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Blake and His Circle: 
A Checklist of Recent Publications

BY D.W. DÖRRBECKER

Because of various technical and organizational difficulties, no annual checklist of recent scholarship was published in the 1985 volume of Blake. The present compilation therefore tries to catch up with what has happened since Thomas L. Minnick and I handed in the 1984 list (see Blake 18 [1984]: 100-15); it covers the period from summer 1984 to—roughly—early summer 1986, with some additional pre-1984 items interspersed which previously had escaped our attention. If, therefore, the 1986 edition of the checklist is much bulkier than earlier ones, this is the most important and obvious reason. But there are some others, too.

It needs no stressing, I suppose, that a periodical checklist like this may well reach for but never will attain completeness, and this is especially so if such a list is concerned with English art and literature, but compiled at various museum and university libraries in Germany. However, there are at least two distinct features of Blake’s checklists which, I believe, guarantee their usefulness to its readers. One is the actuality of this report on recent developments in Blake studies and its neighboring fields (particularly when we resume publication on an annual basis). The other is the reviews section. This part of the checklist—despite its being very likely the least complete—gives access to a field of publication where one can often meet with observations as pertinent and innovative as those of the scholarly books and articles listed in the other sections. Since no other bibliography attempts to give a full account of the review literature in Blake studies, I have devoted more time and care to this than to any other class of publications—well knowing that all too many lacunae will remain.

A few more words concerning the organization, entry format, and coverage of the present checklist may prove useful. In general, I have retained the format of four main sections with a number of subdivisions which has been known to the readers of this journal since 1980. Coverage in parts II and III, however, has always been—and probably to a certain extent will remain—problematic. Are Mary Wollstonecraft and Angelica Kauffmann or Thomas Paine and William Godwin to be considered members of Blake’s circle?—and has not the Related Interest section always looked a little haphazard in scope, either too inclusive or exclusive in its coverage?

Let me recite a few of the criteria for selection, annotation, and bibliographical style that I have followed while compiling the present list.

(1) Blake’s circle has been drawn slightly smaller than in previous years, thus excluding, for example, Edward Young and Robert Blair (whose works were illustrated by the artist, just as those of Dante and Milton or the Bible, but whom he did not know personally), while retaining entries for such figures as Cowper or Erasmus Darwin (contemporaries at least, whose inclusion is nevertheless open to discussion, I think).

(2) Part III is the only section of the checklist which—by necessity—is selective rather than extensive in its coverage. Its contents have been assembled (and subdivided) according to the following few guidelines. First there are entries for some general studies of British Romantic poetry and art which either mention Blake’s works in a larger context and/or are thought to have some bearing on the interpretation of these works, and/or have been reviewed in the pages of this journal. Then, I have included here a selection of books and articles on what might be termed Blake’s “outer circle,” i.e., some contemporary authors and artists who may have been influential for his productions here or there, and who are not covered in any other subject bibliography that is known to me. Since the history of Blake scholarship—during the next decade or so—is bound to become a major field of study in itself, part III also includes entries for biographical and critical assessments of some influential Blake scholars and collectors (and even lists the printing of two of Foster Damon’s poems). Reports on poetical, theatrical, or film adaptations of Blake’s works, as well as statements concerning their influence on modern contemporary art and literature, make up the final section of part III. I have decided, however, to omit adaptations of Blake’s poems by recording artists such as Marianne Faithfull, who quotes from “The Tyger” in her “Eye Communication,” or Sting, who re-
fers to the "dark satanic mills" in his "We Work the Black Seam."

(3) Brief annotations have been provided for at least those book-length studies which to my knowledge have not hitherto been the subject of extensive reviews, and to a number of articles the titles of which I thought were not fully self-explanatory. These annotations follow the bibliographical information in square brackets. Prices have been quoted where available.

(4) I have agreed with the editors to adopt (with very few exceptions) for the formal presentation of the bibliographical data the rules and regulations laid down by Walter S. Achtert and Joseph Gibaldi in The MLA Style Manual (New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America, 1985). This explains the punctuation of the entries, which differs slightly from our earlier lists, and explains the use of certain standard abbreviations such as "U" for "University," or "P" for "Press." The items in each section are arranged in strict alphabetical order by name of author and title. At least in the reviews section of earlier editions of this checklist I often attempted a chronological sequence where the same book had been reviewed more than once; now, these entries have been alphabetized by the reviewers' names and, for easy reference, have also been numbered review by review.

From the foregoing it should be fairly evident that something can be done (and maybe even has to be done) about the organization and the scope of parts II and III in the future. I shall be grateful for any suggestions made by those who work with these checklists.

Finally, it gives me great pleasure to record my indebtedness to those friends and colleagues who have shared some bibliographical information with me or have kindly sent offprints from their articles (which is always very helpful): Rodney M. Baine, Stephen C. Behrendt, G. E. Bentley, Jr., Martin Butlin, Claudia Corti, Morris Eaves, Helen B. Ellis, Robert N. Essick, Michael Fischer, David S. Fuller, Marilyn Gaull and Maurizio Giammarco, Mark L. Greenberg, Jean H. Hagstrum, Nelson Hilton, Terence A. Hoagwood, Traude Kannengiesser, Donald Masterson, Horst Meller, Edward O'Shea, Morton D. Paley, Francois Piquet, Kathleen Raine, Aquilino Sánchez Pérez, Wilhelm Schlink, and Joseph S. Viscomi. The Darwin section would not be half so well informed without the expert knowledge of Desmond King-Hele. Also, I wish to thank all those publishing houses, museums, and journal editors in Britain, Italy, Japan, and the United States who have kindly supplied me with inspection copies and have thus contributed largely to the accuracy and completeness of the present list. Any omissions that remain, will, of course, if brought to my attention, duly be recorded in next year's compilation.

Part I
William Blake
Editions, Translations, Facsimiles, Reproductions

4. Keynes, Geoffrey, ed. To the Nightingale. By William Blake. Isle of Ely: Waterside P, 1981. [This edition, printed privately and limited to 100 copies which are signed by the editor, consists of only two printed crown quarto pages of text, the first of which contains the poem itself, and the second a "Statement" concerning its attribution to the author of Poetical Sketches. This attribution has also been made in an article for the Book Collector and a Nightingale anthology, compiled by the late Sir Geoffrey in collaboration with Peter Davidson; see Blake/An Illustrated Quarterly 16 (1982): 114, #80; 18 (1984): 100, #6.]

See also #110 for a complete printing of Blake's Song of Los, and #119 for a newly attributed poem.

Note: An asterisk beside an entry on the list identifies an item that I have not examined.
Bibliographies, Bibliographical Essays, Catalogues


17. [Haddad, Rosemary, Christopher Heppner, and Elizabeth Lewis]. A Catalogue of the Lawrence Lande William Blake Collection in the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections of the McGill University Libraries. Montreal, PQ: McLennan Library/McGill U, 1983. $60. [A limited edition of 500 numbered copies, only 400 of which are for sale. A fine collection, and a catalogue printed on fine paper; the compilation of the entries, however, does follow standard librarian practice, which is not particularly illuminating for a figure like Blake, whose works have already—and more than once—been the subject of competent bibliographical description. The contents of the Lande collection can best be compared with those of the Preston Blake Library; the catalogue of the latter, published by Westminster City Libraries in 1969 and 1976, is similar in scope, but was sold at a much more reasonable price.]

18. Hawcroft, Francis W. "The most beautiful art of England." Fifty Watercolours, 1750-1850. Manchester, Lancs.: Whitworth Art Gallery, 1983. [Blake was represented by no less than four out of the fifty works in this exhibition; they are here catalogued as #17-20.]

19. Loder, Robert W. William Blake to David Hockney: A Private Collection of British Prints. Oxford, Oxon.: Ashmolean Museum, 1982. £0.75. [This leaflet was published to accompany an exhibition of some of the finest works in the Loder collection, staged at the Ashmolean from 5 Feb. to 28 Mar. 1982. Besides a brief foreword by Kenneth Garlick, it contains an introduction and a list of the exhibits by the collector, including eleven Blakes, one Linnell, four Calverts, and thirteen Palmer prints. See also #10, above, for another exhibition catalogue with materials from the same private collection.]


See also #198 below.

Critical Studies

26. Adkins, Camille. "In Adam's Room: Incarnation of the Divine Image in Paradise Lost and Jerusalem." Dissertation Abstracts International 45 (1984): 1404A. Texas Christian U. ["... Blake ... shared Milton’s interest in the concept of incarnation. Both poets uphold the Protestant assertion which entitles each individual to private judgment in matters of conscience. This individualism leads Milton and Blake to unique perceptions of the myths which underlie Paradise Lost and Jerusalem—the myth of Genesis, the fall and redemption of the Sophia, several mystic marriages, including that of Eros and Psyche. ... Milton perceives a God who is all light, whereas Blake recognizes light and darkness in divinity."]


32. Beer, John. William Blake 1757–1827. Writers and Their Work 277. Windsor, Berks.: Profile Books, 1982. £1.50. [A brief introduction to Blake's work (46 pp. of text), obviously designed to replace Miss Raine's text of 1951 in the same series (3rd ed., 1969). The select bibliography has been augmented and brought up to date (pp. 47–52), but retains most of the misprints of publication dates of the earlier editions and adds a few new ones.]


42. Bentley, G. E., Jr. "["Tyger' and 'Lamb': A Question Easy to Pose, Yet Hard to Answer,]" Guo-wai Wen-xue 15 (1984): 86–113. [An essay on Blake's Songs, printed in no. 3 of the 1984 volume of this Chinese journal on the foreign languages—not only the first of Bentley's articles I have seen in Chinese characters, but also the first time I have come across Chinese versions of Blake's poems; I couldn't read either.]
43. Bentley, G. E., Jr. "The Way of a Papermaker with a Poet: Joshua Gilpin, William Blake, and the Arts in 1796." Notes and Queries 33 (1986): 80-84. [In a "Postscript," which has not yet been published, the author presents additional evidence that — alas! — leaves no doubts as to the identity of Gilpin's Blake: he was the writing engraver William Staden Blake of Exchange Alley, not the painter-poet as Bentley had assumed when submitting his article in 1985.]


53. Brown, James Boyd. "The History of an Illusion: The Meaning of the Four Zoas in Blake's The Four Zoas." Dissertation Abstracts International 44 (1984): 3385-86A. York U, Canada. [Intended "to demonstrate two hypotheses. The first is that each of the Zoas has an essential core of meaning which can be understood by 'translating' it into regular English words. . . . My second hypothesis is that the poem has a referential structure: its plot presents Blake's view of the history of man."]


62. Cushing, James Byers. "The Figure of the Poet: Self-Representation in Young, Blake, and Wordsworth." Dissertation Abstracts International 44 (1984): 3387A. U of California, Irvine. [Treats Blake's Night Thoughts designs as a critical comment on Young, and The Four Zoas as responding "to Night Thoughts in its (the poem's) focus on the figure of the poet, Los, and his struggle to represent himself."]


65. Dörbecker, D. W. "Grant's 'Problems in Understanding' Some Marginalia." Blake/An Illustrated Quarterly 18 (1984-1985): 185-90. [Part of the public debate between one of the editors of the Clarendon edi-
tion of the Night Thoughts designs and some of its reviewers; see also #89, 140, and 148, below.]


73. Essick, Robert N. "A 'New' Blake Engraving?" Print Quarterly 2 (1985): 42–47. [Discusses an engraving showing the "Carfax Conduit, Oxford," signed "Blake sc.," and probably to be attributed to the poet-engraver William Blake. The graphic style and subject of Carfax Conduit support the attribution made possible by the signature in the plate. Although this assemblage of evidence is far from conclusive, it is at least as convincing as the reasons for attributing to Blake a number of book illustrations of the 1770s generally included in his canon without hesitation.] (p. 47)

74. Essick, Robert N. "Variation, Accident, and Intention in William Blake’s The Book of Urizen." Studies in Bibliography 39 (1986): 230–35. [Demonstrates that a loose impression of Urizen 4 originally had been intended for inclusion in copy G and thereby defines the extent to which accidents in the printing process may have affected the texts of Blake’s illuminated books—brief, but important.]


88. Grams, Paul Mueller. "Blake’s Antinomianism." Dissertations Abstracts International 45 (1985): 2110A. U of Michigan. ["This study focuses on the theological expressions in Blake’s pre-1800 writings to demonstrate that Blake held antinomian beliefs from the start of his artistic career."]


109. Hoagwood, Terence Allan. *Prophecy and the Philosophy of Mind: Traditions of Blake and Shelley.* University, AL: U of Alabama P, 1985. $23.50. [The author specifies the philosophic sources which helped to shape *Jerusalem* and *Prometheus Unbound* and attempts to establish the philosophical impact that he believes these poetic creations can justly claim: “Prior relations subsisted between Christian biblical commentaries and secular philosophies of mind, but the poets’ splendid unification of these traditions is revolutionary.” (p. ix)]

110. Holloway, John. *Blake. The Open University/Arts (A Third Level Course, ser. A362: “Romantic Poetry,” units 2–3).* Milton Keynes, Bucks.: Open UP, 1984. [Holloway’s coursebook on Blake’s “Romantic Poetry” is concerned with his writings up to *The Song of Los*, which is reprinted in its entirety from Stevenson’s 1971 edition as “Appendix 2.” The three epics, however, remain unstudied. The booklet is structured by a succession of introductory and interpretative chapters on Blake’s “lyrics and *Thel,*” on the *Marriage* and the “Prophetic Books” of the 1790s; these chapters are interspersed with “Questions and Problems” addressed to the reader. There are 57 pages, complete with text extracts and a list for further reading. A television program which was connected with the Open University course concentrated on Blake’s art and was presented by David Bindman.]


118. Kemeny, Tomaso, ed. *Seminario sull'opera di William Blake*. Pubblicazioni della facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Pavia 30. Proc. of a Conference at the Istituto di lingua e letteratura inglese. Jan. 1982. Florence, It.: Nuova Italia, 1983. Lit. 10'000. [This volume of conference papers from Pavia presents Claudia Corti on Blake's "poetic iconism," Marcella Quadri on word and image in Blake's oeuvre, Carla Locatelli on "tautology" in the *Songs*, Roberto Sanesi on Blake and Newton, Rossana Bossaglia on Blake and the "problem of the predecessors of symbolism," and the editor on Blake and Joyce. The publication of the booklet attests to how firmly Italian Blake scholarship has been established at English Departments on the peninsula during the past four or five years.]


126. Linkin, Harriet Kramer. "The Search for a Transcendent Language: Linguistic Strategies in Herbert and Blake." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 46 (1985): 989A. U of Michigan. ["George Herbert and William Blake are two poets who devise poetic systems or metaphors that attempt transcendence by mimetically representing the infinitude hidden within the mundane, secular, or experientially bound universe. Though Herbert and Blake disagree on the specific nature of immanence, both believe language provides a means of approaching their visions of sublimity."]


137. Meller, Horst. "Gedichstruktur und die ungelösten Antagonismen der Realität: Blake's 'London-


159. Raine, Kathleen. *Blake and the City*. Academ­
ic Inn Discussion Papers 7. London: privately printed for the Academic Inn, Institute of Directors, 1984. [The text of a lecture given on 20 Nov. 1984. According to the bookdealer Julian Nangle of Words etcetera, only 100 copies of this leaflet have been printed.]


165. Rothenberg, Molly Anne. "Blake's Higher Criticism: Rhetoric and Re-Vision in Jerusalem." Dissertation Abstracts International 46 (1985): 973A. U of California, Irvine. ["I argue that Blake wrote Jerusalem in order to teach his readers to recognize the rhetorical strategies by which sacred texts are constructed so that he could liberate his readers from the institutionalized, oppressive effects of the interpretative conventions of traditional exegesis."]


170. Shabetai, Karen. "Blake's Perception of Evil." Dissertation Abstracts International 45 (1984): 1762A. U of California, San Diego. ["... examines the connection between Blake's idea about evil and his theory of perception. I locate contradictions in Blake's ideas about theodicy, which have to do with the problems he encounters when he posits the internal world as the exclusive source of creativity, and with a system of meaning that depends on the psychological state of the perceiving subject. ... I concentrate on Blake's illustrations to Milton's Comus, early versions of the Experience poems, and his Job illustrations."]


179. Taft, Richard Tomlinson. "The Relationship between Art and Philosophy: An Examination of Hegel, Blake, Nietzsche and Heidegger." Dissertation Abstracts International 45 (1985): 3367A. Duquesne U. ["In Chapter 4 the works of William Blake and Friedrich Nietzsche are discussed because each attempts to transgress the traditionally established boundary between art and philosophy."]


183. Van Schaik, Pamela. "Blake's Vision of the Fall and Redemption of Man: A Reading Based on the Contrary Images of Innocence and Experience." Dissertation Abstracts International 45 (1984): 1411A. U of South Africa. ["This thesis explores Blake's vision of the Fall of Man, and his restoration to Eden, in terms of the poet's
consistent use of contrary pairs of images to denote the ‘States’ of Innocence and Experience. It attempts to provide a matrix for Blake’s images, and to demonstrate the unity and coherence of his symbolic vision by relating the symbols of his poetry to those of his visual art.’’]


186. Warner, Janet A. Blake and the Language of Art. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen’s UP, Gloucester, Glos.: Sutton, 1984. $29.95. [This study is concerned with “a kind of visual vocabulary,” “with a set of visual forms, gestures and attitudes of the human body,” which were repeatedly used in Blake’s designs. As in her earlier articles, the author’s “approach to Blake is from design to poetry” and attempts “to demonstrate the variety and importance” of the artist’s “visual shorthand.” Thus, Warner’s “central concern” is to show “to what extent Blake’s formula-figures stand alone as symbols and to what extent their meanings are defined by the context in which they appear.” (pp. xvii–xviii)]


189. Wetenhall, John. “Blake’s Sketches for ‘Hamel­let.’” Burlington Magazine 127 (1985): 229. [A letter to the editor, discussing the subject and date (c. 1805–06) of Bulfinch’s #74 recto and verso, #75, 140, and 547(5).]

190. Whitmarsh-Knight, David Edward. “Structure as a Key to Meaning in William Blake’s The Four Zoas.” Dissertation Abstracts International 45 (1984): 1764A. U of New Brunswick. [“This dissertation provides virtually a line by line textual analysis and critical commentary of . . . The Four Zoas which traces the poem’s mythology and plot, helps reveal Blake’s conscious craftsmanship, and relates the poem’s parts to the work as a whole.”]


192. “William Blake: Prints and Drawings.” National Galleries of Scotland News May/June 1986: n. pag. [An anonymous announcement of a small studio exhibition of the Blake holdings at the Department of Prints and Drawings of the National Gallery of Scotland which was to be seen at The Mound from 3 May to 13 July 1986.]


196. Zimmerman, Daniel John. “What Are Those Golden Builders Doing?: A Study of Blake’s Poetics of Reception.” Dissertation Abstracts International 44 (1984): 3075A. State U of New York, Buffalo. [“William Blake’s poetics establishes his authority to divine and revise the received word in two dimensions, contention and combat, each of them twofold. . . . Examined in this framework, the dynamics of Blake’s poetic ‘moves’ suggest the need to enlarge reception theory with imaginative ‘fit auditors’ of inspiration in poet and reader alike . . .”]

Part II
Blake’s Circle

General Studies

197. Bindman, David, ed. The Thames and Hudson Encyclopaedia of British Art. London: Thames and Hudson, 1985. £10.50. [Contains entries on most of the artist members of Blake’s circle (Barry, Bartolozzi, Blake himself, Calvert, Flaxman, Fuseli, Gillray, the two classicist Hamiltons, Jeffreys, Kauffmann, Payne Knight, Linnell, Louthenbourgh, the Master of the Giants, Mottimer, Opie, Palmer, Richmond, Romney, the Runciman, Stothard, Varley, and West), and with short articles on history painting, Boydell’s Shakespeare Gallery, the industrial revolution, neoclassicism, the Royal Academy, Shoreham, and the sublime will make a most useful work of reference for anybody interested in British art of Blake’s—or, in fact, any other—period.]

198. Lister, Raymond. Great Images of British Printmaking: A Descriptive Catalogue 1789–1939. London: Garton, 1978. [Published in conjunction with an exhibition at Garton’s gallery; prints by Blake, Richmond, Calvert, Palmer, and the British neoromantics who were influenced by them, figured largely in the show (see #2–6, 9, 10, 18 and 19 of this catalogue).]


203. McNamara, RuthAnn. "The Theme of the Learned Painter in Eighteenth-Century British Self-Portraiture." Dissertation Abstracts International 44 (1984): 3526A. Bryn Mawr College. [Examines "the interpretation of the ideal of the learned painter in eighteenth-century England as revealed in the self-portraits of Hogarth, Reynolds, West, Barry, and Fuseli. . . . In the fourth chapter, the self-portraits of Barry and Fuseli are examined as examples of the ambivalence created by the clash between the ideal of the learned painter and the growing strength of the concept of original genius. Finally, Blake's total rejection of the premises upon which the ideal of the learned painter rested is seen as heralding the decline of the influence of the notion of the learned painter in eighteenth-century England."


William Staden Blake


Edward Calvert

See #19, 23, and 198 above, as well as #250, below.

William Cowper


210. King, James. "Some Additions and Corrections to 'New and Corrected Cowper Correspondence.'" Notes and Queries ns 30 (1983): 63. [See also #223, below.]


See also #114, above, and #240 and 319, below.

George Cumberland

224. *Cumberland, George. The Captive of the Castle of Sennaar. Ed. G. E. Bentley, Jr. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Avero, 1983. £14. [This entry was lifted from the current edition of British Books in Print; G. E. Bentley, Jr., however, now informs me that his edition of Cumberland's narrative so far has not been printed at all, but may be available from a different publisher in 1987–88.]

See also #260, below.
Erasmus Darwin


John Flaxman


Henry Fuseli


237. *Grizzi, Corrado, ed. Füssli e Dante. Milano, It.: Torre de’Passeri-Pinacoteca di Brera, 1985. [An exhibition catalogue, reported to contain a series of essays on Fuseli’s early and important “discovery” of Dante’s poetry as a subject for the visual arts.]


William Hayley


244. *Bishop, Morchard [i.e., Oliver Stoner]. "William Hayley [sic] and His Last Printer." Book Collector 31 (1982): 187–200. [Includes the publication of almost seventy letters exchanged between Hayley and the family of William Mason, who became Seagrave’s successor as Hayley’s favorite printer.]


John Linnell

See #19, above.

Samuel Palmer


247. Butlin, Martin. "Connoisseurship and the Palmer Fakes." Blake/An Illustrated Quarterly 19
George Romney

252. Burkett, Mary E., ed. George Romney 1734-1802. Kendal, Cumbria: Abbot Hall Gallery, 1984. [The catalogue of a small exhibition, shown from 5 July to 2 Sept. 1984 in Romney's home county to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the artist's birth. Besides ten oil paintings, a selection of thirty-nine pencil, pen and ink, and wash drawings were on show. The small catalogue also contains a four-page essay on "George Romney and His Drawings" by Gerhard Charles Rump.] See also #10 and 19, above.

John Varley


Part III

Works of Related Interest

Some General Studies, Mostly of Romantic Art, Poetry, and Their Historical Context


264. Cave, Kathryn, ed. The Diary of Joseph Far­lington. Vols. 13-16 (Jan. 1814 to Dec. 1821). Studies in British Art. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 1984. £90. [The entire text of the diary has now been printed; despite the annoying number of typographical as well as editorial errors that have already been detected, the sixteen volumes certainly mark a major achievement for all future "Studies in British Art" of the times of William Blake. A detailed editorial commentary and the much needed index are said to be forthcoming.]


268. Dobai, Johannes. *Die Kunstliteratur des Klassizismus und der Romantik in England*. Vol. 4: "Registerband." Comp. Katharina Dobai. Berne: Benteli, n.d. [1984]. DM140. [On more than 300 pages these indexes supply an indispensable guide to the astonishing riches of the previous three volumes of Dobai's monumental "Prolegomena." It is to be regretted, however, that illness prevented the author from contributing a list of errata et corrigenda for vols. 1–3 to the present publication, the compilation of which he entrusted to his daughter.]


270. Frye, Northrop. "The Survival of Eros in Poetry." *Romanticism and Contemporary Criticism*. Ed. Morris Eaves and Michael Fischer. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1986. 15–29. [Frye's essay is not directly concerned with the poetry of Blake; it was originally read to a class of students participating in a course on "The Romantic Self," offered by Eaves and Fischer in 1982–1983 at the Department of English of the University of New Mexico; it is here printed together with the students' questions and Frye's answers, however, and there the author tells his audience how he has learned his "views of Christianity more or less from Blake." (p. 29)]


**Some Contemporary Artists, Collectors, and Connoisseurs**


Some Contemporary Authors


316. Poovey, Mary. The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Woll­­stonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen. Women in Culture and Society. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1984. [“Man’s Discourse, Woman’s Heart: Mary Wollstone­craft’s Two Vindications” is on pp. 48–81; Wollstone­craft’s Letters and Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman are
discussed in the following chapter on pp. 82–113.]  
319. Tysdahl, B. J. *William Godwin as Novelist*. London: Athlone P, 1981. £15 cloth/£5.95 paper. [Discusses "links between social forces and mental disease" as interpreted by Godwin, Cowper, and Blake; see pp. 143–45.]  

**Some Blake Scholars and Collectors**  
323. Greenberg, Mark L. "Relentless Quest for Association Copy." *AB: Bookman's Weekly/Antiquarian Bookman* 68.11 (1981): 1587–96. [Relates the story of the author's (successful) search for William Bell Scott's transcript and tracings from Blake's Notebook. See also #90, above.]  
339. Wilmerding, John, ed. *Essays in Honor of Paul Mellon: Collector and Benefactor*. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1986. [Ryskamp's contribution to this *festschrift*, an article on Mellon and Blake, is listed separately as #166, above.]  

**Blakean Echoes in the Twentieth Century**  
340. *Adams, Hazard. Joyce Cary's Trilogies: Pursuit of the Particular*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State UP, 1983. $20. [In the words of one reviewer, "in the theoretical discussions (of this book) Blake overwhelms Cary" and the "Blake-allusiveness in Cary's work" is said to be "carefully documented;" see #346.5, below.]  
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452. Poovey, Mary. The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen. Reviewed by (1) Nancy Armstrong, Modern Language Notes 99


The Apocalyptic Sublime
Morton D. Paley
In the first study of the apocalyptic art of the late eighteenth to late nineteenth centuries Morton Paley considers the works of West, de Loutherbourg, Blake, Turner and others and offers a hypothesis for the flourishing of this particular art form.

“Professor Paley has defined and described his subject with originality and persuasiveness.” —G. E. Bentely, Jr.

The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt
“The Body of the Public”
John Barrell
What is the function of painting in a commercial society? John Barrell discusses how British artists and writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including Sir Joshua Reynolds, William Blake, and James Barry, attempted to answer this question. His provocative and illuminating book offers a new perspective on both art criticism and eighteenth-century British culture. Illus. $30.00

Also available
The Paintings and Drawings of William Blake
Martin Butlin
“Remarkable . . . Blake specialists, rejoice!” —William Feaver, The Observer
919 b/w + 120 color illus. Two-volume set, $300.00

Yale University Press
Dept. 437 92A Yale Station New Haven, CT 06520
The Allegorical Female Figure: She Cometh With Clouds

Michael J. Tolley

Christopher Heppner’s article on an obscure drawing, in Blake, 20 (summer 1986), is given an over-confident title: “Blake's 'The New Jerusalem Descending': A Drawing (Butlin #92) Identified.” After reading it, I find myself unpersuaded about almost every submission of importance that he makes, even the new reading “GOG” for what was formerly read as “525.” I am, however, prepared to go along with the identification of the male figure at the lower left of the design as Gog, because there is nothing inherently implausible about it. Whether Blake wrote the inscription seems still doubtful; the proposed analogy, capital letters in The Making of Magna Charta, is suggestive but unpersuasive, both because of their relative thinness of line and because there the lettering is deliberately archaic. What I cannot accept is Heppner’s strange methodology. He explains the obvious (Gog in Ezekiel is to be related to Gog in Revelation and might have contemporary political implications for an artist in the late eighteenth century) by the obscure (eighteenth-century biblical commentary), ignores obvious difficulties, blinds us with irrelevant light (Dürer’s and Duvet’s treatments of the New Jerusalem), and fails to present or consider adequately the necessary evidence.

What is first required in an exercise of this kind is a clear description of the design. Heppner’s description is perfunctory and cannot be checked thoroughly against the reproduction, which is itself obscure and has even been trimmed. This unfortunate fact is crucial, because one simply has to be able to see all the lettering on the book in the bottom left corner of the page before one may propose a new reading. What one can see does not tally very happily with what Heppner claims to have seen after a “close look at the original drawing.” Until I can take such a close look myself, or see reliable photographs, I am not about to propose a new reading. Unfortunately, the reproduction in Butlin (plate 102 of The Paintings and Drawings of William Blake, Yale UP, 1981) is far too small to be of help; all one can say about this photograph and the one which accompanies the article is that they make one wonder why so early a date is given for the drawing. However, apart from this inscription, one would like to know exactly what objects are in the lower part of the design, and whether there is an inscription, perhaps a monogram, just below the corner of the woman’s hem, at right.

A thesis should be tested against objections. Heppner grants that the New Jerusalem does not descend in Revelation 20, when Gog is described, but can claim only that this narrative “leads directly to the Last Judgment and the descent in chapter 21 of ‘the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.’” This is to jump a wide stretch of narrative. Scripturally, there is no authority for having Jerusalem descending into a confused rabble and so Heppner argues that “Blake is not illustrating Revelation and Ezekiel directly, but is rather illustrating—or creating—a prophetic text of his own, based on, but not limited by, the language of those earlier prophets.” This proposition may not be as daft as it sounds, but one needs a much stronger reason for advancing it than any of those adduced by Heppner; it has an air of desperation. Is Blake really, to quote Heppner again, “creating a new but implicit text, founded on the prophets but constituting a new virtual text of his own invention?” The question is begged but not answered.

“New Jerusalem” seems too narrow an identification: Blake may be alluding to her, but his real subject may well be Truth or Wisdom; the spiked crown suits such a figure better than it might Jerusalem as a bride. The design seems very close in spirit to “The Voice of the Ancient Bard.” I am surprised that Heppner did not relate it to two Resurrection designs in the Night Thoughts series, 1 (31E, The 1797 Night IV Title Page) and 264; supposing that we can find better information about this drawing, it should be possible to read it (not necessarily as a resurrection subject, of course) in a thoroughly Blakean manner; it has some affinities, also, with the account of the descent of Jesus in the Clouds of Ololon at the end of Milton. This is an interesting question, because one is bound to wonder whether the woman is “coming in the clouds” (in which case, why is she a woman?) or simply dispelling them (in which case, why is she to be seen as “descending,” rather than, say, “manifesting herself”?).

In note 7, Heppner’s remarks on the Matthew Henry commentary may be misleading to Blake readers. He implies that the “completed commentary” was not available until 1811. My own complete edition is dated 1721. What happened, as Darlow and Moule explain, is that “Before his death he had reached the end of Acts, and the New Testament was afterwards finished by a number of Nonconformist divines. . . . The edition of 1811 contains additional matter from Henry’s manuscripts.” Darlow and Moule, incidentally, is usually the place to go for this kind of information, not DNB. See Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English
Bible 1525–1961, revised and expanded from the edition of T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule by A. S. Herbert, London and New York, 1968, p. 241. The preface to volume 6 gives credit to Henry for much of the substance of that volume (Epistles and Revelation). But why drag in Henry, when all one needs is a Bible with marginal references or a Cruden or "what every Sunday school girl knows"?

The New Jerusalem Defended
Christopher Heppner

It is clear that Michael Tolley finds my essay irritating. It is not so clear that he finds it as unpersuasive as he originally claims, since he is "prepared to go along with the identification of the male figure . . . as Gog," and accepts the claim that "Blake may be alluding to" the New Jerusalem in the female figure. That grants my argument a fair amount of what it claims, and I could simply thank Tolley for his grudging and discourteous support and leave it at that. But he raises enough interesting questions that I welcome the opportunity to both answer him and develop further aspects of my own argument.

Tolley's complaints about the reproduction have some justification. The original photograph is of good quality, and the reproduction is in most respects up to Blake's usual high standard, but there has been a little trimming along the edges. All I can do is confirm that the reading given in the essay of the letters on the scroll at bottom left, hypothetical though it be in some cases, is the best I can do, with one exception. Inadequate proofing on my part allowed the omission of an apostrophe between the capital "L" and "G" of the third line.

It is not clear whether Tolley doubts my reading of the word "GOG," or simply doubts whether it was Blake who wrote it. On the first question, I can only reiterate that it looks like "GOG" to me, and that hypothesis helps explain the hardware at the bottom of the design. On the second question, I was careful in the essay not to make a categorical assertion that Blake himself wrote the word. I believe that he did, but there remains the remote possibility that we are dealing with a case analogous to the informed interpretations of plates in copy D of the "New Testament" of 1575. Darlow and Moule call Henry's work the "most popular of English commentaries." It is clear that Henry in the female figure. That grants my argument a fair amount of what it claims, and I could simply thank Tolley for his grudging and discourteous support and leave it at that. But he raises enough interesting questions that I welcome the opportunity to both answer him and develop further aspects of my own argument.

Tolley's complaints about the reproduction have some justification. The original photograph is of good quality, and the reproduction is in most respects up to Blake's usual high standard, but there has been a little trimming along the edges. All I can do is confirm that the reading given in the essay of the letters on the scroll at bottom left, hypothetical though it be in some cases, is the best I can do, with one exception. Inadequate proofing on my part allowed the omission of an apostrophe between the capital "L" and "G" of the third line.

It is not clear whether Tolley doubts my reading of the word "GOG," or simply doubts whether it was Blake who wrote it. On the first question, I can only reiterate that it looks like "GOG" to me, and that hypothesis helps explain the hardware at the bottom of the design. On the second question, I was careful in the essay not to make a categorical assertion that Blake himself wrote the word. I believe that he did, but there remains the remote possibility that we are dealing with a case analogous to the informed interpretations of plates in copy D of Europe. In any case, the name seems genuinely explanatory, and I can think of no reason why anyone should write on the design a number that so carefully follows the outline of a figure. A glance ahead to the Epitome of James Hervey's "Meditations among the Tombs" will show that there too names have a strong tendency to follow the outlines of the bodies to which they refer. The evidence available suggests that the inscription reads "GOG," and that Blake wrote it, though whether at the time of executing the drawing or at some later date I shall not attempt to decide.

Having rejected, in whichever mode, my reading of the brief inscription that is clearly visible, Tolley wishes to find one that is hidden in the slight lines below the right corner of the woman's hem. I cannot see such a text in the photograph, nor did I see one while looking at the original drawing. Perhaps another pair of eyes will have better luck.

Another point on which Tolley expresses doubts is the date of the design. Butlin writes simply "A typical wash drawing of the 1780s." On stylistic grounds that dating seems appropriate, and I see no reason to question it. Tolley refers to the possibility of finding "better information" about this drawing; that would be pleasant, but for the moment we must work with what we have.

Having objected to my use of obscure biblical commentary, Tolley finds fault with note 7 for potentially misleading readers, and for an inappropriate reference. He has part of a point here. The essential part of my note, that the commentary on Ezekiel quoted in the essay was published by 1710, is correct. But the note does imply that the completed commentary was first published in 1811 and that, as Tolley points out, is incorrect. My error originated in the ambiguity of the account of Henry in the DNB., which does not give the date of the first complete edition, and so permitted my misapprehension. However, Darlow and Moule also fail to give the date of the first complete edition, and do not list the edition of 1721 which Tolley owns. In fact, their account, which was very likely part of the original edition of 1903, reads like a brief synopsis of the DNB account, which was published not long before that. In addition, the "Preface to First Edition" of Darlow and Moule makes it clear that "Commentaries are omitted, unless they contain a continuous text," so that their work is not a reliable guide to the world of biblical commentary. So I apologize for the potential of my note to mislead, albeit in a direction irrelevant to the essay, and I probably should have consulted Darlow and Moule, though in this case they would not have helped very much. On another issue they were helpful; as if to counter the charge that I used overly obscure material (Mede? Pareus? Newton? Lowth?) Darlow and Moule call Henry's work the "most popular of English commentaries."

The question of the spiked crown is a real and interesting one which I neglected in the essay. As so often in art the meaning of a particular motif is largely determined by the context. Crowns in Blake's work frequently bear negative connotations; they are signs of kingship, or of a variety of often negative allegorical functions based on the notion of power. In the Night Thoughts draw-
nings, for instance, Young's Oppression, Life, Earth, Fortune, and Eternity are all figured as crowned women (NT 22, 105, 106, 185, 210, 435, 456), as is the Great Whore (NT 345). But a very different tradition is recorded in "To Spring" (E 408), where Spring is invited to put his "golden crown" upon the head of the "love-sick land" in token of celestial marriage. This tradition appears again in The Book of Thele, where "he that loves the lowly," and has bound his "nuptial bands" around her breast, has also given the Clod of Clay "a crown that none can take away" (E 5). I believe that the new Jerusalem's crown is a sign of her adornment as a bride, in accord with this Blakean symbolism of the 1780s.

It is time to turn to Tolley's central objection to my essay, which is to the "strange methodology" he intuits behind my daftness. That methodology, though that is much too grand a term, simply accepts and articulates further Blake's own understanding of his procedure. This is not to claim that he consciously thought things through in exactly this way on each occasion.

Blake's several comments on the work of inventing a design (e.g., "All but Names of Persons & Places is Invention" [E 650], the note on The Ancient Britons [E 542-45], A Vision of The Last Judgment passim) point to the model of a two-stage process, which begins usually from a text, and then organizes and/or transforms that to produce a virtual or second-order text. Such a virtual text enables Blake both to distance himself in whatever direction he chooses from the values, implicit or explicit, embodied in the initial text, and to produce a structure which can articulate and control the interrelationships between figures in the completed design.

Perhaps the most significant text on this matter is Blake's statement that "what Critics call The Fable is Vision itself" (E 554). I believe that "Fable" is here Blake's term for what I have defined as the virtual or second-order text, and that "Vision" is his term for the total meaning of that Fable, which I would define as the product of both the pictorial realization of the second-order text and the relationships between that and the initiating text.

In the case of the present drawing, I reconstructed a typologically based second-order text which combined elements from Ezekiel with elements from Revelation to produce a narrative or Fable which brought Gog and the new Jerusalem into immediate relationship with each other. Tolley accuses me of jumping a "wide stretch of narrative" in going from Gog as described in Revelation 20 to the descent of the new Jerusalem in Revelation 21. A central purpose of the essay was to sketch in a background of typologically based exegesis which bridged that apparent gap by seeing an analogy with the sequence in Ezekiel which moves from Gog to the description of the temple of the Lord. Tolley seems to believe that "all one needs is a Bible with marginal references," and so protests that "Scripturally, there is no authority for having Jerusalem descending into a confused rabble . . . ." But a typological reading of scripture can produce such a scene, and in fact did so in the sixteenth-century tapestry which I described briefly in the essay. Perhaps if Tolley had paid more attention to typology, which was the point of my use of the "obscure," he might not have been so scandalized by my exposition of the "obvious."

The kind of typologically based structure that I reconstruct has its roots in the Protestant tradition of commentary on the prophets of the Old and New Testaments, and I sketched in something of that commentary. I did not claim that Blake had read any specific portion of it, but he certainly might have, and I would claim that that way of thinking formed part of his intellectual weaponry.

Blake saw the Bible as "the Great Code of Art" (E 274) because it provided "every pathetic story possible to happen. . . . All that can happen to Man in his pilgrimage of seventy years" (E 161), and the defeat of Gog and the revelatory descent of the new Jerusalem are two such basic events. Such stories have a tendency to move into and shape Blake's imagery, just as they form the foundation for many of his designs. Among the texts that Tolley suggests might have been related to the drawing under discussion is "The Voice of the Ancient Bard" (E 31-32).

There is indeed an analogy between the drawing and the poem, and it exists because Blake probably had the descent of the new Jerusalem in mind as the archetype behind the "opening morn" of the poem, and the defeat of Gog and his armies as the archetype behind the fallen and the "bones of the dead" (cf. Ezekiel 39:4-16). I do not think that the poem sheds much direct light on the drawing, but both seem structured out of the same basic images.

Tolley's suggestion that Blake "may be alluding to" the new Jerusalem, but "his real subject may well be Truth or Wisdom," raises several issues and problems. To bring Gog, a historically oriented figure from prophecy, into relation with figures from moral allegory is in itself fraught with difficulty, and is to substitute Allegory for "The Fable [that] is Vision itself." The notion of the "real subject" of a design is difficult in a way that can be illustrated by looking at Blake's description of Number IV of A Descriptive Catalogue: "A Spirit vaulting from a cloud to turn and wind a fiery Pegasus—Shakspeare. The Horse of Intellect is leaping from the cliffs of Memory and Reasoning; it is a barren Rock: it is also called the Barren Waste of Locke and Newton" (E 546). Specific meanings are here fitted into a structure of imaginative action derived from contemplation of a poetic text. But is the "real subject" to be described as "A Spirit vaulting from a cloud to turn and wind a fiery Pegasus," or as "The Horse of Intellect is leaping from the cliffs of Memory and Reasoning"?
I would argue that the confounding of Gog by the descent of the new Jerusalem is the visionary Fable that gives center to the meaning of the design. Having recognized that Fable, we can if we wish proceed to allegorize it into a variety of contexts, as Blake himself did when he wrote that “Jerusalem is called Liberty among the Children of Albion” (E 203). In the essay I explored briefly the contemporary political context as one possible meaning that could be fitted into the structure; certainly others are possible, and if Tolley wishes, in effect, to call Jerusalem ‘Truth or Wisdom,’ I am content, though I hope he would allow Liberty as another name. As Blake wrote in a different but related context, “Tell me the Acts, O historian, and leave me to reason upon them as I please” (E 544).

Tolley suggests several designs with which I might have compared the design I discussed. At some level such comparisons can be very helpful, but too often easy analogies between surface elements leave the underlying structure of a design in darkness, as I have argued elsewhere happened with the color print known as Hecate. I therefore resist what seem premature attempts to get at the Vision by seeing every motif in a design in terms of Blakean motifs from other works. Specifically, the suggestion that I should have related this design to the Resurrection designs (nos. 1, 264) in the Night Thoughts series I find unhelpful. Both show a male, Jesus; the first shows him ascending, the position of the legs making the upward, gravity-defying surge quite clear (see Janet Warner, Blake and the Language of Art, 122–49). In contrast, the new Jerusalem, though the position of her arms is similar to that of the arms of Jesus in NT 1, has her left leg bent underneath her at the knee; the figure has no upward moving energy at all. The position of Gog in the design, moving and leaning towards the left, strongly implies that the female figure is descending and displacing him from the center. Night Thoughts 264, the second of Tolley’s suggested comparisons, shows how Blake handles a figure in process of “manifesting;” it represents Jesus’ head, arms, and upper torso emerging out of darkness towards the viewer. It bears no similarity at all to the drawing I discuss. Comparison with the account of the descent of Jesus in the Clouds of Ololon would seem equally unhelpful.

I thank Tolley for his commentary, but for the time being I stand by both my method and my reading of this particular work. I look forward with interest to whatever interpretation Tolley may in the future offer of this “obscure drawing” — though it is a moot point whether that adjective remains appropriate.

Blake, Context and Ideology
Stewart Crehan

Stuart Peterfreund’s review of my Blake in Context, Blake, 19 (winter 1985–86), shows, once again, that while the liberal text can be encompassed and “deconstructed” by the Marxist text, the Marxist text can only be ignored or misread by the liberal text. Peterfreund begins by stating that writers such as Bronowski, Schorer, “and above all, Erdman,” have already dealt with the social and historical context of Blake’s poetry and art, “but not, apparently, to Crehan’s satisfaction.” Although I do not say so in the book, I did not find Bronowski’s pioneering study satisfactory, though it was one of my starting points. Erdman’s work was an inspiration, as will be evident from the references, and the fact that I followed Erdman in foregrounding the phrase “Republican Art,” used as the title for chapter 8. The tone of Peterfreund’s comment implies, however, that Bronowski, Schorer and Erdman have closed the case on the context issue, a fear I myself began to harbor until I realized that some areas (especially that of ideology) still needed to be explored, and that new approaches were possible. But Peterfreund oversteps the bounds of academic propriety when he attributes to me the view that “the discussion of Blake’s artistic form and practice has been dominated by ‘formalists’ such as Erdman and Anne K. Mellor (see pp. 240–45), who hold power in the academy and insist that the ideology in Blake’s art be de-emphasized or ignored outright.” In the pages cited, Anne K. Mellor is not even mentioned, and nowhere do I attach the label “formalist” to Erdman, or to Mellor. Indeed, my criticism of Mellor’s approach (pp. 260–62) is that it is not formalist enough: “Such a loose, generalising approach, which interprets the bounding line or enclosed form as the work of an oppressive reason,” fails to appreciate the fact that meaning, execution and design in Blake are subtly and necessarily interwoven” (p. 261). As for David Erdman, in a personal letter to me dated 21 January 1985, he graciously said of my book that it would help others writing on Blake “to get a better sense of Blake’s context,” and that “All of us who study and teach Blake will benefit—and our students especially—from your book. Thank you for writing it!” Had I regarded Erdman as some kind of establishment enemy, as Peterfreund tries to insinuate, it is highly unlikely that he would have responded so favorably.
A quotation from my discussion of metrics leads to a more serious misreading. Blake, I say, "pushed the freedom principle further than any other English Romantic poet, even to the extent of writing a free verse poem—the first of its kind in English" (p. 31). Peterfreund says: "The poem Crehan has in mind is Jerusalem, which supposedly makes good Blake's intention to move away from the decasyllabic line and thus avoid 'any "Augustan" relapse into some easy, confident expectation or passive observation' (p. 31)." First, the poem Crehan has in mind is not Jerusalem, as is clear from the context. The poem he has in mind is the short free-verse Argument at the beginning of The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, which opens: "Rintrah roars," and is introduced on page 33: "The next stage, then, is free verse itself. . . . Nowhere do I refer to Jerusalem as a "free verse poem." But Peterfreund evidently wants to put in my mind that which will serve his own project Jerusalem (which I am supposed to champion as the apotheosis of formal freedom, against everything I say elsewhere) is used to advance Peterfreund's own undialectical approach to literary history. Concerning "To the Public," Peterfreund says: "What Crehan does not seem to realize is that most of what Blake has to say in the paragraph under discussion refers, in a highly self-conscious manner, to the statement entitled 'The Verse' which prefaces Paradise Lost." Why I should be thought unaware of such an obvious quotation is quite beyond me. Let me simply refer Peterfreund to my note on the same passage on page 249 of my William Blake: Selected Poetry and Letters (Pergamon, 1976), to clear him of any misapprehensions. Blake's self-conscious repudiation of blank verse involves both a repudiation of Milton and, at the same time, through the use of the phrase "modern bondage," a recognition of Milton's contribution towards such a metrical revolution. But the dialectics of transcendence are lost on Peterfreund, who sees both Blake's and Milton's metrical innovations simply as a return to the past. The key word here is "modern" (rather than "bondage").

"If Blake really intends to repudiate the poetic past, including the Miltonic source of his very words of repudiation, Blake does so more in the service of convention than in the service of freedom, authenticating his vision in relation to his poetic precursors just as Milton had authenticated his vision in relation to his precursors." From details of metrics we have wandered into "vision." But this vision, according to Peterfreund, depends for its authenticity, within its own terms, not on Poetic Genius, or Imagination, or Inspiration, but on the Letter—on written tradition, and memory of that written tradition. According to Blake, "As a man is, So he Sees. As the Eye is formed, such are its Powers. You certainly Mistake, when you say that the Visions of Fancy are not to be found in This World. To Me This World is all One continued Vision of Fancy or Imagination. . . ." Peterfreund would presumably add that none of this was authentic for Blake until it had been stamped by the authority of certain "poetic precursors." While we are on this topic, do poets have given precursors, like people have ancestors? Or do poets select their own precursors? And if they select their own, in what sense are they a validating authority? Why, in particular, was Milton a precursor for Blake, rather than Pope or Shakespeare? What makes a poet anyhow? Peterfreund's glibness suddenly betrays an appalling superficiality.

Let us return to the text in question. What Milton says (and Peterfreund quotes) is that his rhyme-less poem should be "esteemed an example set, the first in English, of ancient liberty recover’d to Heroic Poem from the troublesome and modern bondage of Rimming." The invocation of ancient rights and liberties was, of course, the accepted rhetoric of the seventeenth-century parliamentary cause. Milton is proclaiming his verse as "the first" of its kind in English. In other words, as something new. In quoting "the Miltonic source of his very words of repudiation," Blake is not serving "convention," or tiring himself to the past, but self-consciously placing his own work as the next stage in the metrical revolution after Milton, rejecting blank verse itself as "derived from the modern bondage of Rhyming." I had, I confess, thought all this too obvious to go into, not realizing that for some, nothing is obvious. (The comparisons I make between Miltonic and Blakean epic on pages 292–98 are a critical analysis of Blake's attempt to transcend Milton.)

Peterfreund's way of thinking is further illustrated when, referring to Enlightenment rationalism, he says: "As a notebook poem like 'Mock On Mock On Voltaire Rousseau' makes clear, the cure for such rationalism is hebraic vision, not bourgeois or popular revolution." Peterfreund does not explain his handy catchphrase. However, if it has anything to do with Mosaic law and the God of the Old Testament, we should bear in mind Blake's annotations to Watson's Apology for the Bible, where he defends a notable Enlightenment rationalist and revolutionary, Thomas Paine. (I ought to point out that I do not share Peterfreund's simplistic view of Blake's relationship to Enlightenment rationalism.) Paine, according to Blake, "only denies that God conversed with Murderers & Revengers such as the Jews were, & of course he holds that the Jews conversed with their own State Religion which they call'd God & so were liars as Christ says," adding: "That the Jews assumed a right Exclusively to the benefits of God will be a lasting witness against them & the same will it be against Christians." Not much "hebraic vision" there. But then it all depends what is meant by the phrase. In a late letter to
George Cumberland (12 April 1827) Blake speaks of "Newton's Doctrine of the Fluxions of an Atom, A Thing that does not Exist." However, the last stanza of the notebook poem cited by Peterfreund reads:

The Atoms of Democritus
And Newton's Particles of Light
Are sands upon the Red sea shore,
Where Israel's tents do shine so bright.

(my emphasis)

Instead of simply denying the existence of atoms and particles, the poem imagines how, perceived from a synthesizing viewpoint, they are transformed. In the synthesizing vision, they "Are" Red Sea sands and shining tents; viewed prophetically, "every sand becomes a Gem" (stanza two). For Blake, the atomizing mentality justifies a social order in which "minute particulars" (human beings) are reduced and hardened into "grains of sand"—a profound critique, as I show on pages 78-84, of both analytical philosophy and the alienating isolation of the individual under the new capitalism. For the catchphrase "hebraic vision" to mean anything at all, it would have to include such a critique, one that relates, as I point out on page 41, to a major Blakean insight: the ideological nature of perception. For some reason, Peterfreund associates the situation Blake describes as the 'sands along the Red sea shore / Where Israel's tents do shine so bright' with the "final stage of the socialist revolution," i.e., the millennium. Why?

Even if we accept that the lines allude to the Israelites' encampment after the crossing (Exodus in fact only mentions the Israelites encamping before the crossing), there is nothing necessarily millennial here. The Israelites still had a long way to go, and many difficulties to overcome, before they would see the Promised Land. On one level, then, the phrase "shine so bright" connotes faith in the certainty of final victory, rather than celebration of an achieved "final stage."

Peterfreund objects to the way I connect the lines: "You accumulate Particulars, & murder by analyzing, that you / May take the aggregate; & you call the aggregate Moral Law" with passages from Capital, informing us that what Blake "is actually talking about is the effect of pharasaical codification on one's perception of divinity in the world." Like Thomas A. Vogler, reviewing Morris Eaves' William Blake's Theory of Art (Studies in Romanticism, 24 [summer 1985]), I am always suspicious of those who, with an air of magisterial authority, tell us what Blake is "actually talking about." If the Blakean text were so transparent, Blakean criticism and interpretation would have dried up long ago. Blake's "actual" words are, in fact, merely given another pseudo-Blakean gloss by Peterfreund. Every "explanation" of the Peterfreund type thus leads to another: every decoding becomes another encoding. In this way, the tedious business of interpreting, paraphrasing and explaining to the unintiated what poets are "actually talking about" helps to keep the mill-wheels of the academy turning. While I do not claim that my own gloss mirrors more faithfully what Blake is "actually talking about"—I leave that to Peterfreund—I would claim that by placing the passage in which the quoted lines occur in the context of contemporary philosophical, scientific and economic discourse, I am at least able to suggest the historical and ideological resonances of the precise words used, namely: "accumulate," "Particulars," "analyzing," "aggregate," and "Moral Law." Instead of rewriting Blake, which invariably means concocting a prosaic pseudo-Blake ("the effect of pharasaical codification on one's perception of divinity in the world"), I tried, through the contextual approach, to show how the Blakean text refracts contemporary ideological discourses, grapples and battles with them, and seeks, through its various literary strategies, to absorb, criticize, and finally transcend them.

Blake in Context is, as Peterfreund obsessively reiterates, a Marxist analysis. Its faults I would now be the first to acknowledge, especially the tendency towards reductionism and "economistic" Marxism. Nevertheless, its discussion of visual art (praised by other critics as the most original part of the book) best demonstrates its thesis, and it may be for this reason that Peterfreund has chosen to completely ignore these crucial chapters. Instead, he pillories me for being "completely oblivious (or willfully impervious)" to earlier statements by Morris Eaves, notably an article in Publishing History, 2 (1977), which addresses one of the central concerns of my book: the artist as independent producer. Here I plead guilty. I did not know the article. What Eaves, quoted by Peterfreund, says, is that "Blake's artistic decision to become an independent publisher" was "a landmark in the history of publishing" because "he was far more aware than most others of why he was doing it." Nothing to argue with there. My own view, carefully elaborated throughout the book, is that Blake's independent stand was a radical yet logical extension of the Romantic project (the emergence of "a freely creating individual" whose source of creativity lies within his "own" personality and way of perceiving—what Caudwell calls the quintessential bourgeois illusion); a break with Tory patronage and Royalist norms; an attempt to "absorb the role of the spectre, the commercial middleman" (p. 16); a utopian reaction against the middle-class art market and the reduction of art to a commodity, a reaction that is also part of a new historical phenomenon—"the Radical, plebeian intellectual and self-educated artist or craftsman who is now emerging as a potent force for change" (pp. 143-44); a revival of the medieval illuminated manuscript tradition, combined with a conscious enhancement of the print, unparalleled in the history of art; a triumph of anti-illusionism, "visionary art" and the lin-
earist tradition, impossible without an independent stand; a craftist reaction, anticipating William Morris; an aesthetic revolution (unity and interdependence of text and illustration, word and image); a series of technical innovations (etching technique, color printing, etc.) foreshadowing Walter Benjamin's argument that any artistic challenge to the dominant production relations must also revolutionize "the techniques and forces of artistic production" (p. 242); an insistence on the unity of conception and execution, separated in the patron-protégé relationship, as with Hayley; an assertion of the central importance of creative labor, and so on. In sum: "Blake was always his own printer and bookseller—not out of some Crusoe-like, do-it-yourself crankiness, but for important artistic and ideological reasons" (p. 148).

Ignoring this analysis, Peterfreund says: "Eaves succeeds in his book, while Crehan fails in his." By way of reply, I would refer Peterfreund to Vogler's review of William Blake's Theory of Art, which "undoes" Eaves' text by revealing, and thus deconstructing, its recurrent metaphors of private property. Far from equipping us with a historically objective account of Romantic ideology, which Blake in Context explicitly attempts, these metaphors remain imprisoned in that ideology. As Jerome McGann says: "the scholarship and criticism of Romanticism and its works are dominated by a Romantic ideology, by an uncritical absorption in Romanticism's own self-representations." To quote Vogler: "Eaves' argument is thus informed by a paradigm of class structure which privileges the isolation and monadic autonomy of the bourgeois subject, and 'behind' his theory of art there would seem to be a theory of the subject in consumer or late monopoly capitalism." One could go further: Eaves' 'monadic' paradigm is even given determinate form by the subject of Eaves' own discourse: William Blake.

We come, finally, to the most astonishing remark in Peterfreund's review: that in chapter 10 I seek to show "that the aptness of [] social and artistic analysis rests on a hitherto undiscussed tradition of working-class English radical protestantism," and that if this tradition had not existed, "Blake, Marx (perhaps), and Crehan (certainly) would have found it necessary to invent it! I am hardly the first to view Blake's work in the light of this radical, millenarian tradition. Denis Saurat began to do so as long ago as 1929. The many references in my book to Edward Thompson's classic study, The Making of the English Working Class, and to related work by A. L. Morton, Christopher Hill, Jack Lindsay, J. F. C. Harrison, and others, including David Erdman, are proof enough. One is left with the astonishing conclusion that Peterfreund himself thinks that such a tradition has been "hitherto undiscussed." His remarks about having to invent it even indicate a certain careless indifference as to whether it existed or not. I would not insist that an intimate knowledge of this tradition is essential for readers of Jerusalem, or that writers of pseudo-Blake need to brush up on their working-class history to be clear on what Blake "is actually talking about." However, if I were ignorant of such a tradition, I would not feel particularly proud of the fact, especially if I claimed to know something about the Blakean millennium. Peterfreund evidently is proud, and for this he surely deserves an award of some kind. His attitude shows star quality.

Peterfreund's last little dart is that my book was written in Zambia (in fact, it was written in England) and needs buttressing with "more evidence of careful and reputable research." Dutiful, graduate-style buttressing was a preliminary stage, admittedly; after four or five years I was able to get rid of the scaffolding, and to resist the temptation to fill the book with counter-arguments and refutations. The task was not easy, but in Blake studies, one has to be selective. I decided, in other words, to let the argument speak for itself, to present my ideas in a distilled form, rather than playing the academic game, in the possibly naive belief that no amount of buttressing compensates for a poverty of ideas. The principle was this: that when a building is complete, the scaffolding is removed, and that when a wine is bottled, no sediment remains. If Peterfreund likes sediment in his wine, that is up to him. Likewise, should he wish, at some future date, to rifle my book for his own scholarly purposes without acknowledging his source (I particularly recommend the comparison between Blake's Jerusalem and Richard Brothers' Description of Jerusalem on pages 348-49), then that is also up to him. What he should not do is pretend, with First World arrogance, that he has something spiritually in common with Blake because he can trot out a phrase such as "hebraic vision." The school of Blake is a hard school, especially for reactionary academicians (whom Blake, we know, detested). For the likes of Peterfreund, who have made it their profession to twist revolutionary thought into its opposite, I doubt if it is possible to gain access to what Blake "was actually saying" at all, despite pretensions to the contrary.

Reply to Stewart Crehan
Stuart Peterfreund

When a book review of some 3000 words occasions an angry author’s response of approximately equal length—a response that accuses the reviewer of, among other things, “First World arrogance” and “twist[ing] revolutionary thought into its opposite,” and strongly implies that the reviewer should be numbered among the “reactionary academicians (whom Blake, we know, detested)”—it is tempting to spend another 3000 words to engage the author on each point raised and to defend or amend one’s original assessment of the book. In a sense, Stewart Crehan makes such a project unnecessary. The tone of his response, in which he once again does all he can to alienate those who would hope to engage him in productive dialogue regarding Blake’s historical, social, and intellectual contexts, suggests that his repeated imputations of misreading and misunderstanding may have a basis. But that basis is not a liberal ideology and a “liberal text” by which “the Marxist text can only be ignored or misread,” but “the Marxist text” itself, at least if his text be taken to be what he intends by the appellation “Marxist.”

The result of undertaking a dialectical analysis that divides the world into opposing camps of “liberal” and “Marxist,” “reactionary” and “revolutionary,” and valorizing the latter at the expense of the former is that one tends to lose sight of the possibility that the very heuristic by which he identifies other ideologies may, itself, be an ideology. Just as it is not possible simultaneously to use language and to be “outside” of it, it is not possible to discuss ideologies and be outside of them, especially since language is predisposed because prestructured to create ideologies in the very act of discussing them.

Even Marxist critics as astute as Fredric Jameson, who have done much to gain a secure and respected place for Marxist approaches to literary studies, have been held to account on precisely this point. In an important discussion of *The Political Unconscious* (1981), James H. Kavanaugh, writing in “The Jameson-Effect” (*New Orleans Review*, 11 [spring 1984]), identifies Jameson’s notion of “untranscendable horizons” as his means of deemphasizing the ideological status of his own discourse and suggests that a proper Marxist critical praxis engages the problem of ideology by the sort of critical intertextuality adumbrated by the visionary conversation that occurs at the end of Blake’s *Jerusalem*. In Kavanaugh’s closing words, “Jameson’s properly ideological discourse must be completed by ‘other’ Marxist theory that recognizes the very limited validity of look-
neither Blake nor his art wholesale. If the context had done so, there would be little to choose between the engravings of William Sharp, whom Crehan discusses, and those of Blake. And there is something to choose between them.

In the final analysis, I neither credit the position of Anne K. Mellor that Crehan attacks, namely, "that Blake 'formed a distinctly personal style,'" nor do I credit his position that it was a style entirely determined by an external context. In arguing over whether "things happen" in the life-world because of innate, personal or external, social causes, Crehan falls prey to what is perhaps humanity's oldest and least productive hermeneutical conundrum. "Things happen" in the life-world as the result of both sorts of cause. Blake's visual art is in part of his time, but it is also heavily influenced by a religious commitment closely tied to his readings in gnosticism, especially those pertaining to the supplantation of the true story of the first creation by a false one. This supplantation is picked up by Warburton in *The Divine Legation of Moses Demonstrated* (1738-41), in his discussion of the manner in which the place of the original, "hieroglyphic" account of the creation (Genesis 2:4b-2:25) was usurped by that of a later Mosaic hymn (Genesis 1:1-2:4a). Thus while Blake may have used certain collectively recognizable artistic conventions and techniques of his time, he did so to the end of recovering the authentic hebraic vision that he identified with a usurped and betrayed gnosticism, epitomized by a "hieroglyphic" style successively debased by the civilizations of Egypt, Greece, and Rome. Speaking of context, this is a position that Blake probably assumed no later than the period in which he, as an apprentice to Basire, executed several of the engravings for Jacob Bryant's *A New System of Ancient Mythology* (1774-76), which argues that mythologies such as the Egyptian and the Greek are corrupted accounts of originals found in the Old Testament.

There simply is no place in Crehan's analysis of contexts for innate, personal causes such as religious commitment. He has occasion, for example, to refer to "Blake's ideological revolt" being "not merely a response to contemporary realities; it can also be seen as the continuation of hitherto submerged traditions" such as those of "the antinomians, Ranters, and other radicals of the seventeenth century" (pp. 7-8). But by assuming that these traditions offered Blake the option of discarding one preexistent ideology and taking up another, Crehan completely fails to understand that Blake may have actually harbored strong, personal religious beliefs, and that these beliefs may have been the result not of passive acceptance, but of the sort of vigorous conversation that begins in the Memorable Fancies of *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* and ends in *Jerusalem*. While I myself harbor no strong religious commitment (raised in Reformed Judaism, I remain a secular Jew), I would think twice before dismissing as ideological the religious agenda that informs both Blake's verbal art and his visual.

It strikes me that this rejoinder has grown oblique, and I apologize for that. Moreover, I apologize to Stewart Crehan for having, in a few instances, mistrans the intent or the substance of his comments. Whether it is the fault of the author or the reviewer, it was not always clear to me that Crehan's intent was "equipping us with a historically objective account of Romantic ideology," especially since the ideology was alternately discovered underwriting the Romantics themselves and their later critics, not the ideology underwriting the critics the same as the one underwriting the Romantics, as it is for McGann. It is finally difficult to know precisely what Crehan defines as ideology, except that anything so defined lies on the other side of the dialectical divide from that on which Crehan situates himself. This is not to say that good ideological analysis is impossible. McGann's is exemplary on a theoretical plane, while that of Maureen McNeil on the Lunar Society of Birmingham is exemplary on the practical.

One reason for the increasing obliqueness of this rejoinder and the occasional obtuseness of the review is that *Blake in Context* does not invite engagement. It is at once grandiose in its debunking of a good part of Blake studies and evasive in failing to provide well-buttressed alternatives, at once sweeping in its sociohistorical generalizations and question-begging in its attempt to situate Blake meaningfully in the contexts those generalizations evoke. In its taunting of bourgeois critics and spineless intellectuals for the benefit of an assumed intellectual proletariat, the book alienates precisely those with whom Crehan must close. But he wishes to keep his distance, apparently, and his tactic of dialectical analysis, replete with the bandying about of ideologies and ideological labels of all sorts is finally nothing other than a form of what in psychology is known as projection and denial. If there is a classic case of the syndrome in Blake, it is not Los, who becomes what he beholds, but Urizen, who compels others to worship a horizoned view of reality that he at once creates and denies responsibility for creating. If Crehan's is exemplary of "the Marxist approach to literature and art," there is little to choose between its "untranscendable horizons" and the bounding ones of the Urizenic landscape.
NEWSLETTER

DE-FACED BLAKE
Readers may have noticed a certain patchiness in the type of our fall issue, the unfortunate but unavoidable result of having some articles set in Albuquerque and some in Rochester. The patchiness will continue until all articles set in New Mexico have been published, perhaps as late as the summer and fall issues next year.

ERRATA'S ERRATA
Our readers might like to note these corrections to "Improving the Text of The Complete Poetry & Prose of William Blake" (Blake, fall 1986):

*Blake p. 50:
  p. xvii canterbury should read Canterbury
  *p. 148 Line 60: the error is "tsua" not "tsau"
  p. 482 Line 5 should read Line 6
  p. 487 After Line 32 insert t in the margin
  p. 489 should read ["The Crystal Cabinet"] Line 27 [etc.]

*Blake p. 51, after entry for p. 845 add:
  p. 850 Line 2 (from bottom): insert 32 Envy is free
  1st rdg del.
  p. 986 Line 5 (from bottom): 466 should read 446
  p. 990 Line 3: 488 should read 448

CALL FOR PLAYS
Actors Theatre of Louisville is now conducting a nationwide search for unpublished translations and adaptations of plays for next season's (1987–88) Classics in Context Festival—"The Romantics," which will celebrate the ideals and influence of Romanticism on the stage. Though plays by any dramatist whose work is associated with Romanticism will be considered, plays by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Friedrich Schiller, Ludwig Tieck, Alexander Pushkin, and Michael Lermontov are of particular interest. New plays (either original or adaptations of novels) that deal with the people, ideas, and events connected with Romanticism will also be considered. Please submit plays by 1 November 1987 to Actors Theatre of Louisville, Literary Department, 316 West Main Street, Louisville, KY 40202.

ENERGY AND THE IMAGINATION
Morton D. Paley would like to purchase a clean, unmarked copy of his Energy and the Imagination. If you have a copy and would like to sell it, please write to him at the Department of English, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.
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