCormick, KR XV, 552-570; Kenner, "The Portrait in Perspective," KR X, 361-381; Frye, "Levels of Meaning in Literature," KR XII, 246-262; Frye, "The Archetypes of Literature," KR XIII, 92-110; Frye, "A Conspectus of Dramatic Genres," KR XIII, 543-562; O'Donnell, "François Mauriac: Catholic and Novelist," KR X, 454-471; O'Donnell, "The Faust of Georges Bernanos," KR XI, 405-423. These two essays, together with his "The Pieties of Evelyn Waugh," KR IX, 400-411, appeared in expanded

versions in his Maria Cross: Imaginative Patterns in a Group of Modern Catholic Writers (1952); note by Ransom in the margin of an undated letter by O'Donnell to the Kenyon. KR Papers; O'Donnell, "The Unfallen," KR XII, 172-177.

78 Matthiessen, "Phelps Putnam (1894-1948)," KR XI, 61-82; Matthiessen to Tate, September 11 [1948]; Ransom to Matthiessen, November 18 [1948]. Matthiessen Papers; Schorer, "Fiction and the 'Matrix of Analogy,'" KR XI, 539-560; Macauley, "The Good Ford," KR XI, 269-288; Flint, "I Will Teach You My Townspeople," KR XII, 537-543.

¹ Spiegelberg, "French Existentialism: Its Social Philosophies," KR XVI, 446-462; Kaufmann, "Existentialism Tamed," KR XVI, 487.

² Nagel, "Einstein's Philosophy of Science," KR XII, 520-531; Lansner to Rice, January 1, 1951. Rice Papers; Aiken, "Aesthetics on the Stretch," KR XVII, 633-639; Aiken, "Commonsensical Ethics," KR XIII, 519-526; Aiken, "George Santayana: Natural Historian of Symbolic Form," KR XV, 340; editor's note to Aiken, "George Santayana," 337; Ellmann, "The Art of Yeats: Affirmative Capability," KR XV, 357-385; Elder, "This May Be the Book," KR XV, 386-397; Murphy, "American Philosophy at Mid-Century," KR XII, 647-662; White, "Philosophy in England," KR XIV, 599-607.

³ Ransom to Chalmers, January 22, 1952; White to Rice, March 27, 1950. KR Papers; Rice, "The Philosopher's Commitment," 39. Presidential address delivered before the fifty-first annual meeting of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, May 1 and 2, 1953. Offprint in Rice Papers. It is unclear where it was originally published. Rice was Vice President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association from 1948-1949 and from 1951-1952. He was its President from 1952-1953 and from 1954-1955.

⁴ Ransom to Mizener, March 20, 1954. Mizener Papers; Ransom to Carter, December 2 [1957]. Carter Papers.

⁵ Howe, "Joseph Conrad: I. Order and Anarchy: The Political Novels," KR XV, 505-521; Howe, "Joseph Conrad: III. The Political Novels (cont.)," KR XVI, 1-19; Howe, "Dostoevsky: The Politics of Salvation," KR XVII, 42-68; Chase, "Art, Nature, Politics," KR XII, 591; Chase, "Melville's Confidence Man," KR XI, 122-140; Rosenberg, "The Resurrected Romans," KR X, 602-620; Rosenberg, "The Pathos of the Proletariat," KR XI, 595-629; Abel, "Virile Sophistication," KR XXI, 493.

⁶ Ransom, "Empirics in Politics," KR XV, 654; Ransom to Chalmers, May 16, 1953. KC Papers. Chalmers himself wrote a very laudatory review of Kirk, The Conservative Mind, for the New York Times Book Review.

⁷ Ransom to Winfield Townley Scott, April 3 [1948?]. Scott Papers; Ransom to Cid Corman, June 5, 1954. Corman Papers; Ransom to Theodore Roethke, September 24, 1951. Roethke Papers; Ransom to Vernon Watkins, October 15, 1950. Watkins Papers; Warren, "Brother to Dragons," KR XV, 1-103.

⁸ Watkins, "The Flower" and "The Poet at Nightfall Surveys His Dominion," KR XII, 297-300; Watkins, "A Monument for Norfleet," KR XVI, 200-207; Merwin to Ransom, March 6, 1954; Ransom to John Marshall, November 29, 1954. KR Papers; Merwin, "Ballad of John Cable and Three Gentlemen," KR XIII, 668-671; Trilling to Ransom, October 12, 1951. KR Papers; Merwin, "Canso," KR XV, 591-594; Merwin, "The Nine Days of Creation," KR XVIII, 367-369; Merwin, "A Wit in Age," KR XIX, 196.

⁹ Ransom to Marshall, November 29, 1954; Wright to Ransom, January 4, 1958. KR Papers; Bogardus, "At the Grave of Robert Ingersoll," KR XIII,

280-281; Bogardus, "Prothalamion for K.," KR XV, 190-194; among Nichols' poems we find "The Girl of the Golden West," KR XIV, 452-453; "Hermes in California," KR XVII, 74; and "Roman Spring," KR XVIII, 542; Ransom described Nichols as "an old Kenyon boy" in a letter to Marshall, November 29, 1954. KR Papers.

10 Hecht, "A Little Note," Kalamazoo College Review, XXX, 9. It is not clear whether Hecht is speaking of "Once Removed" or "To a Soldier Killed in Germany," both of which appeared simultaneously in Kenyon's Spring 1947 issue, actually four issues after the one in which Brecht and Bentley appeared. Besides, Bentley, Brecht, and Trilling did not appear together in one issue. Hecht must mean either the Spring 1946 or the Autumn 1946 issue, for Brecht, "The Caucasian Circle of Chalk, Act Five," trans. James Stern and W.H. Auden, and Bentley, "Who Understands Drama?," appeared in KR VIII, 2, 188-202 and 333-337, while Trilling, "The Life of the Novel," and Bentley, "This Is the New Criticism," appeared in KR VIII, 4, 658-667 and 672-674. The Spring 1946 issue seems to be the most likely choice as it was only in KR XX, 393-398 that Brecht reappeared with "The Life of Confucius," a posthumous fragment translated by H.E. Rank; Hecht, "Two Poems," KR IX, 222-224; Hecht, "The Song of the Beasts," KR XIV, 325-326; Hecht, "Upon the Death of Santayana," KR XVI, 75-76; Hecht, "The Gardens of the Villa D'Este," KR XV, 208-212.

11 Wright, "Lonely" and "Father," KR XIII, 672-673; Wright, "Robert Sitting in My Hands," KR XV, 127-128.

12 Mezey, "Pakim Pond, New Jersey" and "An Acquittal," KR XVI, 416-419; Mezey, "Verse," KR XIX, 109-112; Woods, "Birth Day," "The Old Man is Dying," and "Melville Has Green Eyes," KR XII, 81-85; Woods, "Two Poems," KR XIV, 40-42; Woods, "The Deaths at Paragon, Indiana," KR XVI, 442-445; Merrill, "Four Poems," KR IX, 378-381; Merrill, "Transfigured Bird," KR XI, 108-112; Merrill, "Dream and Waking," KR XX, 436-439; Viereck, "Now Kindness," KR IX, 186-187; Viereck, "From Ancient Fangs," KR IX, 567-568; Viereck to Ransom, July 28, 1951; Viereck to Ransom [January 1955]. KR Papers; Gardner, "Sestina," "Timeo," and "The Minotaur," KR XIV, 613-615.

13 Southard, "Winter Landscape, Tien Shan," KR XVII, 111-112; Forman, "Ophelia" and "Mother and Child," KR XIII, 282-283; Belvin, "Palermo, Mother's Day, 1943" and "Third Anniversary Poem," KR XIII, 279-280; Bose, "Two Poems," KR XI, 289-290; Boyars, "Two Poems," KR XI, 453-454.

14 Roethke to Burke, December 25, 1945, Selected Letters of Theodore Roethke, ed. Ralph J. Mills, Jr. (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968), p. 114; Roethke, "A Light Breather" and "Elegy for Jane," KR XII, 475-476; Ransom to Roethke, March 1, 1945; Ransom to Roethke, December 5 [1946]; Roethke to Ransom, July 28, 1947. Roethke Papers.

15 Ransom to Roethke, June 16, 1949; Roethke to Ransom, June 22, 1949; Ransom to Roethke, June 24, 1949. Roethke Papers; Roethke, "Old Lady's Winter Words," KR XIV, 60-62; Ransom to Roethke, June 18, 1954. Roethke Papers; Roethke, "Two Poems," KR XVIII, 120-121.

16 Moore to Ransom, November 6, 1951; Moore to Ransom, November 9, 1951. KR Papers; Moore, "Work in Progress (Five Sonnets)," KR XIV, 80-

83; Deutsch, "Fountain and Unicorn," KR X, 429-430; Ransom to Deutsch, March 22 [1948]. Deutsch Papers. Actually, Deutsch appeared twice: the second time her translation of Ivan Goll, "Jean Le Fleuve," KR XVII, 278-279, appeared side by side with the original; Wilbur to Ransom, June 27, 1952. KR Papers; Wilbur, "A Voice from under the Table," KR XVI, 79-80. Thomas Daniel Young and George Core, eds., Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), pp. 364-365, quote Ransom's letter of June 19, 1952 to Wilbur in which he solicits poems. They note: "Ransom had lost a batch of poems from the manuscript for Wilbur's first collection of poetry, The Beautiful Changes (1947), and was here trying to make amends."

17 Stevens, "The Auroras of Autumn," KR X, 1-10; Viereck quotes this remark of Ransom's in a letter to Ransom dated October 21, 1947. KR Papers; Ransom to Stevens, October 7, 1947, Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom, eds. Young and Core, p.337; Warren, Brother to Dragons: A Tale in Verse and Voices (New York: Random House, 1953; rev. ed., 1979); Warren, "Brother to Dragons: A Tale in Verse and Voices," KR XV, 1-103.

18 Ransom to Warren, December 22 [1952]. Warren Papers.

19 Ransom to Warren, December 22 [1952]. Warren Papers; Rahv to Tate, February 12, 1953. Tate Papers; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers; Tate to Warren, November 9, 1952; Warren to Tate, November 13, 1952. Tate Papers.

20 Victor Strandberg, in "Brother to Dragons and the Craft of Revision," Robert Penn Warren's Brother to Dragons: A Discussion, ed. James A. Grimshaw, Jr. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), pp. 200-210, shows that Tate's suggestions for the revised edition "were manifestly efficacious" (p.204); Lowell, "Prose Genius in Verse," KR XV, 625, 621.

21 Lowell, "Beyond the Alps," KR XV, 398-401; Lowell, Life Studies (New York: Vintage Books, 1959); Lowell, "Falling Asleep Over the Aeneid," KR X, 89-91; Lowell, "Mother Marie Therese," KR X, 403-406; Lowell, "The Mills of the Kavanaughs," KR XIII, 1-19; Lowell, The Mills of the Kavanaughs (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1951); Lowell to Ransom, July 5 [1947]; Ransom to Lowell, January 10 [1948]. KR Papers; Jarrell, Poetry and the Age (New York: Vintage Books, 1953), p. 231; Flint to Ransom, January 31 [1951]. KR Papers.

22 Jarrell, "The Night Before the Night Before Christmas," KR XI, 31-42; Williams to Ransom, January 15, 1949, The Selected Letters of William Carlos Williams, ed. John C. Thirwall (New York: McDowell, Obolenski, 1957), p. 272; Jarrell, "All or None," "The Tower," and "The Black Swan," KR XIII, 204-206; Jarrell, "The End of the Rainbow," KR XVI, 600-610; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers.

23 Williams, "Two Deliberate Exercises," KR X, 427-429; Williams, "The Host," KR XV, 404-407; Williams, "Of Asphodel," KR XVII, 371-382; Williams to Ransom [n.d.]. Internal evidence suggests that the unnamed poem Williams refers to in this undated letter is "Of Asphodel" rather than "The Host;" Ransom to McDowell, October 16, 1956. KR Papers; Faith Corrigan, "Ransom Picks 6 Top U.S. Poets of This Century," Plain

Dealer, July 2, 1962, page number unknown. The other poets were T.S. Eliot, Robert Frost, Ezra Pound, Edwin Arlington Robinson, and Wallace Stevens.

24 Eberhart, "A Legend of Viable Women," KR XI, 83-86; Eberhart, "Using the Meditative Means," KR XVII, 447-448; Eberhart, "The Seasons," KR XIV, 327-330; Eberhart to Ransom, January 30, 1952; Eberhart to Ransom, September 22, 1954. KR Papers.

25 Herschberger to Rice, March 6 [1951]. KR Papers; Herschberger, "The Mink," KR XIII, 425-426; Herschberger, "To S.R." and "My Dear He Dress in Scarlet," KR XVII, 444-446; Schwartz, "The Early Morning Light," KR XII, 243-245; Schwartz, "The First Morning of the Second World," KR XVII, 575-580. Schwartz to Ransom, December 10, 1954 wrote that "The First Morning of the Second World" was "the first verse I've sent you (and almost anyone else) in over five years, and I hope you won't mind my saying that I feel, at the moment at any rate, that it's as good as the best lyric I've written, 'Starlight like Intuition Pierced the Twelve' [KR VI, 383-385]." Letters of Delmore Schwartz, ed. Robert Phillips (Princeton, N.J.: Ontario Review Press, 1984), p.296; Berryman, "A Winter-Piece to a Friend Away" and "Rock-Study with Wanderer," KR X, 240-245. John Haffenden, The Life of John Berryman (Boston. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), pp. 197-198, reports that Berryman became incredibly angry when he saw that Ransom had not followed his instruction to print "Rock-Study with Wanderer" first; Rukeyser, "Eyes of Night-time," KR IX, 234, Garrigue, "Invocation to Old Windylocks," KR XIV, 616-618; Miles published, for instance, "Siege," "Son," "Idea of Joy," and "Bombay," KR XI, 649-651; and "Barge," "Belief," "Find," "Bush," and "Height," KR XVI, 76-78; Ransom to McDowell, June 12 [1952]. Random House Papers; M. de la Fontaine, "The Cat and the Mouse" and "The Man and the Serpent," trans. Moore, KR XVI, 71-74; Prévert, "Two Poems," trans. Lloyd Parks, KR XI, 218-221; Éluard, "Three Poems," trans. Nahas, KR XI, 222-225; Michaux, "In the Land of Magic," trans. Ellmann, KR XI, 173-186.

26 Stevens to Rice, April 20, 1950. KR Papers.

27 West, The Short Story in America, 1900-1950 (1952; rpt. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1979), p. 118; Ransom to Chalmers, January 22, 1952. KR Papers; Creeley, "The Unsuccessful Husband," KR XIII, 64-71; Mitchner, "Invitation to Lunch," KR XII, 602-617; Sultan, "The Fugue and the Fig Tree," KR XIV, 418-431.

28 Most of these figures are taken from a memo from John Marshall to David Stevens, January 14, 1947 and from a memo from G. Gillette to Marshall, February 18, 1947. LMS Papers; some are from a leaflet attached to Frederick Morgan to Ransom, January 29, 1959 and Ransom to Morgan, February 11, 1959. HR Papers.

29 Interview with Helen and Elizabeth Forman, October 19, 1981; Marshall to O'Connor, August 26, 1955. KC Collection.

30 O'Connor, "The Life You Save May Be Your Own," KR XV, 195-207; O'Connor, "A Circle in the Fire," KR XVI, 169-190; O'Connor, "The Artificial Nigger," KR XVII, 169-192; O'Connor, "Greenleaf," KR XVIII, 384-410; Ransom to Andrew Lytle, March 25, 1954. Lytle Papers; O'Connor

to Ransom, July 13, 1953. KR Papers; Macauley, ed., Gallery of Modern Fiction: Stories from the Kenyon Review (New York: Salem Press, 1966); Burke to Ransom [late January or early February 1957]. Burke Papers; another very sexual story, "The Comforts of Home," appeared during Macauley's editorship in KR XXII, 523-546, and marked O'Connor's final contribution to The Kenyon. Because mention is made of a female character in the nude, Macauley added a tiny illustration of a naked girl. This led O'Connor to write on January 2, 1961 that she was "disappointed and sick" when she saw the illustration and that Macauley "had lost a contributor." KR Papers. Only long after O'Connor's death in 1965 did Macauley learn that "Flannery did not care one way or the other, but her mother was outraged. . . and. . . made Flannery write that letter." Interview with Macauley, August 9, 1982.

31 Lanning, "News about Miss Prince," KR XIII, 624-640; Ransom to Marshall, November 29, 1954. KR Papers; one of Lanning's most famous novels is The Pedestal (New York: Harper, 1966); Nemerov to Ransom, October 10, 1954. KR Papers.

32 Nemerov to Ransom, September 24, 1955. KR Papers; Nemerov, The Homecoming Game (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957); Nemerov, "Tradition," KR XVII, 408-424. This story was probably written just before Nemerov's Fellowship; Nemerov, "An Encounter with the Law," KR XVIII, 212-223; Nemerov, "A Delayed Hearing," KR XIX, 448-462; Nemerov, A Commodity of Dreams and Other Stories (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1959); Ransom to Nemerov, February 3, 1956; Ransom to Nemerov, August 24, 1956. KR Papers.

33 Curley contributed "To Ask the Hard Question Is Easy," KR XVI, 565-586 and "The Appointed Hour," KR XVII, 543-574; Domino contributed "The Shared Bed," KR X, 287-303 and "It Almost Happened," KR XI, 397-404; Heath contributed "The Mothers," KR XIV, 406-417 and "The Other Woman," KR XXI, 34-57; McGuire contributed "If a Man Die," KR X, 2 (Spr 1948), 273-286 and "The Tenant of the Room," KR XI, 654-671; Young contributed "The Glass Trumpet," KR XVI, 191-199 and "The Admirer," KR XIX, 593-604; Creeley contributed "The Unsuccessful Husband," KR XIII, 64-71 and "The Boat," KR XV, 571-576; Jarrell contributed "Pictures from an Institution: Book I," KR XV, 104-126 and "Pictures from an Institution: Book III," KR XVI, 81-123; Morris contributed "A Man of Calibre," KR XI, 101-107 and "The Safe Place," KR XVI, 587-599; Stern contributed "Cooley's Version," KR XVI, 257-267 and "The Assessment of an Amateur," KR XXI, 250-259; Macauley contributed "The Thin Voice," KR XIII, 50-63; "The Cheigny Man," KR XVII, 75-93; and "Legend of Two Swimmers," KR XIX, 246-266; Creeley as quoted in anonymous, "Don't Bury the Hatchet," TLS February 13, 1964, 127; Ransom to McDowell, October 12, 1950. Random House Papers.

34 Stern reviewed, for instance, Marcel Proust, Jean Santeuil, and James Joyce, Stephen Hero, KR XVIII, 486-496 and Saul Bellow, Henderson the Rain King, KR XXI, 655-662; Macauley's first Kenyon appearance was his review of Mark Schorer, The Hermit Place, and Robert Paul Smith, So It Doesn't Whistle, KR IV, 124-126; Ransom to Macauley, December 3, 1956. KR Papers.

35 Morris, The Works of Love (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952); Morris, Ceremony in Lone Tree (New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1960);

Jarrell, Pictures from an Institution (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954); K.S. White of The New Yorker to Jarrell, September 14, 1951. Jarrell Papers; Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers.

36 Jarrell to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers; Hathorn, "Fan Letter," KR XV, 305; Stevens to Bernard Heringman, January 29, 1954. Quoted in Sister Bernetta Quinn, O.S.F., Randall Jarrell (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981; TUSAS, No. 398), p. 128; Williams to Jarrell, March 5, 1954. Jarrell Papers.

37 Hardwick, "Two Recent Travelers," KR XV, 436-454; Ransom to Lowell (Hardwick's husband), December 13, 1952; KR Papers. The date of publication, about half a year after this letter was written, suggests that Hardwick submitted a revised version; Fiedler to Ransom, November 24, 1954. KR Papers; Fiedler, "The Dancing of Reb Hershl with the Withered Hand," KR XVII, 193-207.

38 Goyen, "Old Wildwood," KR XVII, 425-437; Gordon, "The Feast of St. Eustace," KR XVI, 234-256; Gordon, The Malefactors (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956); Warren, "Portrait of La Grand' Bosse," KR XII, 41-50; Warren's second contribution in fiction to KR is "It's a Long Way from Central Park to Fiddlersburg," KR XXVI, 129-143; Warren, World Enough and Time: A Romantic Novel (New York: Random House, 1950); Ransom to Rice, January 20 [1950]. Rice Papers; Rice to Warren, September 27, 1949. KR Papers.

39 O'Faolain, "Persecution Mania," KR XI, 588-594; Fitzgerald, "The World's Fair," KR X, 567-578; Mizener, The Far Side of Paradise: A Biography of F. Scott Fitzgerald (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951; rev. ed. 1965); Mizener, "A Note on 'The World's Fair,'" KR X, 701-704; Ransom to Mizener, July 11 [1948]. Mizener Papers; Grace H. Turnbull to Ransom, January 3, 1949. KR Papers. Grace Turnbull might be a relative of Andrew Turnbull, the writer of the biography Scott Fitzgerald (New York: Scribners, 1962).

40 Clark, "The Head in the Parlor," KR XVII, 208-254. This story is an excerpt from her novel Baldur's Gate (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970); Gottlieb, "Give Her Roses," KR X, 652-663; Mizener, "Undiscovered Country," KR XV, 595-613; Rosenfeld, "In the Monastery," KR XIII, 394-413. According to an editorial note "In the Monastery" is an excerpt from "a novel, The Enemy, to be published in 1951 by the Viking Press," but this novel never came out; Schwartz, "The Fabulous Twenty-Dollar Bill," KR XIV, 378-405. Schwartz to Ransom, March 17, 1952 wrote that he "thought it was the best piece of fiction [he] had written in years." Letters of Delmore Schwartz, ed. Phillips, p. 264; Goodman, "Our School," KR X, 445-453; Goodman, "A Visit to Chartres," KR XXI, 563-572; Elder, "Roses Are Red," KR IX, 353-377; Elder, "The Divorce," KR XIII, 563-580; Elder, "The Unsayable," KR XIV, 579-598.

41 Rice to Peter Taylor, January 17, 1950. KR Papers; Gibson and Slaيمان have not been mentioned before. Gibson contributed "Two Mortuary Sermons," KR XIV, 432-445 and Slaيمان contributed "Who's Bitter," KR XVI, 405-413; Ransom to McDowell, June 26, 1951; Ransom to McDowell, January 22 [1952]. Random House Papers.

42 Ransom to Chalmers, January 22, 1952. KR Papers.

- 43 Bentley, "Yeats as a Playwright," KR X, 196-208; Bentley, "Chekhov as Playwright," KR XI, 226-250; Bentley, "Monsieur Verdoux as 'Theatre,'" KR X, 705-716; Bentley, "Sartre's Struggle for Existenz," KR X, 328-334; Bentley, "German Stagecraft Today," KR XI, 630-648; Bentley, "Eduardo de Filippo and the Neapolitan Theatre," KR XIII, 111-126; Bentley, "Jean-Louis Barrault," KR XII, 2 (Spr 1950), 224-242; Barrault, "The Theatre and Its Instrument," trans. Bentley, KR XII, 219-223; Bentley, "Trying to Like O'Neill," KR XIV, 476-492; Bentley, "An American Theatre Critic! (or the China in the Bull Shop)," KR XII, 138-147; Young, Immortal Shadows (New York: Scribners, 1948); interview with Bentley, October 11, 1982; Bentley to Barzun [April, 1950]. Barzun Papers; Young to Ella Somerville, February 4, 1950. Quoted in Stark Young: A Life in the Arts (Volume II), ed. John Pilkington (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975), p. 1136. This letter is preceded by a very long and very friendly letter about the article by Young to Bentley.
- 44 Abel, "Eric Bentley's Classics," KR XXII, 151; Bentley to Macauley, September 27, 1959. KR Papers; Bentley, "The Political Theatre Reconsidered," KR XXIII, 75-90; Bentley, "Bertolt Brecht's First Play," KR XXVI, 83-92.
- 45 Bentley to Rice, January 7 [1950]. KR Papers; during these years Bentley himself regularly contributed reports on Broadway to The New Republic; Popkin, "Theatre Letter," KR XII, 331-339; Popkin, "Theatre Letter," KR XIII, 504-511; Popkin, "Theatre Letter," KR XIV, 493-501; Bentley to Rice, June 18 [1952]. KR Papers; Hoffman, "Theatre Letter," KR XV, 293-298. Bentley to Ransom, December 19 [1953], wrote that he had found himself "in hot water over the discontinuance of Popkin as drama critic. [Popkin] reported that he had been removed for personal reasons by me against the wishes of Ransom and Rice." KR Papers.
- 46 Hivnor, "Theatre Letter," KR XVI, 463-467; Hivnor, "Theatre Letter," KR XVII, 294-299; Hivnor, "Theatre Letter," KR XVIII, 125-130; Weales, "Two Theatre Letters: Theatre I," KR XX, 300-306; Weales, "Theatre Letter," KR XXI, 327-333; Bentley to Ransom, April 1 [1957]. KR Papers.
- 47 Fergusson, "Action as Passion: Tristan and Murder in the Cathedral," KR IX, 201-221; Fergusson, "Philosophy and Theatre in Measure for Measure," KR XIV, 103-120; Fergusson, "Don Perlimplin: Lorca's Theatre Poetry," KR XVII, 337-348; Fergusson, "The Search for New Standards in the Theatre," KR XVII, 581-596; Fergusson, "The Tragedy of Passion," KR XI, 148-152; Fergusson, "A Memory for the Theatre," KR XVIII, 310-311; Burke, "Action, Passion, and Analogy," KR XII, 532; Fiedler, "The Bearded Virgin and the Blind God," KR XV, 540-551; Fiedler to Ransom, November 24, 1954; Fiedler to Ransom, September 3, 1953. KR Papers.
- 48 Tyler, "The Impressionism of Marcel Proust," KR VIII, 46-54; Tyler, "Pained Sex: Elizabethan Style," KR VIII, 323-325; Tyler to Ransom, January 19, 1946. KR Papers.
- 49 Tyler, The Hollywood Hallucination (New York: Creative Age Press, 1944); Tyler, Magic and Myth of the Movies (New York: Holt, 1947); Tyler, "Movie Letter," KR IX, 317; Tyler, "Movie Letter: Charlie

Verdoux," KR IX, 457-464; Tyler, Chaplin: Last of the Clowns (New York: The Vanguard Press, 1948); Tyler, quoted in Twentieth Century Authors: A Biographical Dictionary of Modern Literature, First Supplement, ed. Stanley J. Kunitz (New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1967), p. 1013.

50 Tyler, "Movie Letter: Novel into Film: All the King's Men," KR XII, 370-376; Tyler to Ransom, September 3, 1950. KR Papers; Tyler, "Movie Letter: Three Myths," KR XIII, 542.

51 Examples are: Tyler, "The Film Artist as Prometheus and Pantaloon," KR XV, 155-159; Tyler, "Movie Note: The 3-D's," KR XVI, 468-472; Tyler, "Lust for Lifelikeness," KR XIX, 131-136; and Tyler, "Film Letter: On the Cult of Displaced Laughter," KR XX, 628-633.

52 Lansner was the Kenyon's editorial assistant from the middle of 1949 (or perhaps 1948) until sometime in 1950; Lansner, "Art Notes from Paris," KR XIV, 141-147; Lansner, "George Rouault: As Seen in the Retrospective Exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York," KR XV, 455-460; Lansner, "Art Letter: Museum and Anti-Museum," KR XVII, 160-168; Walker, "Marsden Hartley," KR IX, 248-259; Wight, "Introduction to Edward Munch," KR XII, 457-469; Weisstein, "Iconography of Chagall," KR XVI, 38-48; Phillips, "Pierre Bonnard," KR XI, 561-566.

53 Two examples of reviews about music are George Hemphill, "Negro Music," KR IX, 299-303 and Robert E. Garis, "Sour Notes from Harvard," KR XI, 325-330; Leibowitz, "The Musician's Commitment," trans. Lionel Abel, KR XI, 675-684; Barzun, "The Fetish of Form: An Example from Music," KR XII, 86-98; Barzun, Berlioz and the Romantic Century (New York: Little, Brown, 1950); Rice to Barzun, August 2, 1949; Rice to Barzun, September 5, 1949. KR Papers; Haggin, "Berlioz," KR XVII, 525-542; Haggin, "Musical Performance," KR XVIII, 300-303; Haggin, "Concerning Opera," KR XIX, 494-497; Haggin, "Harsh Notes among Music Critics," KR XX, 317-322.

54 Terry, "The Firstness of Dance," KR X, 70-81; Denby, "Dance Criticism," KR X, 82-88; Denby, "The American Ballet," KR X, 638-651; Gottlieb, "Dance Chronicle: New Trends in Modern Dance," KR XII, 148-155; Gottlieb, "A Year of Dance: Inventory vs. Invention," KR XIII, 127-137; Gottlieb, "Dance Chronicle: Significance and Insignificance in Technique," KR XIV, 349-358; examples of later dance criticism in the Kenyon are Selma Jeanne Cohen, "Not on Their Toes," KR XXVII, 742-747 and Marcia B. Siegel, "The Year That Couldn't Happen," KR XXXI, 533-545.

55 Anonymous, "Current Periodicals," TLS April 21, 1950, 249.

56 Ransom to Rice, October 10 [1949]; Ransom to Rice, March 3 [1950]. Rice Papers; Rice to Trilling, November 16, 1949. KR Papers.

57 Ransom to Marshall [April 17, 1958]. KR Papers; undated report, "The Kenyon Review," dictated but not used by Chalmers for the October 1952 meeting of the Board of Trustees. KC Papers.

58 Report, "The Kenyon Review," by Chalmers for the October 1952 meeting of the Board of Trustees. KC Papers; Ransom to Rice, April 16

[1952]. Rice Papers.

59 For instance, for the academic year 1949-1950, the Kenyon received \$451.31 under the headings of "Royalties" and "Fees and Miscellaneous;" for 1950-1951, probably thanks to the publication of The Kenyon Critics, the Kenyon received as much as \$1,500.58 under "Royalties;" for 1952-1953, the first year the Kenyon received royalties from Perspectives USA, "Royalties and Fees" amounted to \$1,316.59--part of which may still be thanks to The Kenyon Critics--; and for 1954-1955 the amount under "Royalties and Fees" had collapsed to only \$60.90. These and most of the following figures are taken from the Kenyon's financial reports for 1947-1948, 1949-1950, 1950-1951, 1952-1953, 1953-1954, and 1954-1955. The reports for 1948-1949 and 1951-1952 are missing from the files. KR Papers; Perspectives USA, edited by Laughlin and backed by the Ford Foundation, was published from the autumn of 1952 to the summer of 1956. Many authors, among them Blackmur and Schwartz, were angered by the Kenyon's practice of keeping half of the Perspectives--and other--royalties for itself. Sometimes, as, for instance, with Schwartz, the Kenyon relented and gave the author more than half of the royalties; Laughlin, President of Intercultural Publications Inc. to Chalmers, July 9, 1952; Ransom to [Chalmers], December 15, 1955. KC Papers.

60 Statement entitled "PROPOSED BUDGET For present fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and ending June 30, 1953," October 8, 1952. KR Papers; Ransom to Milton Rose, Secretary of the William C. Whitney Foundation, October 1, 1952; report by Chalmers for the meeting of the Board of Trustees of February 14, 1953. KC Papers.

61 Coffin to Austin Warren, July 2, 1952. KR Papers; Ransom to Chalmers, January 18, 1955. KC Papers.

62 During, roughly, the academic year 1951-1952, John Nerber, Kenyon College graduate and former Kenyon contributor, living in New York, was the Kenyon's advertising agent and received a \$200.00 commission. The editors got fed up with Nerber, in particular when it appeared that he had been boasting in the New York Times that he had been one of the founders of the Kenyon, whereas he had been a mere office boy for a little while. Nerber was replaced by Lanning, among whose duties as the Kenyon's part-time secretary at \$38.00 per month was the securing of advertisements. In a hypocritical letter of January 31, 1952 to Ransom, Nerber writes that he had only said to the editor of the New York Times that he had "helped to found" the Kenyon, and that he had "noted with horror" that he had been credited with being one of its founders. KR Papers; taken into consideration are the circulation reports headed October 1, 1947, October 5, 1948, October 3, 1949, October 6, 1950, October 1, 1951, Autumn 1952, Fall 1953, Autumn 1954, and Autumn 1955. The contradictory report is dated March 3, 1953. KR Papers.

63 Draft of a letter by Rice to D'Arms, September 16, 1952; Ransom to Charles Fahs of the Rockefeller Foundation, February 24, 1953. KR Papers.

64 Anonymous, "The American Scene," TLS August 24, 1951, xxxv; anonymous, "The Younger Critics," TLS August 29, 1952, ii; anonymous, "The Serious Literary Review," TLS September 17, 1954, lviii; Newman,

"The American Literary Reviews," Twentieth Century, CLV, 926 (Ap 1954), 343; anonymous, "1950 Bollingen Prize in Poetry Awarded to John Crowe Ransom," New York Herald Tribune, January 22, 1950, page number unknown; anonymous, "Macaulay Succeeds Ransom As Kenyon Review Editor," Nashville Banner, March 28, 1958, 23; anonymous, "Ransom Harvest," Time, May 12, 1958, 75.

- 1 Joseph E. Baker, "The Philosopher and the 'New Critic,'" SR L, 2 (Ap-Je 1942), 171; Howard M. Jones, "The Uninfluentials," SRL XXIV, October 11, 1941, 20.
- 2 Jarrell, "The Age of Criticism," Poetry and the Age (New York: Vintage Books, 1953), p. 65. From Jarrell to Mary von Schrader [September 24, 1951] it appears that Jarrell had originally written "The Age of Criticism" for the Kenyon. He writes: "Worked on my Kenyon piece . . . did well, too, except, alas' alas' I'm afraid they may think it an unkind tactless piece more or less directed at them, among others--as it is. It's about the Age of Criticism--takes a dim view of it." Randall Jarrell's Letters: An Autobiographical and Literary Selection, ed. Mary Jarrell (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985), p.270; Rexroth to Babette Deutsch, June 16, 1952. Rexroth Papers.
- 3 Spacks, "Circulation 'Bloody Low,'" Nation, September 17, 1960, 167, 168; Hicks, "'Sewanee,' 'Partisan,' 'Kenyon' and 'Hudson' Reviews: A Brief Analysis," New Leader, December 9, 1957, 10; Phelps, "The 'Little' Magazines," New York Herald Tribune, November 17, 1963, 25; Barrett, "The Resistance," PR XIII, 4 (S-O 1946), 479-488; Barrett, "Declining Fortunes of the Literary Review: 1945-57," The Anchor Review, No. 2 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1957), p. 158; the most severe attack, perhaps, on literary magazines is John W. Aldridge's caustic fictional account of an editor (partly modelled on Ransom) and his review, The Party at Cranton (New York: David McKay Company, 1960).
- 4 Memo, December 14, 1957, by C.B. Fahs of the Rockefeller Foundation of a trip to Kenyon College; Alfred A. Knopf to John Marshall, October 30, 1957. KC Collection; Ransom to Tate, January 1, 1938. Tate Papers; Theodore Peterson, Magazines in the Twentieth Century (1956; rev. ed. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), p. 416.
- 5 Ransom to Lowell, August 10, 1949. Lowell Papers; Ransom to Tate, June 27 [1950]. Tate Papers.
- 6 Ransom to Blackmur, July 3 [1955]. Blackmur Papers; Ransom to Chalmers, November 16 [1955]; Chalmers to Hugh Kenner, August 20, 1955. KC Papers.
- 7 Ransom to Marshall, September 22, 1955. KC Collection; Rubin to Tate [n.d.]. Tate Papers.
- 8 Ransom wrote, for instance, to William Empson, May 10, 1956: "I do not think Rice can be replaced;" to Blackmur, May 16, 1956, he wrote: "I don't think he could be replaced;" and to Mizener, June 22, 1956: "I dare say he is irreplaceable." KR Papers.
- 9 Ransom, "Philip Blair Rice," KR XVIII, 2, unnumbered page.
- 10 Lowell to Kathryn Rice, February 13, 1956; Chalmers, "Philip Blair Rice." Unpublished memorial speech. Rice Papers. Chalmers, "Philip Blair Rice." Press release, January 25, 1956. KR Papers.
- 11 Austin Warren to Ransom, June 3, 1956. KR Papers;

- 12 Interview with Helen and Elizabeth Forman, October 19, 1981; Ransom to Warren, August 28, 1956. Warren Papers.
- 13 Ransom, "These Little Magazines," in "American Scholar Forum: The Misery and Necessity of the Quarterly," AS XV, 4 (Ag 1946), 551; Warren wrote to Tate on December 8, 1957: "John Ransom is right, I guess, in saying that now is the time to discontinue the magazine." Tate Papers.
- 14 Telephone-interview with Taylor, December 19, 1981; memo by Chalmers, June 19, 1953. KC Papers. From the conversation this memo records, it appears that Ransom had recommended Rice in addition to Taylor. In February 1955, however, Chalmers told Edward D'Arms that Rice was not regarded as Ransom's successor. This must have been one of Chalmers' arbitrary ideas, for it is inconceivable that Ransom would have agreed to Rice's elimination. It is not quite clear whether Rice himself knew of Chalmers' intentions, though his frantic search for a new job at the end of 1955 would seem to indicate that he did.
- 15 Taylor to Jarrell, March 17 [1957]. Jarrell Papers.
- 16 Taylor to the author, February 1, 1983; Ransom to Tate, October 2, 1957. Tate Papers. Thomas Boardman Greenslade, Kenyon College: Its Third Half Century (Gambier, Ohio: Kenyon College, 1975), p. 208, writes: "From the early days of Kenyon College it had been traditional for the College to furnish housing for its faculty. Just as traditional was the constant friction between administration and faculty caused by . . . inadequacies and inequities in housing. Moving from house to house was almost a yearly affair. Since the choice of a house was based on seniority, a vacated residence resulted in a complete movement of household goods, all down the line, and usually on the same day;" Ransom to Warren, July 3, 1957. Warren Papers; Mary Jarrell, the editor of Randall Jarrell's Letters, pp. 437-438, writes: "In an exchange of letters with Peter Taylor at this time [February 1959], Jarrell learned that . . . Peter had been given a Ford grant that not only provided him and the family with a year in London for the 1960-1961 season of the Royal Court Theatre but also offered him a welcome release from the prospect of editing the Kenyon Review." But it is clear from Ransom's July and October 1957 letters to Warren and Tate that Taylor had refused the editorship long before the date Mary Jarrell mentions.
- 17 Ransom to Tate, September 24, 1957; Ransom to Tate, October 2, 1957. Tate Papers.
- 18 Ransom to Tate, October 18 [1957]. Tate Papers; a selection of Thompson's contributions to the Kenyon gives us "Horses, Romantic Beasts," KR IV, 356-358 and "Homecoming" and "The Deluge," KR XII, 472-475; Howard Nemerov's in fact excellent review of Lolita and My Poor Pnin [sic] appeared in KR XIX, 313-321.
- 19 Ransom to Tate, October 25, 1957. Tate Papers.
- 20 Ransom to Stallknecht, October 25 [1957]. Stallknecht Papers. As early as 1956 other institutions, such as Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, had expressed interest in taking over The Kenyon Review;

Kirk to Lund, October 16, 1957. KC Papers.

21 Lund to Kirk, October 28, 1957. KC Papers; Ransom, "Empirics in Politics," KR XV, 648-654; Kirk to Lund, November 3, 1957; KC Papers. Weaver, Ideas Have Consequences (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1948). This book was reviewed by Eliseo Vivas, "Historian and Moralist," KR X, 346-349. Weaver had studied under Brooks and Warren at Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge; Carter's Kenyon contributions had been "Ezra Pound the Critic," KR XVI, 490-497 and "Rationalist in Hell," KR XVIII, 326-336.

22 Lund to Kirk, October 28, 1957. KC Papers.

23 Ransom to Tate, November 5, 1957. Tate Papers.

24 Memo by Ransom of conversations with Lund and Sutcliffe, November 23, 1957. KC Papers; Ransom to Tate, November 23 [1957]. Tate Papers.

25 Lund to Ransom, November 26, 1957; Barzun to Lund, December 6, 1957; Kirk to Lund, December 10, 1957. KC Papers.

26 Kirk to Lund, January 19, 1958; Kirk to Lund, February 9, 1958. KC Papers.

27 Nemerov to Tate, December 5, 1957. Tate Papers; Ransom to Lund, December 12, 1957. KC Papers.

28 Lund to Kirk, January 3, 1958. KC Papers.

29 Ransom to Tate, January 27, 1958. Tate Papers.

30 Jarrell to Lund, February 5, 1958. KC Papers.

31 Ransom to Lund, February 14, 1958. KC Papers.

32 Ransom to Macauley, February 20, 1958, Selected Letters of John Crowe Ransom, eds. Thomas Daniel Young and George Core (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), p. 398; Lund to Macauley, March 11, 1958. KC Papers.

33 Ransom to Marshall, April 17, 1958. KR Papers; the titles of Kreutz's plays are Inconstant Moon and Teddy Bear, Teddy Bear; anonymous, "New Managing Director," Kenyon Alumni Bulletin, XVII, 2 (Ap-Je 1959), 13.

34 Ransom to Lytle, August 31, 1957. Lytle Papers; Ransom to Warren, July 22 [1959]; Ransom to Warren, September 2, 1959. Warren Papers.

35 Ransom to Blackmur, November 1 [1957]. Blackmur Papers.

36 Ransom to Blackmur, February 4, 1958; Ransom to Blackmur, November 10, 1958. Blackmur Papers.

37 Ellmann, "Wallace Stevens' Ice-Cream," KR XIX, 89-105; Ellmann to Ransom, July 28, 1956. KR Papers; Fergusson, "The Human Image," KR XIX, 1-14; Fergusson, The Human Image in Dramatic Literature (New York:

Doubleday, 1957); Goodman, "The American Writer and His Americanism," KR XXI, 478-482; Goodman, "A Visit to Chartres," KR XXI, 563-572; Burke to Ransom, October 10, 1957. KR Papers; Hyman, "Palpable Designs," KR XIX, 647-657; Ransom to Newton P. Stallknecht, January 3 [1957; wrongly dated 1956]. Stallknecht Papers; Lewis, "The Fiction of Graham Greene: Between the Horror and the Glory," KR XIX, 56-75; Lewis also contributed a review entitled, "Poetry and Change," KR XVIII, 318-326; Mizener, "Spring Fiction," KR XIX, 484-493.

38 Ransom to Blackmur, September 13 [1955]. Blackmur Papers; Blackmur to Ransom, September 22, 1955. KC Papers; Blackmur to Ransom, January 11, 1956. Blackmur Papers; Ransom, "Emily Dickinson: A Poet Restored," Perspectives USA, XV (Spr 1956), 5-20; Ransom to Blackmur, March 8, 1956. KR Papers; Blackmur, "Emily Dickinson's Notation," KR XVIII, 224-237.

39 Blackmur, "Obscuris Vera Involvens," KR XX, 161-168; Blackmur, "Ara Coeli and Campidoglio," KR XX, 337-361; Ransom to Burke, September 2 [1958]. Burke Papers; Blackmur, "The Logos in the Catacomb: The Role of the Intellectual," KR XXI, 1-22.

40 Ransom to Blackmur, February 27 [1959]; Ransom to Blackmur, February 28 [1959]. Blackmur Papers.

41 Blackmur, "Edwin Muir: Between the Tiger's Paws," KR XXI, 419-436; Blackmur to Ransom, April 29, 1959. Blackmur Papers; Blackmur, "Homo Ludens," KR XXI, 662-668.

42 Burke to Ransom, July 29, 1957. KR Papers.

43 Burke, "The Anaesthetic Revelation of Herone Liddell," KR XIX, 505-559; Burke to Ransom, March 28, 1957. KR Papers; Burke to Tate, September 9, 1957. Tate Papers; Burke to Ransom, March 4, 1957; Ransom to Burke, March 18, 1957; Burke to Ransom, March 28, 1957; Burke to Ransom, July 11, 1957; Ransom to Burke, August 23, 1957; Burke to Ransom, September 1, 1957. Burke Papers.

44 Burke to Ransom, September 1, 1957. Burke Papers.

45 Burke, "Towards a Post-Kantian Verbal Music," KR XX, 529-546; Ransom to Burke, September 3 [1958]; Burke to Ransom, September 20, 1958. Burke Papers; Burke discussed Rémy de Gourmont in "Three Adepts of 'Pure' Literature," Counter-Statement (1931; rpt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), pp. 1-28.

46 Burke, "On Catharsis, or Resolution, with a Postscript," KR XXI, 337-375; Ransom to Burke, February 21 [1959]; Ransom to Burke, May 10, 1959; Burke to Ransom, May 13, 1959; Ransom to Burke, May 18 [1959]. Burke Papers.

47 Burke to Ransom, March 23, 1959; Burke to Ransom, July 30, 1959; Burke to Ransom, August 1, 1959. Burke Papers; Burke, "Democracy of the Sick," KR XXI, 639-643.

48 Ransom, "The Idea of a Literary Anthropologist: And What He Might Say of the Paradise Lost of Milton," KR XXI, 121; Pearce, "Historicism

Once More," KR XX, 554-591.

49 Ransom, "The Idea of a Literary Anthropologist," 122; Ransom, "The Strange Music of English Verse," KR XVIII, 460-477.

50 The Summer 1956 Kenyon Review symposium "English Verse and What It Sounds Like" consists of the following essays: Whitehall, "From Linguistics to Criticism," 411-421; Chatman, "Robert Frost's 'Mowing': An Inquiry into Prosodic Structure," 421-438; Arnold Stein, "Donne's Prosody," 439-443; Chatman, "Mr. Stein on Donne," 443-451; Stein, "A Note on Meter," 451-460; and Ransom, "The Strange Music of English Verse," 460-477; Ransom, "The Strange Music of English Verse, 460; Whitehall's review of Trager and Smith, Jr., An Outline of English Structure, "From Linguistics to Criticism," appeared in KR XIII, 710-714.

51 Stein's "Donne's Prosody" was an expanded version of pp. 261-264 of his "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse (continued)," KR XIII, 256-278; Stein to Ransom, April 2, 1956; Ransom to Stein, May 9, 1956. KR Papers.

52 Chatman, "Communication," KR XVIII, 648; Hemphill, "The Meter of the Intermediate Poets," KR XIX, 37; Thompson, "Sir Philip and the Forsaken Iamb," KR XX, 90-115; Beloof, "Prosody and Tone: the 'Mathematics' of Marianne Moore," KR XX, 116-124. On page 116 of this article Beloof refers to an April 1953 Kenyon Review article by Jarrell on Moore, "The Humble Animal." He must have meant Jarrell's review of Moore's What Are Years, which appeared under that title in KR IV, 408-411; Hollander, "The Metrical Emblem," KR XXI, 279-296.

53 Stein, "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse," KR XIII, 20-36; Stein, "Structures of Sound in Donne's Verse (continued)," KR XIII, 256-278, Stein, "Structures of Sound in Milton's Verse," KR XV, 266-277; Mary A. Rahming, secretary to The Kenyon Review, to Stein [n.d.], KR Papers; Stein, "The Image of Antony: Lyric and Tragic Imagination," KR XXI, 586-606; Stein, "Shakespeare Allegorized," KR V, 448-451; Stein, "The Criticism of Wyatt," KR XIII, 703-710, Stein, "The Business of Wonder," KR XIV, 513-520; Stein, "The Criticism of Allegory," KR XX, 322-330.

54 Fergusson, "The Human Image," KR XIX, 1-14; Fiedler, "Green Thoughts in a Green Shade: Reflections on the Stony Sestina of Dante Alighieri," KR XVIII, 238-262; Fiedler, "A Kind of Solution: The Situation of Poetry Now," KR XXVI, 54-79; Irving Kristol, "A Traitor to His Class?," KR XXII, 505-509 highly praised Love and Death in the American Novel; Ransom to John Marshall, March 8, 1956. KR Papers; Hoffman, "47 Workshop," KR XVII, 300-304. Bentley and Fergusson had refused to review this book. As it was not until 1969 that a book on the theatre by Hoffman (joint author with Kenneth Cameron), The Theatrical Response (New York: Macmillan), appeared, Hoffman's Fellowship project must have failed.

55 Fergusson, application form for Fellowships, October 20, 1957; Ransom to Murray Krieger, January 28, 1957. KR Papers; Fergusson was the general editor of The Laurel Shakespeare (New York: Dell, 1958-1968). One of Fergusson's earlier papers on Shakespeare had appeared in

the Kenyon: "Philosophy and Theatre in Measure for Measure," KR XIV, 103-120; Ransom to Carter, October 13, 1955. Carter Papers.

56 Ransom to Carter, February 18 [1955]; Ransom to Carter, March 29, 1955. Carter Papers; Carter, "Ezra Pound the Critic," KR XVI, 490-497; Carter, "Rationalist in Hell," KR XVIII, 326-336; Carter, "That Hard Sophoclean Light," KR XIX, 658-661; Carter, application form for Fellowships [n.d.]; Carter to Macauley, February 7, 1961 shows that Carter had not yet written the projected papers on Flannery O'Connor, Ford Madox Ford, and Ezra Pound. Carter never finished the planned book and died in 1963 when he was still in his early thirties. KR Papers; Carter, untitled review of Lawrence Durrell and Henry Miller: A Private Correspondence, ed. Wickes, KR XXV, 382-384.

57 Nemerov, "Iniquity It Is; But Pass the Can," KR XX, 642-645; Nemerov, "The Morality of Art," KR XIX, 313-321. Pnin is called My Poor Pnin here; Ransom to Tate, October 18 [1957]. Tate Papers; Nemerov, "The Marriage of Theseus and Hippolyta," KR XVIII, 633-641; Nemerov, "The Poetry of Reed Whittemore," KR XXI, 260-278; Nemerov, "Younger Poets: The Lyric Difficulty," KR XX, 25; Nemerov to Ransom, July 13, 1957. KR Papers.

58 Rahv, "Fiction and the Criticism of Fiction," KR XVIII, 276-299; Ransom, "The Understanding of Fiction," KR XII, 189-218; Rahv to Ransom, August 7, 1955; Rahv to Ransom, January 26, 1956. KR Papers.

59 Rahv, "Fiction and the Criticism of Fiction," 277, 280; Ransom, "The Understanding of Fiction," 197, writes: 'Can we not say that fiction, in being literature, will have style for its essential activity?'; Ransom, "The Understanding of Fiction," 202, 208; Rahv, "Fiction and the Criticism of Fiction," 287; Stallman, "Fiction and Its Critics: A Reply to Mr. Rahv," KR XIX, 291; Rahv, "Fiction and the Criticism of Fiction," 284; Mudrick, "Communication: Mr. Stallman's Remarks," KR XIX, 483.

60 Hall, "The Fiction of Henry Green," KR XIX, 76-88; Gifford, "W.D. Howells: His Moral Conservatism," KR XX, 124-133; Krieger, "Tragedy and the Tragic Vision," KR XX, 281-299; Cook, "Modern Verse: Diffusion as a Principle of Composition," KR XXI, 199-220; Pedersen, "Forster's Symbolic Form," KR XXI, 231-249; Kline, "The Spiritual Center in Eliot's Plays," KR XXI, 457-472.

61 Cook, "Modern Verse: Diffusion as a Principle of Composition," 219.

62 Mercier, "The Limitations of Flaubert," KR XIX, 404, 410; Hoffman, "Psychology and Literature," KR XIX, 608; Dickerson, "Portrait of the Artist as a Jung Man," KR XXI, 81.

63 Stratford, "One Meeting with Mauriac," KR XXI, 611-622; Young, "The Glass Trumpet," KR XVI, 191-199. Another story by Young is 'The Admirer,' KR XIX, 593-604; Ransom to Young, January 8, 1957; Buckman to Ransom [n.d.]. KR Papers; Young, "Summer Letter from London," KR XVIII, 642-647; Young, "London Letter," KR XIX, 284-289; Young, "Letter from London," KR XIX, 477-482.

64 Borneman, "Credo Quia Absurdum: An Epitaph for Bertolt Brecht," KR XXI, 169-198; Green, "British Decency," KR XXI, 505-532; Kermode, "The Dissociation of Sensibility," KR XIX, 169-194; Watson, "The Dangers of Security: E.E. Cummings' Revolt against the Future," KR XVIII, 519-537.

65 Levi, "A Hundred Years after Kierkegaard: I. The Three Masks," KR XVIII, 169-182; Kaufmann, "A Hundred Years after Kierkegaard: II. Kierkegaard," KR XVIII, 182-211; Aiken, "Philip Blair Rice and His Philosophy," KR XVIII, 595-618; Ransom to Rice [n.d.]. Rice Papers; Ransom to David McDowell, August 17, 1955. Random House Papers; Aiken, "Philip Blair Rice and His Philosophy," 618; Ong, "Personalism and the Wilderness," KR XXI, 297-304.

66 Eberhart, "Sermon on the Amount of Love," KR XVIII, 365-367; Eberhart, "The Parker River," KR XX, 20-24; Garrigue, "For a Holy Day in Naples" and "For the New Come to Elysium," KR XIX, 574-576; Merrill, "Dream and Waking," KR XX, 436-439; Merwin, "The Miner," "A Wit in Age," and "Coal Barges," KR XIX, 195-196; Mezey, "Dusk Near a Mental Hospital," "Corinna in Vendome," and "The Groundkeeper's Complaint," KR XIX, 109-112; Miles, "Panther," "Dog," "Fish," "Sheep," "Monkey," and "The Savages," KR XVIII, 21-25; Miles, "Magna Carta," "Aim," "Deed," and "Voyage," KR XX, 428-430; Roethke, "Two Poems," KR XVIII, 120-121; Warren, "Ballad of a Sweet Dream of Peace," KR XIX, 31-36; Ransom to Warren, October 16, 1956. KR Papers; Warren, "Penthesilea and Achilles: Fatal Interview" and "Switzerland," KR XX, 599-603.

67 Ashbery, "A Long Novel" and "Two Scenes," KR XVIII, 272-274; Dickey, "Awaiting the Swimmer," KR XXI, 609-610; Feldman, "Works and Days," KR XXI, 84-96; Hall, "Christmas Eve in Whitneyville, 1955," KR XX, 433-435; Hollander, "The Sun Dial," KR XIX, 569-571; Logan, "Narcissus: Vision and Retrospect," KR XVIII, 267-269; Avison, "From a Provincial," "The Apex Animal," "New Year's Poem," and "Knowledge of Age," KR XVIII, 263-265; Honig, "Near Hope in Providence" and "Corrales 1948," KR XX, 597-599. As early as 1948 Honig had published criticism in the Kenyon: "Hobgoblin or Apollo," KR X, 664-681. Other articles by Honig during Ransom's editorship are "That Mutation of Pound's," KR XVII, 349-356 and "In Defense of Allegory," KR XX, 1-19; Morgan, "Scene," "Etude," and "The Last Days," KR XIX, 560-563; Everson, "Tiger Watch," "Diamonds in Summery Cities," and "Angels Who Have Suffered the First Forlornment," KR XX, 57-59; Goedicke, "Circumnavigation," "Proudflesh," and "Calypso," KR XX, 59-61; Gregor, "Dreams" and "The Old Canal at New Hope, Pa.," KR XX, 70-72; besides those already mentioned we find in "The Younger Poets Themselves," KR XX, 51-73 Fried, "The Fossil Indian," 65-68; Marshfield, "Pilgrim," 61-64; Patton, "A City," "For Hart," and "Mishap," 68-69; Pauker, "On the Beach," 73; Pritchard, "Point of Change," "The Shattered Air," and "Sang My Name," 53-56; and Tongue, "After a Painting by M. Vanka," 51-53; Nemerov, "Younger Poets: The Lyric Difficulty," KR XX, 25-37.

68 Kavaphes, "Waiting for the Barbarians" and "Loutsas Beach," trans. Lattimore, KR XVII, 291-293; Lattimore, "Andritsaina Revisited" and "Poussin's World: Two Paintings," KR XXI, 388-389; Slavitt, "Partiti da Cotesti che son Morti," "Great Grandfather," and "Warning," KR XVIII, 370-372.

69 Ransom to Honig, December 11, 1956. KR Papers.

- 70 Schwartz to Ransom, December 8, 1956. KR Papers; Schwartz, "The First Morning of the Second World," KR XVII, 575-580; Schwartz to Ransom, March 12, 1958. KR Papers; Ransom to Schwartz, March 18 [1958]. Schwartz Papers; Schwartz, "Poem," "The Sequel," "Once and For All," "At a Solemn Musick," "Poem," "Sonnet," and "Poem," KR XX, 440-445; Schwartz to Ransom [n.d.]. Schwartz Papers.
- 71 Schwartz to Ransom, March 29, 1958; Schwartz to Ransom, November 10, 1958; Ransom to Schwartz, November 17 [1958]. Schwartz Papers.
- 72 Ransom to John Marshall, March 8, 1956. KR Papers; Stone, "The Parents" and "Speculation," KR XV, 402-403; Stone, "When Wishes Were Fishes," "Ballet," "Confusion in the Occident," and "Mémorial," KR XVIII, 538-540; Holmes, "The Life of the Estate," KR XVIII, 274-275; Ransom to Blackmur, January 1 [1956; wrongly dated 1955]. Blackmur Papers; Holmes, "A Prayer for Rain," KR XVIII, 361-364; Holmes, "Journeys," KR XIX, 106-108; Holmes, "The Lovers in the Graveyard," KR XIX, 197-198; Holmes, "The Knowledge of Our Dream," KR XX, 250-256. Holmes's first book of poetry was The Harvest and the Scythe: Poems (New York: Scribners, 1957).
- 73 Wright to Ransom, January 28, 1958. KR Papers; Wright, "Lonely" and "Father," KR XIII, 672-673; Wright, "Robert Sitting in My Hands," KR XV, 127-128; Ransom to Wright, February 4, 1957; Wright to Ransom, November 5, 1957. KR Papers.
- 74 Wright to Ransom, January 4, 1958. KR Papers; Wright, "A Girl Walking into a Shadow," "All the Beautiful Are Blameless," "Safety," and "With the Gift of a Feather," KR XX, 592-596; Wright to Ransom, May 25, 1958. KR Papers; Wright, "President Harding's Tomb in Ohio," KR XXIII, 390-391.
- 75 Goodman, "Red Jacket (Lake Seneca)," KR XX, 431-433; Richards, "Lighting Fires in Snow" and "Screens," KR XXI, 221-227; Swartz, "Why We Loved Her," KR XX, 278; Herzing, "The Candy-Man's Art Is the Sweetest Art I Know," KR XX, 279-280; Herzing, "The Spent Substance" and "A Winter's World," KR XXI, 607-609; Rahv to Ransom, April 27, 1958. KR Papers; Coffin, "Evening at the Athenaeum," KR XIX, 418-419; Allen Ginsberg submitted poetry more than once. Ransom rather liked his poems, but thought that the Kenyon needed "a more compacted thing" and that Ginsberg's poems lacked "independent argument, or narrative." But neither during Ransom's nor during Macaulay's editorship did the Beats make an impact on The Kenyon Review. In an interview, August 8, 1982, Macaulay stated that Ginsberg had told him he "would never submit anything to The Kenyon Review because they were so establishment." That this had not always been the case is apparent from Ransom's unfortunately undated letters to Ginsberg. Ginsberg Papers.
- 76 Ransom to Marshall, March 8, 1956. KR Papers; Ransom to Lytle, February 28, 1956; Ransom to Lytle, August 31, 1957. Lytle Papers; Lytle, The Velvet Horn (New York: McDowell, Obolensky, 1957); Macaulay, "Big Novel," KR XIX, 646.
- 77 Powers, "Sailing against the Wind," KR XXIV, 257-280; Macaulay to Powers, November 6, 1961. KR Papers; Powers, Morte D'Urban (Garden

City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1962); Macauley, "The Thin Voice," KR XIII, 50-63; Macauley, "The Chevigny Man," KR XVII, 75-93; Macauley, "Legend of Two Swimmers," KR XIX, 246-266; Macauley, application form for Fellowships, October 27, 1957. KR Papers.

78 Ransom to Marshall, June 14, 1958; Marshall to Ransom, June 17, 1958; Ransom to Marshall, July [22?], 1958. KC Collection.

79 Wain, "A Few Drinks with Alcock and Brown," KR XIX, 233-245; Ostroff, "La Bataille des Fleurs," KR XIX, 463-476; Antin, "The Balanced Aquarium," KR XXI, 577-585; O'Connor, "The Retirement of Professor John Underhill," KR XVIII, 576-582; Zimbel, "Margie, This Is Your Father," KR XVIII, 583-594.

80 Taylor, "Venus, Cupid, Folly and Time," KR XX, 169-202; Taylor, "Who Was Jesse's Friend and Protector?," KR XXI, 395-418; DeJong, "The Drowning," KR XX, 362-372; DeJong, "When It Thundered," KR VI, 180-188; Heath, "The Other Woman," KR XXI, 34-57.

81 Hivnor, "The Other Language," KR XX, 634-637; Weales, "The Latest Eliot," KR XXI, 473-478; Harding, "The Progression of Theme in Eliot's Plays," KR XVIII, 337-360; Hays, "Satire and Identification: An Introduction to Ben Jonson," KR XIX, 267-283; Ransom to Hays, October 27, 1956. KR Papers; Taylor, "Tennessee Day in St. Louis," KR XVIII, 92-119; Brecht, "The Life of Confucius," trans. H.E. Rank, KR XX, 393-398.

82 Tillim, "The Pedestals of Brancusi," KR XX, 620; Werner, "Art Letter: Dr. Picasso and the Toothache," KR XIX, 620-625; Lewis, "Picasso," KR II, 196-211.

- ¹ Ransom, "Announcement," KR XXI, 4, unnumbered page; Ransom to Watkins, October 30, 1965. Watkins Papers.
- ² George Core, "New Critic, Antique Poet," SR LXXVII, 3 (JL-S 1969), 515; Norman Podhoretz, untitled tribute, John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters, eds. D. David Long and Michael R. Burr, supplement to the Kenyon Collegian, LXXX, 7 (1964), 17; Ransom, "Introduction," The Kenyon Critics: Studies in Modern Literature from the Kenyon Review, ed. Ransom (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1951), p. vii; Mizener, "Ransom as Editor," John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters, 15, 14.
- ³ Mizener, "Ransom as Editor," 14.
- ⁴ The quotations are all taken from John Crowe Ransom: A Tribute from the Community of Letters: Stewart, "A Little Higher in Spirit," 9; Cowley, untitled tribute, 17; Tate, "Teacher and Friend," 18; Nemerov, untitled tribute, 24; Schorer, untitled tribute, 27.
- ⁵ Rahv to Ransom, April 27, 1958; Hyman to Ransom, January 14, 1958; Burke to Ransom, March 28, 1957; Schwartz to Ransom, February 2, 1954; Nichols to Ransom, October 1, 1957. KR Papers; Shapiro to Macauley, April 24, 1958. Shapiro Papers; Berryman to Macauley, June 6, 1963. KR Papers.
- ⁶ Newman, "Literary Quarterlies, the Modest Mediators," Chicago Tribune, February 13, 1968, page number unknown; Weiss, in "Friends of Promise: Four Editors Look Back at Outstanding Periodicals of Their Youth," TLS June 16, 1978, 667; Colvert, "The Function of the Academic Critical Quarterly," Mississippi Quarterly, XXIII, 2 (Spr 1970), 98, 99, 100.
- ⁷ Rahv to Ransom, April 27, 1958; Schwartz to Ransom, April 9, 1958. KR Papers; Shapiro to Ransom, April 24, 1958. Shapiro Papers; at first sight Macauley's editorial experience seems considerable. It extended from having edited the Kenyon College undergraduate paper Hika, to having edited Gourmet, having read manuscripts for The Western Review, and having worked briefly at the publishing house Henry Holt. However, most of these jobs were short and consisted of merely mechanical editorial work; Ransom to David McDowell, August 11, 1953. Random House Papers; Macauley, The End of Pity (New York: McDowell, Obolensky, 1957); Macauley, The Disguises of Love (New York: Random House, 1952).
- ⁸ Kreutz to the author, November 5, 1983; Lanning, This Happy Rural Seat (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1953); interview with Lanning, October 21, 1981.
- ⁹ Interview with Macauley, August 9, 1982; interview with Lanning, October 21, 1981.
- ¹⁰ Interview with Macauley, August 9, 1982; figures are taken from budget statements and minutes of the meetings of the Board of Trustees giving information about finances over the years. KC Papers.
- ¹¹ Figures and other information are taken from letters written by

Macauley to Lund dated December 12, 1962, October 1, 1963, and December 31, 1963; from a letter written by Lanning to S.S. Lord, comptroller of Kenyon College, dated January 11, 1965; from an undated [circa 1964] untitled memo; from a "Report on The Kenyon Review 1965-1966," and from a report dated October 6, 1950, "Foreign Subscriptions Kenyon Review." KR Papers. It is highly likely, however, that Macauley embellished some of the reports he gave to Lund. John Lavelle, "Facts of Journal Publishing, IV," PMLA LXXXI, 6 (N 1966), 11, gives the following circulation figures for 1965: HR 2180, KR 4070, and PR 7800. SR is not listed. To compare: the figures given for Atlantic are 291,467 and for Harper's 291,917. Besides, the Kenyon's rise in circulation was not entirely to the financial good of the magazine, for whereas each new subscriber used to mean added income, now production costs surpassed the selling price per copy.

12 Ransom to Monroe K. Spears, August 9, 1958. SR Papers.

13 General figures are taken from letters by Macauley to Lund, December 12, 1962 and October 1, 1963. KR Papers. Also from Macauley to Lund, October 2, 1963; salaries are mentioned in the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Trustees of February 22, 1958, May 31, 1958, February 12, 1966, and February 1, 1969. KC Papers.

14 Undated [circa 1964] untitled memo; "Report on The Kenyon Review" [January 27, 1967]; "Supplementary comments on the 1960-70 KENYON REVIEW budget," January 6, 1969. KR Papers.

15 Lanning to Mort Epstein, November 2, 1960; Macauley to Lund, March 14, 1958. KR Papers.

16 Steiner to Macauley, September 1, 1962; Steiner to Macauley, February 6, 1962. KR Papers; interview with Lanning, October 21, 1981.

17 Trilling had resigned as an advisory editor of Partisan Review on February 13, 1961. PR Papers; C.P. Snow to Macauley, December 15, 1960 wrote: "my literary friends (like Lionel Trilling) . . . all regard you as the great white hope of the Quarterly world for the next decade;" Trilling to Macauley, September 14, 1959; Trilling to Macauley, December 26, 1962; Macauley to Trilling, December 28, 1962; Macauley; to Bentley, March 7, 1963. KR Papers.

18 Macauley to Lund, September 7, 1965. KR Papers; although after three years at Kenyon College Berman left gladly for the University of California at San Diego, he remained interested in the Kenyon and procured a number of reviews for the magazine; Berman, untitled review of Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714, KR XXXI, 708-714; Berman "The Convert and the Heretic," on Max Eastman, Love and Revolution, KR XXVII, 530-535; Berman, "Zion as Main Street," on Fiedler, Waiting for the End, KR XXVII, 171-175; Berman, "Rochester and the Defeat of the Senses," KR XXVI, 354-368; Macauley made one other unsuccessful attempt to add an advisory editor from abroad to the Kenyon's staff. William Webb, literary editor of the British Guardian, was the Kenyon's "Editorial Associate for the U.K." from March to November 1966; interview with Roelofs, September 28, 1982.

19 Macauley to Lund, March 14, 1958; Macauley to the advisory editors,

November 1, 1959. KR Papers; Edward Seidensticker, "I. Through Foreign Eyes: Redskins in Japan," KR XXII, 374-391; Jan Blonski, "II. Through Foreign Eyes: Americans in Poland," KR XXIII, 32-51; Leo Gilson Ribiero, "III. Through Foreign Eyes: Brazil: Between Dogpatch and Yoknapatawpha," KR XXIII, 394-407; Elsa Gress Wright, "IV. Through Foreign Eyes: Almost in the Family," KR XXIV, 282-303; Lanning to Mary Hivnor, November 7, 1967. KR Papers.

20 Martha McDowell [Mrs. David McDowell] to Lytle, February 22, 1965. Lytle Papers.

21 The following writers and stories appeared in Macauley's Gallery of Modern Fiction: Stories from the Kenyon Review (New York: Salem Press, 1966): John Stewart Carter, "The Keyhole Eye;" Turner Cassity, "Distances from Berlin;" Hilary Corke, "Someone with Whom to Converse;" Avram Davidson, "The Dragon Skin Drum;" Vincent G. Dethier, "Haboob;" William Eastlake, "What Nice Hands Held;" Nadine Gordimer, "Message in a Bottle;" James B. Hall, "Letters Never Mailed;" Elizabeth Hardwick, "Two Recent Travelers;" R. Prawer Jhabvala, "The Award;" Mary Lavin, "A Wet Day;" Doris Lessing, "One Off the Short List;" Georgia McKinley, "The Short Rope;" Wright Morris, "The Safe Place;" Flannery O'Connor, "Greenleaf;" Boris Pasternak, "Aerial Ways;" Nancy Potter, "We Have Seen the Best of Our Times;" J.F. Powers, "Sailing Against the Wind;" Thomas Pynchon, "Entropy;" Peter Taylor, "Venus, Cupid, Folly and Time;" Betty Wahl, "A Shorter History of the Irish People;" John Wain, "A Few Drinks with Alcock and Brown;" Jessamyn West, "The Picknickers;" Leonard Wolf, "Fifty-Fifty."

22 Macauley, "The Kenyon Review, 1939-1970," The Little Magazine in America: A Modern Documentary History, eds. E. Anderson and M. Kinzie (Yonkers, N.Y.: Pushcart Press, 1978), pp. 74-76.

23 Carter, "The Keyhole Eye," KR XXIV, 595-623, and "To a Tenor Dying old," KR XXV, 567-631.

24 Macauley, "Introduction," Gallery of Modern Fiction, p. ix.

25 Macauley to Karl Shapiro, August 9, 1962. Shapiro Papers; promotion leaflet [1962]. KR Papers; Macauley to Tate, December 5, 1961. Tate Papers; Pechter, "Two Movies and Their Critics," KR XXIV, 351.

26 "Standpoint," KR XXII, 312; "Standpoint," KR XXIII, 158; Macauley, "'Let Me Tell You about the Rich . . .,'" KR XXVII, 645-671.

27 Young, "Fallen from Time: The Mythic Rip Van Winkle," KR XXII, 547-573; Young, "The Mother of Us All: Pocahontas Reconsidered," KR XXIV, 391-415; Young, "Our Hemingway Man," KR XXVI, 676-707; Young, "Hemingway and Me: A Rather Long Story," KR XXVIII, 15-37. The revised 1966 edition of Young, Ernest Hemingway (1952) was entitled Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration.

28 Steiner, "George Lukács and his Devil's Pact," KR XXII, 1-18; Steiner, "The Genius of Robert Graves," KR XXII, 340-365; Steiner to Macauley, October 31, 1959. KR Papers; Steiner, "The Retreat from the Word," KR XXIII, 187-216; Steiner to Macauley, January 8 [1960; wrongly dated 1959]. KR Papers; Elliott, "A Brown Fountain Pen," KR XXIV, 62-

79; Elliott, "A Piece of Lettuce," KR XXV, 295-315; Algren, "The Peseta with the Hole in the Middle, Part One," KR XXIII, 549-570; Algren, "The Peseta with the Hole in the Middle, Part Two," KR XXIV, 110-128.

29 Promotion leaflet [circa 1960]. KR Papers; Mizener, "A Dance to the Music of Time: The Novels of Anthony Powell," KR XXII, 79-92; Meixner, "Two Discussions of Ford Madox Ford: I. The Saddest Story," KR XXII, 234-264; Lid, "Two Discussions of Ford Madox Ford: II. Tietjens in Disguise," KR XXII, 265-276; Steiner, "The Genius of Robert Graves," KR XXII, 340-365; Thale, "C.P. Snow: The Art of Worldliness," KR XXII, 621-634; Klein, "A Discipline of Nobility: Saul Bellow's Fiction," KR XXIV, 203-226; Baumbach, "The Economy of Love: The Novels of Bernard Malamud," KR XXV, 438-457; Herbst, "Nathanael West," KR XXIII, 611-630; Hyams, "Peyrefitte," KR XXIV, 484-499; promotion leaflet [circa 1962], signed by Elizabeth Browne, secretary for the Kenyon. KR Papers.

30 Interview with Macauley, August 9, 1982; Blackmur to Macauley, March 19, 1963. Blackmur Papers.

31 "To John Crowe Ransom," KR XXVI, 23; the contents of the Ransom issue are: "To John Crowe Ransom," 23; Lowell, "Five Poems for John Crowe Ransom," 25-29; Ellmann, "Yeats without Analogue," 30-47; Jarrell, "Woman," 48-53; Fiedler, "A Kind of Solution: The Situation of Poetry Now," 54-79; Graves, "All I Tell You From My Heart," "To Myrto about Herself," "In Time," "In Disguise," "The Leap," and "Man Does, Woman Is," 80-82; Bentley, "Bertolt Brecht's First Play," 83-92; Gordimer, "One Whole Year, and Even More," 93-115; Stafford, "The Tea Time of Stouthearted Ladies," 116-128; Warren, "It's a Long Way from Central Park to Fiddlersburg," 129-143; Taylor, "There," 144-170; Lattimore, "Late Alone," "Lord Bountiful's Raid," and "Begin Autumn Here," 171-172; Brooks, "W.H. Auden as a Critic," 173-189; "A Symposium on W.H. Auden's 'A Change of Air'" with essays by Elliott, Karl Shapiro, Stephen Spender, and Auden, edited by Anthony Ostroff, 190-208; Berryman, "Three Dream Songs," 209-210; Blackmur, "The Charterhouse of Parma," 211-231; Nemerov, "The Human Condition," 232; and Ransom, "The Planetary Poet," 233-264.

32 Editor's note to "A Symposium on W.H. Auden's 'A Change of Air,'" 190; Shapiro, 196; Auden, 204; Ransom, 233.

33 Anonymous, "Culture and Gallantry," Newsweek, January 27, 1964, 65; anonymous, "Don't Bury the Hatchet," TLS February 13, 1964, 127.

34 Editor's note to "Once Over Lightly," KR XXII, 166; it is possible that Lanning started the "Bad Books Department," because Macauley was on a sabbatical until September 1965; promotion leaflet signed by Elizabeth Browne [circa 1962]. KR Papers.

35 Ransom, "Master's in the Garden Again," KR XXIV, 439-440; Steiner to Macauley, July 15, 1961; Steiner to Macauley, February 6, 1962; Macauley to Lund, March 14, 1958. KR Papers.

36 Macauley, "The Kenyon Review, 1939-1970," The Little Magazine in America, eds. Anderson and Kinzie, p. 74; Howe, A Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1982), p. 171; interview with Macauley, August 9, 1982.

- 37 Macauley to Richard West, October 6, 1976. KC Papers.
- 38 Kramer to Macauley, February 8, 1960; Lawrence to Macauley, July 11, 1960; Austin Warren to Macauley, July 10, 1961. KR Papers.
- 39 Hedley in "Little Magazines in America: A Symposium [Part One]," Mainstream, XV (N 1962), 28; Bly, promotion leaflet for The Sixties [n.d.]. KR Papers; Gross, "Culture and Anarchy: What Ever Happened to Lit Magazines," Antioch Review, XXIX, 1 (Spr 1969), 53; Solotaroff, "The Red Hot Vacuum," The Red Hot Vacuum and Other Pieces on the Writing of the Sixties (New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1970), p. 153.
- 40 Dickstein, Gates of Eden: American Culture in the Sixties (New York: Basic Books, 1977), pp. 135-136.
- 41 In the symposium "The Role of the Literary Magazine," TLS June 6, 1980, 637, Howe recalls how he used to wait eagerly for each issue of Partisan Review; Ellington White, in an interview of October 21, 1982, similarly recalled the excitement with which The Kenyon Review was received; Robert Hellman, in "The State of Letters: Baton Rouge and LSU Forty Years After," SR LXXXVIII, 1 (Ja-Mr 1980), 126-143, speaks of the "excitement" generated by The Southern Review; Macauley, "The Kenyon Review, 1939-1970," The Little Magazine in America, eds. Anderson and Kinzie, pp. 76-77.
- 42 Macauley to Lund, February 1, 1967; Lund to James Bellows, February 23, 1967; Davie to Lund, April 20, 1967; Wain to Lund [late April or early May 1967]. KC Papers.
- 43 Macauley to Lund, May 2, 1967; Lund to Bellows, May 10, 1967. KC Papers.
- 44 Under his full name Edmund Wallace Hildick, Hildick had published, for instance, the "Jim Starling," "Lemon Kelly," and "Questers" series for children. His novels for adults until 1966 were Bed and Work (1962), A Town on the Never (1963), and Lunch with Ashurbanipal (1965), all published by Faber in London. His major book of criticism was Word for Word: A Study of Author's Intentions (1965), also by Faber. Many of his children's books have been translated into different languages, among them Dutch, French, German, Italian and Polish; Hildick to Lanning, April 23, 1967. KC Papers.
- 45 Interview with Lanning, October 21, 1981.
- 46 Editor's note to "The International Symposium on the Short Story: Part One," KR XXX, 443; interview with White, October 21, 1982.
- 47 Ransom, "Introduction," The Kenyon Critics, ed. Ransom, p. x; interview with Lanning, October 21, 1981.
- 48 "Front Matter," KR XXX, 583; promotion leaflet [1962]; Ransom to David Stevens, March 5, 1945; Lanning, "Report on The Kenyon Review" [January 27, 1967]; promotion leaflet [May 1967]; promotion leaflet [Spring 1967]. KR Papers.

- 49 Sypher to Patrick Cruttwell, August 23, 1968; Warren to Cruttwell, August 26, 1968; Tate to Cruttwell, August 14, 1968. KC Papers.
- 50 Lowell to Cruttwell, August 13, 1968. KC Papers.
- 51 Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, June 1, 1968; Lund to Max M. Fisher, December 22, 1967; minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, Presidential Report, February 17, 1968. KC Papers.
- 52 Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, October 5, 1968. KC Papers; "The Kenyon Review," report by the Cruttwell Committee [early 1969]. KRns Papers; minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, February 14, 1969; minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, February 1, 1969. KC Papers.
- 53 Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, December 9, 1969. KC Papers.
- 54 White to Howard Allen, November 3, 1970. KRns Papers.
- 55 Interview with Lanning, October 21, 1981.
- 56 Statement for KR issue 128 (1970). It is not clear from the AMS reprint of The Kenyon Review whether this statement was an insert or put on the cover. KR Papers.
- 57 Newman to John Fink, February 27, 1970. KRns Papers.
- 58 Interview, James Conrad with Thomas Perry, September 28, 1983; interview, James Conrad with Rodger Brooks, October 4, 1983. East Texas Papers.
- 59 Howard Allen to Caples, December 9, 1969. KRns Papers.
- 60 Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, January 31, 1970. KC Papers; Phil Cooper to White, February 2, 1970 was "deeply sorry." KR Papers; Holly Stevens, Business Manager of The Yale Review, to the Business Manager of The Kenyon Review, April 3, 1970, was "distressed;" Alfred Werner to Lanning, November 28, 1969, was "terribly upset;" Allen to Pierre McBride, Trustee of Kenyon College, November 3, 1969. Allen sent copies of this letter to Caples and Lanning, adding in a note to the latter: "Should Caples . . . ask who the hell is Howard Allen--tell him I'm a millionaire and he'd better keep [the Kenyon] alive or I won't leave a damned cent to the College." KRns Papers.
- 61 Madden to Caples, November 9, 1969. KC Papers.
- 62 Phillips to Lanning, February 20, 1970; Nadine Gordimer to Lanning, November 22, 1969 was "very sorry;" William Odell, assistant to Kirk, to Lanning, March 14, 1970 wrote that "Dr. Kirk would be most happy to promote your efforts to regain sound financial backing . . . through direct appeals and his various columns." KRns Papers; Mazzaro to Jean Farley, January 9, 1970 was "sorry;" KR Papers; Foley, "Foreword," The Best American Short Stories, ed. Foley (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), p.xi; James Neff, "Rebirth: Kenyon Review Makes a Comeback," Plain Dealer, December 26, 1978, 1b; in interviews with Macauley on

August 9, 1982, Lanning on October 21, 1981, and White on October 21, 1982, it seemed as if all three actually preferred to talk about Ransom's Kenyon.

63 "The New Kenyon Review: a Prospectus," [excerpts from a report of the special Presidential Committee to study the revival of The Kenyon Review, October 11, 1975] states: "The New Kenyon Review would seek to establish and occupy a literary mainstream rather than defensively to assume a reactionary or an avant-garde position. To do so the Review should be prepared to set up its own standards of value, and to revive and appropriate to itself certain past standards of value that have been allowed to decay. The establishment of recognizable, even provocative and polemical positions would, as it was for Ransom's Review, be part of its mission." Macauley's and Lanning's Kenyon is not mentioned. KC Papers.

64 Eliot, "Notes: The Function of a Literary Review," Criterion, I, 4 (J1 1923), 421; Arnold, "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Matthew Arnold: Poetry and Prose, ed. John Bryson (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1967), p. 353.

Index to persons, periodicals, publishers, and foundations.

- Aaron, Daniel, 71
 Abbot, Claude Colleer, 51
 Abel, Lionel, 5, 268, 296
Abside, 72
Accent, 140, 193, 194, 274
 Adams, Henry, 36, 70, 241, 244, 245
 Adams, Leonie, 184, 206
 Adams, Philip R., 113, 177
 Adams, Robert M., 215, 217
Adelphi, 218
 Adorno, T.W., 175
 Agee, James, 67, 68, 188
 Aiken, Conrad, 184, 255
 Aiken, Henry David, 111, 265, 318, 355
Alcestis, 299
 Aldrich, Virgil C., 78, 86, 158
 Algren, Nelson, 389
 Allen, Howard, 414
Alumni Bulletin, see Kenyon Alumni Bulletin
American Review, 44
 Ames, Van Meter, 111, 318
 Anderson, Maxwell, 149
 Anderson, Quentin, 174, 296
 Anderson, Sherwood, 67, 223
 Antin, David, 365
Antioch Review, 115
 Aragon, Louis, 166
 Arendt, Hannah, 260, 261, 262
 Aristotle, 134, 136, 156, 258
 Armitage, Merle, 54
 Arnold, Matthew, 10, 63, 64, 249, 417
 Artaud, Antonin, 366
Arts, 396
Ascent, 287
 Ashbery, John, 356
Atlantic Monthly, 284
 Atlantic Monthly Press, 376
 Atlas, James, 46, 71, 72, 164
 Auden, W.H., 52, 57, 65, 66, 87, 89, 153, 184, 192, 226, 230, 247, 371, 391, 392
 Auerbach, Erich, 217, 218, 220
 Avison, Margaret, 356
 Babbitt, Irving, 71, 279
 Bailey, Frank, 321
 Baker, Carlos, 327
 Baker, George Pierce, 347
 Baker, Howard, 28, 54, 120
 Balet, Leo, 175, 176
 Balzac, Honoré de, 71
 Barker, George, 87
 Barnard, Mary, 64
 Barnes, Djuna, 299
 Barrault, Jean-Louis, 295
 Barrett, William, 5, 44, 47, 82, 185, 209, 261, 262, 313
 Barzun, Jacques, 114, 115, 121, 122, 155, 174, 175, 296, 302, 327, 328, 371
 Bates, H.E., 402
 Baudelaire, Charles, 71, 150, 151, 219
 Baumbach, Jonathan, 390
 Beach, Joseph Warren, 120
 Beath, Paul R., 234
 Beck, Warren, 154
 Beiswanger, George, 97, 174, 296
 Belitt, Ben, 55
 Bellow, Saul, 47, 222, 390
 Beloof, Robert, 346
 Belvin, William, 274
 Bennett, Joseph, 151
 Bentley, Eric, 9, 29, 43, 45, 46, 77, 98, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 129, 130, 133, 140, 141, 150, 157, 158, 159, 173, 174, 175, 176, 179, 192, 194, 199, 200, 211, 217, 226, 233, 260, 271, 295, 296, 297, 298, 322, 343, 347, 378, 379, 387, 388, 393, 407
 Bentley, Phyllis, 402
 Berlioz, Hector, 302
 Berman, Ronald, 380, 381, 388
 Bernanos, George, 262
 Berryman, John, 30, 47, 51, 64, 65, 68, 69, 92, 100, 138, 142, 167, 170, 171, 188, 189, 196, 282, 372, 391, 404
 Bertì, Luigi, 154
 Bewley, Marius, 215, 217, 335
 Bishop, John Peale, 53, 65, 66, 85, 224
 Blackmur, R.P., 28, 31, 32, 36, 43, 46, 48, 50, 51, 56, 57, 68, 72, 74, 75, 94, 95, 102, 112, 118, 120, 121, 123, 125, 137,

- 138, 145, 151, 155, 182, 186,
 188, 191, 192, 196, 206, 209,
 210, 217, 218, 219, 221, 225,
 236, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243,
 244, 245, 255, 263, 315, 316,
 322, 325, 328, 333, 334, 335,
 336, 337, 338, 360, 391, 392
 Blake, William, 83, 389
 Bly, Robert, 397
 Bogan, Louise, 184, 192, 206
 Bogardus, Edgar C., 206, 269,
 270, 331, 332
 Bollingen Foundation, 183, 186,
 191
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, 279
 Bonnard, Pierre, 301
 Booth, Wayne C., 250
 Borneman, Ernest, 355, 387
 Bose, Buddhadeva, 274
Botteghe Oscure, 275
 Bowles, Paul, 222
 Bowling, Lawrence, 154
 Bowra, C.M., 151
 Boyars, Arthur, 274
 Boyers, Robert, 239, 240
 Boyle, Kay, 55, 405
 Brancusi, Constantin, 367
 Brecht, Bertolt, 71, 112, 116,
 159, 166, 173, 174, 261, 271,
 295, 296, 355, 367, 392
 Bridges, Robert, 63, 247
 Brinnin, John Malcolm, 166
 Broch, Hermann, 261
 Brontë, Charlotte, 133
 Brontë, Emily, 133
 Brooks, Cleanth, 3, 29, 43, 44,
 46, 50, 56, 65, 66, 72, 73, 74,
 75, 76, 78, 105, 106, 107, 112,
 113, 114, 120, 124, 125, 126,
 127, 128, 131, 134, 139, 140,
 154, 182, 188, 199, 208, 213,
 237, 245, 248, 249, 255, 257,
 261, 335, 370, 371, 378, 392
 Brooks, Van Wyck, 69, 70, 71,
 192, 210
 Browne, Sir Thomas, 257
 Buckman, Gertrude, 354
 Burke, Kenneth, 37, 57, 58, 59,
 72, 95, 108, 113, 114, 120, 141,
 143, 144, 145, 151, 192, 196,
 200, 201, 215, 236, 258, 259,
 260, 274, 285, 298, 334, 335,
 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343,
 372
 Burns, Alan, 402
 Bush, Douglas, 211, 213
 Calder, Alexander, 118, 132
 Campbell, Roy, 71
 Camus, Albert, 153, 265
 Candlemas Foundation, 218
 Caples, William, 408, 409, 410,
 411, 412, 413, 415
 Carmichael, O.C., 17
 Carnap, Rudolf, 78
 Carnegie Foundation, 38, 102,
 191, 305
 Carruth, Hayden, 189, 191
 Carter, John Stewart, 385
 Carter, Thomas Henry, 207, 267,
 324, 327, 347, 348
 Cason, C., 17
 Cavalcanti, Guido, 220
 Chagall, Marc, 301
 Chalmers, Gordon Keith, 11, 12,
 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22,
 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30,
 31, 37, 38, 39, 40, 71, 96, 101,
 102, 103, 110, 114, 119, 179,
 180, 187, 188, 189, 190, 199,
 201, 202, 203, 204, 266, 268,
 283, 294, 305, 306, 307, 308,
 315, 316, 318, 319, 321, 381
 Chalmers, Roberta, see Swartz,
 Roberta Teale
 Chapin, Katherine Garrison, 184
 Chaplin, Charlie, 299
 Charlot, Jean, 178
 Chase, Philander, 35
 Chase, Richard, 112, 116, 133,
 154, 199, 200, 209, 210, 212,
 213, 235, 267, 327, 328
 Chatman, Seymour, 345
 Cheever, John, 405
 Chekhov, Anton, 129, 130, 295
 Cheney, Seldon, 54
 Chesterton, G.K., 9
 Chevalier, Haakon M., 54, 69
 Chiappe, Andrew, 121
Chicago Review, 9
Chimera, 274
 Church, Henri, 104, 107, 151,
 178
 Church, Philip, 403
 Ciardi, John, 91
 Clark, Eleanor, 51, 93, 96, 142,
 157, 292
 Clarke, Donald Lloyd, 6
 Claudel, Paul, 147
 Cleveland World Publishing
 Company, 172, 214
 Clurman, Harold, 174

- Cocteau, Jean, 300
 Coffin, Charles, 187, 189, 200, 215, 216, 308, 319, 332, 362, 381
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 132
 Collins, James, 265
 Collins, Seward, 44
 Colvert, James B., 372
 Conrad, Joseph, 224, 267, 351
Contact, 299
 Cook, Albert, 352
 Core, George, 44
 Corke, Hilary, 385, 388
 Corrington, John William, 394
 Coulborn, Rushton, 85
 Cowley, Malcolm, 35, 60, 147, 152, 153, 154, 188, 189, 192, 194, 348, 371
 Cox, Sidney, 75, 76, 77
 Cox, Louis, 62, 63
 Crane, Hart, 247
 Crane, R.S., 41
 Crane, Stephen, 261, 351
 Greeley, Robert, 283, 287, 288, 290, 293
Criterion, 1, 19, 49, 71, 72, 372
 Croce, Benedetto, 258
 Cruttwell, Patrick, 408, 409
 Cummings, E.E., 138, 188, 247, 355
 Cummings, Wilbur L., 11
 Curley, Daniel, 287
 Curry, Walter Clyde, 51

 Daiches, David, 120, 121, 123
 Dali, Salvador, 178
 Daniel, Robert [?], 153
 Dante, 119, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 240, 256, 347
 D'Arms, Edward, 183, 204, 309
 Davidson, Avram, 384
 Davidson, Donald, 13, 15, 17, 39, 56, 327
 Davie, Donald, 400
 Davis, Lambert, 30
 Davis, Olivia, 385
December, 413
 DeJong, David Cornel, 162, 173, 366
 Demuth, Charles, 122
 Denby, Edwin, 303
 Dethier, Vincent G., 384
 Deutsch, Babette, 276
Dial, 1, 4, 25, 26, 49, 101, 193, 196
 Dickens, Charles, 260
 Dickerson, Lucia, 353
 Dickey, James, 235, 356, 393
 Dickinson, Emily, 63, 73, 100, 335, 336
 Dickstein, Morris, 398
 Dillon, George, 101
 Disney, Walt, 175
Dissension, 85
 Dr. Seuss, see Geisel, Theodore
 Dodds, John W., 327
 Domino, Ruth, 287
 Donne, John, 65, 127, 131, 202, 215, 216, 217, 236, 239, 243, 257, 345, 346, 390
 D [oolittle], H [ilda], 137
 Dorantes, Nicholas, 99
 Dos Passos, John, 67, 188
 Dostoevsky, Feodor, 224, 267
 Doubleday, Doran, and Company, 168, 169, 170, 172, 178
 Dover Wilson, John, see Wilson, John Dover
 Dowling, Allan, 195
 Drury, Elizabeth, 217
 Dryden, John, 44
 Duncan, Robert, 166, 167
 Dupee, F.W., 30, 147
 Durrell, Lawrence, 348

 Eastman, Max, 248, 249, 380
 Eberhart, Richard, 30, 60, 281, 282, 356, 371, 394
 Eddington, Sir Arthur Stanley, 78
 Edel, Leon, 121, 237
 Einstein, Albert, 175, 265
 Eisenstein, Sergei, 300
 Elder, Walter, 171, 172, 206, 266, 293, 295, 318
 Eliot, T.S., 1, 14, 17, 19, 36, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 61, 62, 63, 70, 72, 139, 151, 174, 184, 186, 187, 191, 202, 217, 218, 219, 226, 242, 243, 247, 252, 256, 261, 262, 298, 299, 341, 352, 366, 372, 416
 Elliott, G.P., 389, 392
 Elliott, G.R., 239
 Ellmann, Richard, 206, 209, 226, 227, 228, 229, 236, 263, 266, 282, 286, 334, 335, 392
 Éluard, Paul, 282
 Empson, William, 28, 36, 43, 45, 51, 60, 61, 199, 200, 201, 209, 212, 215, 216, 227, 236, 238,

- 239, 257, 263, 334, 371
Encounter, 275, 395
Engle, Paul, 114
English Review, 372
Euripides, 147
Evans, Walker, 67, 68
Evergreen Review, 9
Everson, Landis, 356, 357

Faber and Faber, 19
Fahs, Charles, 204
Farley, Jean, 403, 404
Faulkner, William, 60, 150, 152, 153, 154, 225, 252, 279, 348
Feldman, Irving, 356
Fergusson, Francis, 43, 97, 120, 121, 122, 153, 173, 196, 206, 207, 217, 218, 219, 220, 242, 269, 298, 322, 325, 334, 335, 346, 347, 391
Ferlinghetti, Lawrence, 371
Fiedler, Leslie, 206, 209, 211, 212, 213, 221, 222, 223, 229, 236, 263, 290, 291, 298, 327, 328, 343, 347, 380, 392
Fielding, Henry, 239
Filippo, Eduardo de, 295
Fisher, Margery, 402
Fiskin, Abram, 154
Fitts, Dudley, 147
Fitzgerald, F. Scott, 142, 171, 292, 385
Fitzgerald, Robert, 92, 136, 206, 217, 218, 219, 284
Flaubert, Gustave, 133, 353
Fletcher, John Gould, 15, 30, 75
Flint, R.W., 157, 235, 241, 252, 256, 263, 279
Foerster, Norman, 57
Foley, Martha, 415
Ford, Charles Henri, 89, 299
Ford, Ford Madox, 17, 36, 54, 263, 348, 372, 390
Ford Foundation, 306, 307, 367
Forman, Helen Ransom, 158, 274, 340
Forster, E.M., 67
Forster, Ian, 352
Fowlie, Wallace, 148
Foxx, Robert, see Southard, Walter
Frank, Joseph, 206, 323, 325, 326, 327, 328
Frank, Waldo, 67
Frazer, George, 104, 107, 178
Frazier, Russell, 239, 240

Freud, Sigmund, 86, 87, 88, 89, 232, 272, 342, 343
Fried, Michael, 357
Friess, Horace L., 159
Fromm, Erich, 89
Frost, Robert, 12, 16, 28, 65, 231, 232, 247, 272, 345
Frye, Northrop, 211, 213, 262, 371
Fugitive, 13, 14, 373
Furbank, P.N., 402

Gardner, Isabella, 273
Garrigue, Jean, 91, 125, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 282, 356, 394
Gass, William, 252
Gayle, Harriet, 384
Geisel, Theodore, 22
Geismar, Maxwell, 141
Geoffrey, William, 262
Georgia Review, 9, 372
Gershwin, George, 54
Ghiselin, Brewster, 393
Gibson, Richard, 293, 295
Gide, André, 147
Gifford, Henry, 352
Gilbert, Jack, 394
Gilbert, James, 5
Gilbert, Katharine, 251
Goedicke, Patricia, 356, 357
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 147
Golding, William, 354, 402
Goodman, Paul, 95, 96, 100, 209, 229, 232, 233, 236, 247, 262, 263, 292, 334, 335, 362
Goodman, Percival, 100
Gordimer, Nadine, 385, 392, 415
Gordon, Caroline, 21, 96, 153, 291
Gottlieb, Beatrice, 303
Gottlieb, Elaine, 173, 292
Gourmont, Rémy de, 151, 341
Goyen, William, 291
Graff, Louis, 178
Granville-Barker, H., 174
Graves, Robert, 230, 389, 390, 391
Green, F.L., 222
Green, Henry, 260, 352
Green, Martin, 355
Green, Paul, 184
Greenberg, Clement, 188
Greene, Graham, 335, 405
Gregor, Arthur, 357
Grene, Majorie, 157

- Gropius, Walter, 158, 176
 Gross, Beverly, 397
 Guerard, Albert J., 326
 Guiget, Jean, 148
- Haggin, B.H., 54, 175, 176, 302, 367
 Hall, Donald, 326, 356
 Hall, James, 352
 Harding, D.W., 215, 217, 366
 Hardwick, Elizabeth, 47, 290
 Hardy, John Edward, 130
 Hardy, Thomas, 247
 Harper's, 284
 Harridges, Anthony, 327
 Hartley, Marsden, 301
 Hathorn, Isabel, 290
 Hayes, H.R., 366
 Hazard, Paul, 101
 Heath, Priscilla, 287, 295, 366
 Hecht, Anthony, 270, 271, 272, 273, 276, 283
 Hedley, Leslie Woolf, 397
 Hefner, Hugh, 400
 Hegel, Georg, 250
 Heidegger, Martin, 157, 265
 Heilman, Robert, 238
 Hemingway, Ernest, 136, 252, 260, 389
 Hemphill, George, 158, 345
 Henry Holt, 152, 160, 172
 Herbst, Josephine, 390
 Herschberger, Ruth, 91, 158, 230, 282
 Herskovits, M.J., 234
 Herzing, Albert, 362
 Hicks, Granville, 192, 313, 371
 Hika, 403
 Hildick, Wallace, 401, 403, 405
 Hillyer, Robert, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 202, 318, 374
 Hirsch, Sidney Mtttron, 13
 Hitler, Adolf, 85, 86
 Hivnor, Mary, 297, 366
 Hodgson, Ralph, 206
 Hoffman, Frederick J., 140, 192, 194, 353
 Hoffman, Theodore, 206, 233, 297, 347
 Hollander, John, 346, 356
 Holmes, Theodore, 207, 360
 Honig, Edwin, 356, 357
 Hook, Sidney, 47
 Hoor, Marten ten, 78, 86, 251
 Hopkins, Gerard Manley, 51, 63, 113, 119, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 216, 217, 221
 Hopkins Review, 327
 Horney, Karen, 88, 89
 Horrell, Joe, 75
 Houghton Mifflin, 385
 Hound & Horn, 1, 4, 26, 46, 49, 54, 120, 124
 Housman, A.E., 60, 65, 231, 247, 349
 Howe, Irving, 5, 47, 60, 68, 142, 143, 206, 207, 223, 224, 229, 236, 267, 343, 395
 Howells, W.D., 352
 Hudson Review, 2, 3, 4, 5, 139, 182, 189, 205, 224, 263, 284, 310, 356, 357, 393
 Humphries, Rolfe, 93
 Huxley, Aldous, 147
 Hyams, Edward, 390
 Hyman, Stanley Edgar, 208, 209, 233, 234, 235, 236, 262, 263, 267, 326, 334, 335, 372
 Hytier, Jean, 148, 153
- Ibsen, Henrik, 129, 130
 Inferno Press, 397
 Inventario, 154
 Isère, Jean, see Guiget, Jean
- James, Henry, 70, 113, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 128, 130, 138, 260
 James, William, 123
 Janssens, G.A.M., 1
 Jarrell, Randall, 8, 17, 37, 39, 47, 53, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 72, 91, 95, 101, 113, 138, 158, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 188, 192, 194, 196, 202, 225, 226, 229, 230, 231, 236, 238, 250, 263, 278, 279, 280, 282, 287, 289, 290, 312, 313, 321, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 346, 371, 391, 404
 Jaspers, Karl, 157
 Jeffers, Robinson, 147
 Jhabvala, Ruth Praver, 385
 Johnson, Norman, 24, 25, 26, 31
 Johnson, Samuel, 44, 131, 133, 256
 Johnson, Thomas H., 335
 Jones, Ernest, 206
 Jonson, Ben, 367
 Joost, Nicholas, 327
 Joseph, Sister Miriam, 259
 Joyce, James, 70, 148, 151, 227,

- 228, 236, 262
 Jung, C.G., 186, 353
- Kafka, Franz, 52, 53, 232, 257
 Kahler, Erich, 171
 Kant, Immanuel, 39, 250
 Kardiner, Abram, 89
 Karr, E.R., 293
 Kaufmann, Walter, 265, 355
 Kavaphes, Konstantinos, 357
 Kazin, Alfred, 5, 46, 47, 121, 188, 192, 194
 Keats, John, 127
 Kees, Weldon, 92
 Kenner, Hugh, 262
Kenyon Alumni Bulletin, 332, 374
Kenyon Collegian, 187
Kenyon Review, *passim*
 Kermode, Frank, 355
 Kiely, Benedict, 385
 Kierkegaard, Søren, 157, 265, 355
 Kinne, Wisner P., 347
 Kirk, Russell, 268, 324, 327, 328, 347, 415
 Kirkland, James H., 17
 Kirstein, Lincoln, 97
 Klee, Paul, 177
 Klein, Marcus, 390
 Kline, Peter, 352
 Klitgaard, Kaj, 206
 Kluckhohn, Clyde, 85, 251
 Knight, G. Wilson, 234
 Knights, L.C., 133, 200
 Koch, Vivienne, 228, 257
 Koestler, Arthur, 143, 260
 Kramer, Hilton, 396
 Kreutz, Irving, 332, 374, 375
 Krieger, Murray, 238, 322, 352
 Krutch, Joseph Wood, 88, 97, 132
- La Fontaine, Jean de, 255, 282
 Landis, Bernard, 235
 Langer, Susanne K., 266
 Lanier, Lytle, 17
 Lanning, George, 10, 32, 187, 206, 241, 286, 293, 295, 369, 374, 375, 377, 379, 382, 387, 400, 401, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 409, 411, 412, 415
 Lansner, Kermit, 259, 260, 265, 301, 318
 Lattimore, Richmond, 357, 391
 Laughlin, James, 51, 93, 104, 105, 124, 306, 336
 Lavin, Mary, 172
- Lawrence, D.H., 61, 84, 390
 Lawrence, Seymour, 376, 396
 Leavis, F.R., 116, 127, 129, 131, 132, 133, 155, 202, 212, 214, 237
 Lebowitz, Martin, 146, 147
 Le Corbusier, 100, 232
 Lee, Elizabeth, 91
 Leibowitz, René, 302
 Leighton, Lawrence, 148, 151
 Lessing, Doris, 385, 405
 Le Sueur, Meridel, 173
 Levi, Albert William, 355
 Levin, Harry, 75, 133, 255
 Lewis, C.D., 230
 Lewis, R.W.B., 206, 224, 225, 226, 229, 236, 263, 334, 335
 Lewis, Sinclair, 67
 Lewis, Wyndham, 99, 348, 367
 Lidd, R.W., 390
 Liddell, Robert, 402
 Lindsay, Vachel, 247
 Lispector, Clarice, 385
Little Review, 120, 193
 Lobdell, D.H., 187
 Lockridge, Ross, 222
 Logan, John, 356
 Longview Foundation, 288, 357
 Lorca, Federico García, 93, 298
 Louchheim, Aline B., 189
 Lovejoy, Arthur, 87
 Lowell, Robert, 8, 37, 39, 40, 53, 91, 100, 125, 126, 127, 128, 137, 138, 150, 163, 166, 184, 200, 275, 278, 279, 282, 314, 318, 322, 327, 328, 330, 346, 371, 391, 394, 400, 404, 407
 Lukács, Georg, 389
 Lund, Franze Edward, 320, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 365, 376, 378, 388, 396, 400, 401, 408
 Lytle, Andrew, 15, 17, 18, 96, 172, 195, 206, 333, 363, 364, 382, 383
- Macaulay, Robie, 9, 10, 31, 36, 71, 150, 172, 206, 207, 235, 236, 260, 263, 285, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 295, 296, 297, 298, 318, 322, 323, 325, 326, 327, 328, 330, 331, 332, 333, 363, 364, 365, 369, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391,

- 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397,
399, 400, 401, 403, 404, 405,
406, 410, 415
McCarthy, Joseph, 266, 267
McCarthy, Mary, 47
McClellan, Edward, 327
MacDiarmid, Hugh, 235
MacDonagh, Donagh, 226
Macdonald, Dwight, 4, 47, 70,
121, 166
Macdonald, Nancy, 121
McDowell, David, 17, 40, 58, 67,
110, 214, 281, 282, 288, 293,
318
McFadden, Roy, 226
McGuire, Edgar, 287, 295
McKinley, Georgia, 384
MacLeish, Archibald, 28
Macleod, Norman, 230
McLuhan, Herbert Marshall, 126,
127
MacNeice, Louis, 87, 93
Madden, David, 374, 375, 414
Magny, Claude-Edmonde, 262
Mailer, Norman, 399
Malamud, Bernard, 390
Mallarmé, Stéphane, 151
Malraux, André, 69
Mann, Klaus, 85
Mann, Thomas, 85, 221, 240, 241,
252
Manning, Olivia, 172
Marcel, Gabriel, 157, 265
Marcus, Steven, 304
Mare, Walter de la, 247
Maritain, Jacques, 217, 218, 219
Marlowe, Christopher, 255
Marshall, John, 48, 102, 124,
149, 186, 191, 192, 194, 198,
207, 229, 245, 284, 305, 309,
316, 332, 363, 364, 365
Marshall, Margaret, 326
Marshfield, Alan, 357
Martin, Alexander Reid, 88
Martin, [Carter W.], 285
Masefield, John, 247
Massachusetts Review, 9
Mathews, Jackson, 148
Matthiessen, F.O., 43, 45, 71,
120, 121, 122, 138, 139, 153,
192, 198, 199, 201, 202, 210,
236, 263
Mauriac, François, 148, 262, 354
Maurois, André, 101
May, Karl, 85, 86
Mayberry, George, 192
Mazzaro, Jerome, 415
Meixner, John A., 390
Mellers, W.H., 98
Mellon, Paul, 191, 305, 315
Mellquist, Jerome, 99, 113
Melville, Herman, 136, 150, 267,
273, 279
Mencken, H.L., 140
Mercier, Vivian, 353
Mercure de France, 218
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 268
Merrill, James, 273, 283, 356
Merwin, William, 206, 269, 270,
273, 275, 276, 283, 356
Mesures, 104, 151
Mezey, Robert, 273, 283, 356
Michaux, Henri, 228, 282
Milano, Paolo, 217
Miles, Josephine, 81, 92, 100,
125, 127, 164, 166, 215, 217,
282, 346, 356, 404
Miller, Henry, 348
Miller, L.L., 217
Millett, Fred B., 155
Millspaugh, C.A., 55
Milton, John, 127, 130, 343, 346
Minnesota Review, 9
Mitchner, Ann, 283
Mizener, Arthur, 43, 46, 75, 76,
97, 112, 125, 126, 127, 128,
129, 138, 150, 171, 172, 173,
188, 196, 200, 206, 209, 213,
240, 253, 254, 255, 256, 263,
292, 334, 335, 370, 390
Modern Age, 324, 327
Moholy-Nagy, Laszlo, 35, 99, 378
Monnier, Adrienne, 148
Moore, Lillian, 97
Moore, Marianne, 28, 93, 95,
121, 124, 138, 192, 206, 247,
255, 256, 282, 346, 371
Moore, Merrill, 20, 64, 276, 359
Moore, T. Sturge, 63
Morgan, Frederick, 356
Morris, A.C., 235
Morris, Charles W., 79, 80, 111,
145
Morris, Wright, 287, 289, 290
Morse, Samuel French, 162
Mortimer, Ronald Lane, 299
Moses, W.R., 64
Moss, Howard, 91, 163
Mott, Michael, 403, 404
Mount Vernon News (Ohio), 86
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 175
Mudrick, Marvin, 351

- Muir, Edwin, 337
 Munch, Edvard, 301
 Munro, Thomas, 113
 Murphy, Arthur E., 266

 Nabokov, Vladimir, 323, 349
 Nagel, Ernest, 78, 87, 265
 Nahas, Gabriel, 282
 Naipaul, V.S., 385
Nashville Banner, 311
 Nathan, Leonard E., 393
Nation, 22, 54, 115, 165, 175, 189, 206, 302, 313, 326
 Negig, Sheila, 385
 Neider, Charles, 221
 Nemerov, Howard, 91, 101, 167, 188, 206, 229, 230, 231, 236, 263, 286, 287, 323, 326, 328, 329, 340, 348, 357, 371, 391, 394
 Nerber, John, 91
Neue Rundschau, 171
 Neurath, Otto, 78
 Newby, P.H., 353
 New Directions, 51, 104, 124, 211
 Newell, H. Louis, 293
 Newhall, Beaumont, 99
 Newman, Charles, 372, 412, 413
 Newman, William, 311
New Republic, 35, 144, 165, 298
Newsweek, 181, 392
New World Writing, 392
New Yorker, 168, 284, 289, 290
New York Herald Tribune, 108, 109, 311
New York Review of Books, 10, 399
 Nichols, Douglas, 206, 269, 270, 372
 Niebuhr, Reinhold, 82
 Nierendorf, Karl, 177
 Nin, Anaïs, 172
 Nobbe, George, 174, 296
Nouvelle Revue Française, 1, 72
 Nowell-Smith, Simon, 260

 Oates, Joyce Carol, 385
 O'Brien, Conor Cruise, 146, 262
 O'Brien, Justin, 71, 77, 86, 87, 101
 O'Connor, Flannery, 206, 207, 284, 285, 286, 287, 348, 383
 O'Connor, Frank, 382, 388
 O'Connor, William Van, 352, 365
 O'Donnell, Donat, see O'Brien, Conor Cruise
 O'Donnell, George Marion, 17, 37, 39, 60, 64
 O'Faolain, Julia, 385
 O'Faolain, Sean, 262, 292
 O. Henry, see Porter, William Sidney
 Oklahoma University Press, 214
 Olson, Elder, 371
 O'Neill, Eugene, 295
 Ong, S.J., Walter J., 356
 Ortega y Gasset, José, 155, 261
 Ostroff, Anthony, 365

 Pack, Robert, 394
 Packer, Nancy Huddleston, 384
 Palmer, John, 136, 195, 196, 258
 Palmer, Paul A., 71, 159
 Panofsky, Erwin, 176, 177
Paris Times, 22
 Parker, John, 91
 Parks, Lloyd, 282
 Parris, Elizabeth, 384
Partisan Review, 1, 3, 4, 5, 22, 30, 31, 47, 70, 101, 115, 118, 122, 140, 143, 157, 166, 167, 182, 185, 193, 194, 195, 196, 205, 260, 261, 278, 284, 310, 313, 327, 328, 362, 393, 395, 397, 398, 408, 413
 Pasternak, Boris, 172
 Patton, Frances Gray, 170
 Patton, R.S., 357
 Pauker, John, 357
 Pavese, Cesare, 222
 Pearce, Roy Harvey, 343
 Pechter, William S., 387
 Pedersen, Glenn, 352
 Peirce, William Forster, 11
 Pelligrini & Cudahy, 160
 Pepper, Stephen C., 158
 Perelhoff, A.D., 185
 Perkins, Maxwell, 19
Perspectives USA, 306, 336
 Peterson, Theodore, 183
 Peyrefitte, Roger, 390
 Phelps, Robert, 313
 Phillips, Duncan, 301, 305, 308
 Phillips, William, 5, 31, 47, 143, 415
 Picasso, Pablo, 99, 367
 Picchi, Mario, 402
 Pilot Press, 160
Plain Dealer (Cleveland), 55
 Plato, 39
Playboy, 10, 396, 399, 400, 410

- Pocahontas, 389
 Podhoretz, Norman, 5, 47, 371
 Poe, Edgar Allan, 220, 256
Poetry, 22, 101, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 327, 357
Politics, 166
 Pollet, Elizabeth, 358
 Pope, Alexander, 130, 131
 Popkin, Henry, 296, 297, 366
 Porter, Fairfield, 99
 Porter, Katherine Anne, 18, 61, 96, 121, 122, 153, 173, 184, 188
 Porter, William Sidney, 285, 366
 Posner, David, 393
 Potter, G.R., 216
 Potter, Nancy, 384
 Pound, Ezra, 36, 52, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189, 191, 243, 247, 348
 Powell, Anthony, 390
 Powers, J.F., 188, 207, 363, 364
 Powys, T.F., 402
Prairie Schooner, 167
 Praz, Mario, 153
 Prévert, Jacques, 282
 Prior, Matthew, 337
 Pritchard, Sheila, 357
PMLA, 9, 314
 Prokosch, Frederic, 55, 92
 Proust, Marcel, 70, 130, 147, 262, 299
 Putman, Clay, 206
 Putnam, Phelps, 263
 Pynchon, Thomas, 385

Quarterly Review of Literature, 372

 Radford, Ruby Lorraine, 95
 Rahming, Norris, 35
 Rahv, Philip, 7, 47, 48, 52, 53, 66, 72, 111, 112, 118, 121, 142, 143, 188, 200, 201, 211, 212, 214, 242, 243, 246, 251, 278, 349, 350, 351, 362, 372, 373
 Rand, F., 17
 Random House, 214, 288, 293, 305, 376
 Ransom, John Crowe, passim
 Read, Herbert, 86, 87, 200, 212, 213
 Regnery, 306
 Reik, Theodore, 141
 Reinhart, Kurt F., 265
Review of Religion, 159
Revue des Deux Mondes, 10

 Rexroth, Kenneth, 312, 313
 Reynal and Hitchcock, 131, 132
 Ribiero, Leo Gilson, 378
 Rice, Kathryn, 318
 Rice, Philip Blair, 7, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 45, 48, 50, 51, 57, 71, 72, 73, 75, 78, 79, 81, 84, 87, 88, 110, 111, 112, 113, 119, 121, 122, 132, 141, 145, 148, 149, 150, 155, 156, 157, 167, 168, 171, 176, 177, 178, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 197, 200, 204, 206, 215, 217, 218, 228, 229, 231, 245, 247, 250, 251, 252, 253, 257, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 274, 282, 291, 292, 295, 297, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 317, 318, 319, 321, 346, 355, 356, 375, 381, 388, 390, 397, 415, 416
 Richards, I.A., 43, 51, 57, 60, 75, 209, 211, 237, 249, 258, 259, 362
 Richards, Mary C., 366
 Richardson, Dorothy, 67
 Richman, Robert, 301
 Riding, Laura, 164
 Ricks, Christopher, 402
 Rieff, Philip, 252, 342, 343
 Riker, Charles, 118, 179
 Rimbaud, Arthur, 71
 Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 405
 Robinson, Edwin Arlington, 247
 Rochester, John Wilmot, Earl of, 381
 Rockefeller Foundation, 32, 48, 102, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 124, 177, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 191, 192, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 240, 250, 284, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 315, 316, 365, 376
 Rodell, John, 149
 Roditi, Edouard, 148, 232, 233
 Roelofs, Gerrit, 381
 Roelofs, Howard Dijkema, 79
 Roethke, Theodore, 63, 65, 230, 274, 275, 276, 282, 356
Rolling Stone, 399
 Romans, Jules, 54
 Rosenberg, Harold, 47, 267, 268
 Rosenfeld, Isaac, 7, 47, 143, 144, 145, 172, 173, 260, 292
 Rosenfeld, Paul, 28, 30, 54, 97,

- 113
 Rouault, Georges, 301
 Roubiczek, Paul, 257
 Rougemont, Denis de, 141
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 279
 Rubin, Louis D., Jr., 5, 316, 327
 Ruggles, Eleanor, 126, 128
 Rukeyser, Muriel, 90, 92, 163, 282, 394
 Russell, Bertrand, 54, 78, 83
 Ruth, Babe, 43

 Sagmaster, Joseph, 22, 318
 Santayana, George, 22, 78, 265, 266, 272
 Saroyan, William, 402
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, 111, 153, 157, 211, 265, 268, 295
Saturday Review of Literature, 185, 188, 189, 190, 191
 Saunders, H.D., see Stewart, John L.
 Savage, D.S., 149
 Schapiro, Meyer, 47, 117
 Schoder, S.J., R.V., 125
 Schorer, Mark, 71, 83, 139, 188, 200, 263, 371
 Schwartz, Delmore, 36, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 62, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 100, 121, 137, 151, 164, 173, 188, 200, 207, 282, 292, 354, 357, 358, 359, 372, 373, 394
 Scribners, 19, 21, 306
Scrutiny, 72, 73, 129, 133, 253
 Seldes, Gilbert, 28, 97
 Sender, Ramon J., 173
 Sessions, Roger, 118, 158, 175
Seven Arts, 26
Sewanee Review, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 118, 136, 152, 155, 178, 182, 193, 194, 195, 196, 204, 238, 256, 258, 274, 284, 310, 327, 370, 382, 393
 Shakespeare, William, 51, 133, 238, 259, 271, 298, 346, 347, 349, 390
 Shapiro, Herbert Eugene, 5
 Shapiro, Karl, 8, 164, 166, 184, 185, 191, 230, 323, 357, 372, 373, 392
 Shaw, Erwin, 222
 Shaw, George Bernard, 174
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 219
Shenandoah, 9, 325

 Silone, Ignazio, 225
 Sidney, Sir Philip, 346
 Simpson, Eileen, 171
 Simpson, E.M., 216
 Singleton, Charles, 217, 219, 220
 Sissman, L.E., 394
Sixties, 397
 Slaiman, Mortimer, 293
 Slavitt, David K., 357
 Smith, Gerald, 237
 Smith, H.L., Jr., 344, 345
 Smith, Robert Paul, 71
 Smith, William J., 323
 Snodgrass, W.D., 371
 Snow, C.P., 390
 Solotaroff, Theodore, 397
 Southard, Walter, 96, 146, 159, 160, 177, 274, 318
Southern Review, 1, 3, 4, 8, 17, 26, 46, 55, 73, 74, 75, 96, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 112, 113, 120, 167, 178, 195, 196, 370, 413
 Spacks, Barry, 313
 Spears, Monroe K., 5, 32, 238, 327, 337
 Spector, A.C., 396
 Spencer, Elizabeth, 207, 363, 364
 Spencer, Theodore, 184
 Spender, Stephen, 87, 211, 213, 230, 371, 392
 Spielberg, Herbert, 265
 Spurgeon, Caroline, 234
 Stafford, Jean, 173, 391
 Stafford, William, 393
 Stalknecht, Newton P., 203, 324, 352
 Stallman, Robert Wooster, 153, 206, 208, 229, 351
 Stead, Christina, 385
 Stein, Arnold, 215, 216, 257, 345, 346
 Steiner, George, 378, 379, 389, 390, 394
 Stern, Richard, 287, 288, 290, 334
 Stevens, David, 114, 117, 124, 197, 199, 204
 Stevens, Wallace, 30, 52, 62, 70, 93, 161, 166, 192, 194, 196, 244, 247, 253, 276, 282, 283, 290, 334, 392
 Stewart, John L., 75, 76, 370
 Stewart, Paul Robert, 167

- Stitt, James S., 384
 Stone, Ruth, 206, 360
Story, 167
 Stratford, Philip, 354
 Strindberg, August, 130
 Sulkin, Sidney, 173
 Sultan, Stanley, 284, 293
 Sutcliffe, Denham, 187, 189, 190, 287, 325, 326, 331
 Swallow Press, 412
 Swartz, Roberta Teale, 11, 12, 28, 29, 94, 188, 362
 Sweeney, James Johnson, 34, 99
 Sweeney, John, 122, 251, 253
 Swinnerton, Frank, 402
 Sykes, Christopher, 222
 Symons, Julian, 68, 69, 85, 130
Symposium, 1, 22, 36, 49
 Synge, John Millington, 130
 Sypher, Wylie, 130, 407
- Taller, 72
 Tate, Allen, 2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 46, 50, 51, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 70, 73, 74, 75, 77, 93, 94, 95, 96, 100, 102, 104, 106, 107, 110, 111, 114, 118, 120, 121, 125, 137, 138, 143, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, 164, 165, 166, 168, 178, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 199, 201, 203, 209, 212, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 230, 236, 243, 247, 248, 249, 254, 256, 257, 263, 274, 278, 284, 315, 322, 323, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 370, 371, 391, 407
 Taylor, Edward, 61
 Taylor, Harold, 289
 Taylor, Peter, 17, 92, 172, 188, 284, 289, 291, 320, 321, 322, 325, 330, 366, 367, 378, 391
Temps Modernes, 302
Tennessean (Nashville), 17
 Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, 241, 243
 Terry, Walter, 303
 Thale, Jerome, 390
 Thayer, Scofield, 1
 Thomas, Dylan, 36, 68, 69, 87, 93, 230, 247
 Thomas, Wright, 75
 Thompson, John, 91, 322, 323, 346
 Thompson, Lawrence, 71
 Thorp, Willard, 75, 184
 Tillim, Sidney, 367
 Timberlake, Philip, 28, 29
Time, 181, 311
Times Literary Supplement, 304, 310, 393
Times-Star (Cincinnati), 22
 Tongue, Margaret, 357
 Torrance, Ridgely, 28
 Toulmin, Stephen, 265
 Toulouse-Lautrec, Henri, 54
 Tovey, D.F., 175
 Toynbee, Arnold, 241, 244
 Trager, George L., 344, 345
transition, 34
 Trilling, Diana, 47, 188
 Trilling, Lionel, 7, 46, 47, 48, 63, 64, 67, 68, 70, 72, 75, 76, 77, 88, 89, 111, 113, 114, 115, 121, 141, 142, 146, 150, 154, 188, 192, 194, 197, 198, 199, 202, 203, 210, 212, 222, 224, 233, 236, 242, 247, 260, 269, 270, 271, 302, 304, 327, 328, 350, 378, 379, 380, 391
TriQuarterly, 372, 412
 Troy, William, 71, 153
 Turco, Lewis, 394
 Tuve, Rosemond, 215, 216
Twentieth Century, 311
 Tyler, Parker, 216, 299, 300, 301, 367, 387
- University of South Carolina Press, 412
 Untermeyer, Louis, 371
 Ussher, Arland, 263
- Valéry, Paul, 71, 147, 148, 262, 341
 Vallette, Jacques, 218
Vanderbilt Alumnus, 55
 Van Doren, Mark, 19, 28, 29, 37, 93, 138, 162, 188
 Van Duyn, Mona, 170
 Van Gennep, Arnold, 235
 Van Gogh, Vincent, 178
 Venable, Vernon, 22, 54
 Viereck, Peter, 273, 283
 Viertel, Berthold, 174
View, 299
Village Voice, 398, 399
Virginia Quarterly Review, 17, 26, 30

Index

Vittorini, Elío, 153
 Vivas, Eliseo, 28, 29, 43, 46,
 61, 79, 81, 82, 84, 87, 88, 100,
 111, 113, 121, 123, 257, 258,
 261, 265
 Voegelin, Erminie, 234
Vogue, 269
 Wagner, Geoffrey, 402
 Wagner, Martin, 176
 Wagner, Richard, 129, 130, 174
 Wahl, Jean, 111, 252, 265
 Wain, John, 365, 400
 Walker, Hudson, 301
 Wall, Alan, 6
 Wallis, Charles Glenn, 141, 142
 Walter, Arnold M., 158
 Warren, Austin, 43, 56, 61, 121,
 122, 125, 126, 127, 128, 199,
 213, 214, 215, 216, 256, 257,
 308, 319, 388, 396
 Warren, Robert Penn, 3, 5, 14,
 15, 19, 21, 29, 36, 39, 43, 46,
 50, 56, 61, 63, 64, 70, 72, 86,
 87, 94, 95, 106, 108, 112, 113,
 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122,
 123, 124, 125, 131, 132, 136,
 137, 138, 146, 150, 152, 153,
 154, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169,
 171, 179, 184, 189, 192, 197,
 202, 215, 257, 269, 276, 277,
 278, 279, 282, 291, 292, 300,
 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 346,
 356, 370, 371, 378, 379, 383,
 391, 394, 407
 Warshow, Robert, 47
 Watkins, Edwin, 206, 207, 269,
 318
 Watkins, Vernon, 369
 Watson, Barbara, 355
 Watson, James Sibley, 1
 Waugh, Evelyn, 146
 Weales, Gerald, 297, 366
 Weaver, Richard A., 257, 325,
 327
 Weaver, Robert A., 101, 102
 Weaver, Robert A., Jr., 104, 107
 Webster, Grant, 46, 119
 Webster, John, 76
 Weiss, Theodore, 372
 Weisstein, Allyn, 301
 Wellek, René, 154, 200, 257
 Wells, H.G., 389
 Welty, Eudora, 30, 136
 Werner, Alfred, 367, 387, 388,
 404

West, Nathanael, 390
 West, Ray B., 283
Western Review, 194, 287
 Wheelwright, Philip, 36, 75, 77,
 81, 82, 83, 100
 Whicher, George, 63, 64, 100
 White, John Ellington, 403, 405,
 409, 410, 415
 White, Frederick, 301
 White, Morton, 266
 Whitehall, Harold, 114, 115,
 125, 127, 140, 169, 179
 Whitehead, Alfred North, 78, 87
 Whitman, Walt, 231
 Whitney Foundation, 307
 Whittemore, Reed, 91, 162, 206,
 349
 Wickes, George, 348
 Wilbur, Richard, 276
 Wilde, Oscar, 232
 Williams, Charles, 269
 Williams, Raymond, 378
 Williams, William Carlos, 52,
 93, 138, 159, 168, 189, 192,
 193, 222, 228, 247, 263, 280,
 281, 283, 290, 299, 348
 Wilson, Angus, 402
 Wilson, Edmund, 36, 57, 87, 120,
 124, 142, 151, 192, 193, 224
 Wilson, F.A.C., 336
 Wilson, John Dover, 238
 Wimsatt, W.K., 248, 335
 Winner, Percy, 222
 Winters, Yvor, 43, 44, 50, 51,
 52, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 77, 139,
 140, 189, 192, 200, 201, 230
Wisconsin Studies in
Contemporary Literature, 9
 Wiser, William, 384
 Wolfe, Thomas, 53
 Woods, John, 273, 283
 Woodward, Henry, 98
 Woolf, Leonard, 402
 Wordsworth, William, 60, 131,
 237, 246, 247, 260
 Wright, Frank Lloyd, 100, 232
 Wright, H. Bunker, 337
 Wright, James, 39, 207, 270,
 272, 275, 276, 283, 360, 361,
 362
Yale Review, 25, 26, 55, 413
 Yeats, W.B., 61, 63, 70, 149,
 226, 227, 228, 243, 247, 266,
 280, 295, 336, 390, 392
 Young, Philip, 388, 389

Index

Young, Marguerite, 91, 92, 100,
166
Young, Stark, 295, 296
Young, Thomas Daniel, 5
Young, Vernon, 224
Young, Wayland, 287, 354

Zabel, Morton Dauwen, 17, 75,
120, 121, 192, 224
Zimbel, Elaine, 365
Zinsser, Hans, 138

THE KENYON REVIEW (1939-1970): EEN KRITISCHE GESCHIEDENIS

De Amerikaanse literaire geschiedschrijving plaatst The Kenyon Review, in 1939 opgericht door de dichter en criticus John Crowe Ransom en lange jaren door hem geleid, onder de belangrijkste literair-kritische tijdschriften van de twintigste eeuw in de Verenigde Staten, maar tot op heden is er geen serieuze analyse van dit tijdschrift verschenen. Deze studie geeft derhalve een geschiedenis alsmede een kritische analyse van The Kenyon Review en beschrijft de plaats en invloed ervan. Zij kwantificeert en analyseert de relatie in het tijdschrift tussen kritiek, poëzie en fictie, de verschillende literair-kritische benaderingswijzen die het door de jaren heen voorstond, en de wisselende redactionele belangstelling voor literatuur, filosofie, en kunst.

De inhoud van een literair tijdschrift bepaalt zijn uiteindelijke plaats en importantie, maar voor een kritische studie over de opkomst en invloed van een tijdschrift is het van groot belang het dagelijks leven ervan te reconstrueren. De gepubliceerde jaargangen geven vaak een onzuivere afspiegeling van redactionele dromen en ambities. Alleen door informatie en inzichten opgedaan uit ongepubliceerde bronnen en uit interviews kunnen dergelijke dromen en ambities aan het licht gebracht worden. Bij de analyse van de inhoud van The Kenyon Review is derhalve op uitgebreide schaal gebruik gemaakt van oorspronkelijk archiefmateriaal, waaronder de redactie-correspondentie, zodat het redactionele beleid, de intenties van auteurs, en de reacties van lezers konden worden beschreven en geëvalueerd.

Deze kritische geschiedenis van The Kenyon Review betoogt, tegen de

achtergrond van de literaire situatie, dat dit tijdschrift gedurende het eerste decennium van zijn bestaan meer dan enig ander Amerikaans periodiek de literair-kritische stroming van de "New Criticism" op briljante wijze vertegenwoordigde, zonder daarbij echter andere vormen van creatieve literatuurkritiek buiten te sluiten. Vanaf het eerste begin droegen ook poëzie, en spoedig, zij het in iets mindere mate, fictie, bij tot de faam en de invloed van The Kenyon Review; deze belangrijke aspecten zijn echter altijd overschaduwed gebleven door de originaliteit en hoge kwaliteit van de kritische artikelen, die in belangrijke mate hebben bijgedragen tot de grote invloed van de literatuurkritiek, en met name de "New Criticism," in de jaren veertig.

The Kenyon Review van de jaren vijftig staat algemeen bekend als het bolwerk en de thuisbasis van de "New Critics." Dit is een hardnekkig misverstand, want gedurende deze jaren publiceerde het ongeveer alles behalve "New Critical" literatuurkritiek en was het, door publicatie van nieuwe en originele benaderingen van literatuur, zijn tijd eens te meer vooruit.

Gedurende de laatste jaren van het hoofdredacteurschap van John Crowe Ransom, vanaf ongeveer 1955, ging de kwaliteit van The Kenyon Review sterk achteruit. De markt voor literatuurkritiek was, onder meer door het verschijnen van een aantal nieuwe literaire tijdschriften, verzadigd geraakt, en voor Ransom, nu bijna zeventig, was het hoofdredacteurschap geen passie meer, maar nog slechts routine. Zijn opvolger Robie Macauley trachtte vanaf 1960 de Kenyon nieuw leven in te blazen door de nadruk te verleggen van kritiek naar fictie, van nationaal naar internationaal, en van "highbrow" naar "middlebrow." Maar Macauley, die in 1966 werd opgevolgd door de minder getalenteerde

George Lanning, introduceerde zoveel nieuwe, steeds weer verschillende aspecten, dat The Kenyon Review zijn persoonlijkheid verloor. Bovendien kon de Kenyon als kwartaaltijdschrift, in tegenstelling tot bijvoorbeeld de nieuw opgerichte en veel vaker verschijnende New York Review of Books, niet voldoen aan de vraag naar onmiddellijke informatie en meningsvorming over de sociale en politieke vraagstukken die in de jaren zestig de aandacht opeisten. The Kenyon Review had de voeling met de eigen tijd, en daarmee zijn invloed, verloren. In deze studie wordt derhalve slechts aandacht besteed aan de Kenyon onder Macauley en Lanning als naschrift en verheldering van de gouden jaren van het tijdschrift; de nadruk ligt op de eerste vijftien jaren toen The Kenyon Review het Amerikaanse literaire klimaat in zo belangrijke mate bepaalde.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Marian Janssen werd in 1953 te Deventer geboren. Zij volgde de Gymnasium-B opleiding te Zwolle, waar zij in 1972 eindexamen deed. Zij begon in 1974 met de studie Engels aan de Katholieke Universiteit te Nijmegen en legde in 1980 het doctoraal examen cum laude af. Sinds 1980 is zij werkzaam bij de Katholieke Universiteit, eerst als onderzoekpoolmedewerker, vervolgens als onderwijsmedewerker, en nu als coördinator Amerikanistiek.

STELLINGEN

behorende bij het proefschrift

THE KENYON REVIEW (1939-1970): A CRITICAL HISTORY

te verdedigen op vrijdag 4 december 1987 om 15.30 uur

door M.L.M. Janssen

I

Uitgeverijen doen er bij het herdrukken van literair-kritische tijdschriften verstandig aan het gehele tijdschrift, inclusief de kaft, reclamepagina's en dergelijke, opnieuw uit te geven.

II

Geweld in de verhalen van Flannery O'Connor is nooit een doel op zich.

III

De symboliek in de romans van Toni Morrison is te opgelegd.

IV

Hoewel Isabella Gardner (1915-1981) op grond van de technische kwaliteit en de indringende thematiek van haar werk tot de belangrijkste dichters van haar generatie gerekend mag worden, is haar poëzie onderbelicht gebleven.

V

Taalverwervingsonderwijs is een zeer gewenst element in het studieprogramma van Nederlandse studenten Amerikanistiek.

VI

Voor de ontplooiings- en overlevingskansen van een nieuw interdisciplinair doctoraal programma is geïnstitutionaliseerde coördinatie van wezenlijk belang.

VII

Een literaire canon is niet heilig, maar wel handig.

1939 - 1970 A CRITICAL HISTORY