



English Literature

ALEX PREMINGER

THE IMPORTANCE OF bibliographies to scholars working in the field of English literature has perhaps been shown most clearly by Raynard Swank in his study on "The Organization of Library Materials for Research in English Literature."¹ While this study did not conclusively settle the old controversy about the relative merits of catalogs, subject classifications, and bibliographies, it definitely pointed to the latter as the most useful tool in locating primary and secondary sources for the researcher in the field.

Most scholars would readily agree that the bibliographical coverage of English literature is highly developed and unsurpassed in range and depth by that of any other literature, ancient and modern. The one bibliography to which Swank again and again calls attention as most helpful to researchers is the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature (CBEL)*, edited by F. W. Bateson (Cambridge University Press, 1940 and New York, Macmillan Co., 1941). According to his investigations, it came closest to the "ideal scheme for the literary historian [which] would bring together the literary, critical, and background materials produced by particular periods and countries and the later secondary studies relevant to them."² Undoubtedly, one of the most fundamental bibliographies ever published in English, the *CBEL* has provided the groundwork for countless English literary studies. Selective but still vast in scope, it takes English literature from about 600 A.D. to 1900 for its province, assuming a broad definition of literature and excelling in its coverage of ancillary materials. Yet—as seems to be unavoidable in any large-scale project involving the cooperation of many contributors—it is an uneven work. Its not infrequent lack of proportion cannot always be accounted for by changes in literary reputation, and some of the bibliographies were out of date

Alex Preminger is Assistant Professor and Chief, Humanities Division, Brooklyn College Library, City University of New York.

English Literature

long before they saw print in 1940. In 1957 a *Supplement* (Volume 5, edited by George Watson) was added, listing new editions of the original texts, but concentrating above all on secondary sources: biography and criticism. Even with the *Supplement*, the *CBEL* is hardly any longer of central importance, but both the young scholar and the graduate student will find it a good place to begin their research.

For an introduction to more recent material, they might turn to such manuals as Richard D. Altick and Andrew Wright's *Selective Bibliography for the Study of English and American Literature* (2d ed., New York, Macmillan, 1963); particularly worthwhile are the critical comments "On the Use of Scholarly Tools"; they are expanded in Altick's *The Art of Literary Research* (New York, W. W. Norton, 1963); Donald F. Bond's *A Reference Guide to English Studies* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962), a revision of the *Bibliographical Guide to English Studies* compiled by Tom Peete Cross; and Arthur G. Kennedy and Donald B. Sands's *A Concise Bibliography for Students of English* (4th ed., Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1960; despite the title, the most comprehensive of the three manuals and particularly strong in its coverage of peripheral studies). In these guides the researcher will find references to such older titles as William Thomas Lowndes's *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature* (rev. ed. Henry G. Bohn, London, Bell, 1857-64, 6 vols.)—nineteenth-century predecessor of the *CBEL* and still occasionally useful today, especially for its comments on editions and prices; and Clark Sutherland Northup's *A Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1925), which is a detailed guide to more than 5,000 bibliographies and is supplemented by Nathan Van Patten's *An Index to Bibliographies and Bibliographical Contributions Relating to the Work of American and British Authors, 1923-1932* (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1934). Either of the three manuals will guide the user also to more recent compilations such as the *Annals of English Literature, 1475-1950* (2d ed., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1961), a work most useful for its chronological approach, listing the main books published each year, and to general bibliographies covering all subjects or multi-field compilations of which only a handful of greatest relevance to English literature can be mentioned in this article.

Perceptive—and, when needed, critical—comments on many bibliographical aids listed in the foregoing manuals are made by the editor of the *CBEL*, F. W. Bateson, in his *Guide to English Literature*

(Chicago, Aldine, 1965). Confronting the literature itself, he notes standard editions, biographies, historical and critical studies. In a fine chapter on literary criticism, he rightly points to the importance of René Wellek and Austin Warren's *Theory of Literature* (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1949; rev. 1956 and 1963); Wellek's *History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1955-65, 4 vols. to date); William Wimsatt and Cleanth Brooks's *Literary Criticism: A Short History* (New York, Knopf, 1957)—all of which include extensive bibliographies—and other more specialized studies and guides.

A wealth of bibliographical material is contained also in the standard histories, e.g., *The Oxford History of English Literature* (edited by F. P. Wilson and Bonamy Dobrée, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1945-63). While the extent of the bibliographical treatment varies in the nine volumes that have appeared so far, the authoritative studies by C. S. Lewis and Douglas Bush are equipped with a model bibliographical apparatus. However, some of the volumes in the series were published about twenty years ago and need updating.

Another important contribution was sponsored by the Committee on Literary Scholarship and the Teaching of English of the National Council of Teachers of English: *Contemporary Literary Scholarship* (edited by Lewis Leary and published in 1958 by Appleton-Century-Crofts) offers a critical review of fairly recent scholarship, dealing primarily with English literature. Similar is a European work, *Englische Literatur* (Berne, A. Francke, 1957) by the Swiss scholar Rudolf Stamm, who concentrates on English literature from 1500-1900. Lastly, *Writers and Their Work: Bibliographical Series of Supplements to "British Book News"* (1950- , published for the British Council and the National Book League by Longmans, Green) might be mentioned in passing. Dealing with a particular English author or with a genre or phase of literature, these critical essays include selected bibliographies.

As for current coverage, the following three annual bibliographies combined thoroughly comb the field:

(1) The English Language and Literature section of "MLA International Bibliography" (1956- ; from 1921-55 the listings were restricted to the work of American scholars), which appears in the May issue of *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (PMLA). While not exhaustive, this listing attempts reasonable completeness. It contains only items which have been actually seen by

English Literature

the bibliographers. Coverage of books and, in particular, journals is very extensive, including continental and East European sources.

(2) *The Year's Work in English Studies* (YWES) (1919-), which is published in London for the English Association, is more selective than the MLA bibliography, but it is of great value to the scholar who wants to find out if what has been written during the year is worth reading. It is, in fact, an annual review of the more significant books and articles published. In addition, it serves as an invaluable guide to trends in scholarship and fluctuations in taste.

(3) *The Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* (ABELL) (1920-) is sponsored by the Modern Humanities Research Association, a society of European and American scholars, and published by it in association with the University of Colorado Press. It is distinguished by its comprehensive international coverage and its network of contributors, some as far away as India, Japan, New Zealand, and South Africa. Like the MLA "Annual Bibliography," it is a finding list, and one would assume considerable duplication of entries between these two bibliographies. A few years ago, Lewis Sawin and Charles Nilon, both of the University of Colorado, investigated duplication in seventeenth-century entries in these two listings and discovered an unexpectedly low percentage of 21.⁸ Even if that figure is raised as the investigators suggested, the rate of duplication still seems small if one considers the fact that each bibliography makes an attempt at reasonable completeness. One explanation is that the ABELL includes more Commonwealth works and European titles in general than the MLA bibliography, which in turn indexes more little magazines and university publications. While ABELL does not evaluate publications as the *Year's Work in English Studies* does, it notes book reviews and, for important titles at least, continues to list them in the next year or two. A most serious shortcoming of both these tools has been their slowness in appearing, but after the war-caused delays they are now nearing their normal publication schedule. The 1962 and 1963 volumes of ABELL and YWES were produced with unusual speed, both seeing print during 1965 and thus rapidly closing the gap. The editors expect to begin a regular publication schedule with the 1964 volumes.

Another current bibliographical guide, though somewhat more limited in scope, is *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* (SEL) (Houston, Tex., Rice University Press, 1961-). A quarterly publication, it devotes its winter issue to the English Renaissance, the

spring number to the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, the summer issue to the Restoration and the eighteenth century, and the autumn number to the nineteenth century. Each issue contains a review article surveying and evaluating the significant work of the preceding year, including articles of special relevance or importance.

So much for bibliographies covering all aspects of the subject. As for the major divisions of English literature: fiction, poetry, and drama, few bibliographic aids deal with them throughout their entire history or even a major portion of it. For fiction, only one tool does so: Inglis Bell and Donald Baird's *The English Novel, 1578-1956* (Denver, Swallow, 1959). A checklist limited to twentieth century criticism, it has proved to be primarily a boon to the undergraduate. So has *Poetry Explication* (edited by George W. Arms and Joseph M. Kuntz, New York, Swallow Press and Morrow, 1950), which, as its subtitle indicates, is a checklist of interpretations since 1925 of British and American poems past and present. The volume, revised in 1962, is supplemented and brought up to date by the annual checklists of explications contained since 1944 in the journal *The Explicator*. For the drama, Blanch M. Baker's bibliography *Theatre and Allied Arts* (New York, Wilson, 1952), is still useful as a general tool. More recent is a remarkable Italian work, the *Enciclopedia dello spettacolo* (Rome, Casa Editrice Le Maschere, 1954-1962, 9 vols.; *Supplement, 1955-65, 1966*), with its expertly selected bibliographies. Truly international in scope, it yet yields more information on many phases and figures of English theatre than available reference volumes concerned with that subject alone. Of specific interest for the English drama are W. W. Greg's monumental descriptive *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (London, Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, Oxford, 1939-59, 4 vols.), G. William Bergquist's recent *Three Centuries of English and American Plays: A Checklist (1500-1800 in England; 1714-1830 in U.S.; New York, Hafner Publishing Co., 1963)*, and Allardyce Nicoll's six-volume *History of English Drama, 1660-1900* (Cambridge University Press, 1952-59), with its fine bibliographies. For a chronological record of all plays, acted or not acted, printed or not printed, extant or lost, Alfred Harbage's *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940), revised by Samuel Schoenbaum in 1964, is most helpful. Lastly, Carl J. Stratman's *A Bibliography of British Dramatic Periodicals, 1720-1960* (New York, New York Public Library, 1962), opening up rich sources on the history of the theatre in Great Britain,

English Literature

is worth mentioning, as is his "Dramatic Play Lists: 1591-1963," *New York Public Library Bulletin*, February and March 1966 (70:71-85 and 169-188), in which he evaluates practically all works containing lists of English plays.

Bibliographic tools dealing with fiction, poetry, and drama in the context of a period, will be found above. Period bibliographies are listed within three large chronological groupings: 600-1500, 1500-1800, and 1800 to the present.

600-1500.

Bibliographically the Middle Ages are not among the most thoroughly covered periods in English literature. Arthur H. Heusinkveld and Edwin J. Bashe's *Bibliographical Guide to Old English* (Iowa City, University of Iowa) is selective and—published in 1931—badly in need of updating. Wilfrid Bonser's *Anglo-Saxon and Celtic Bibliography (450-1087)* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1957) is much more recent but concerned primarily with history. It is of limited interest to the student of Old English literature, who will find it useful primarily as a guide to background material. For literary sources he will be better served by the bibliographies in the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, W. L. Renwick and Harold Orton's *The Beginnings of English Literature to Skelton, 1509* (London, The Cresset Press, 1939; Part 2 is an annotated listing of the most helpful studies), and such a standard history as George K. Anderson's *The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons* (Princeton University Press, 1949; a revised edition is in preparation). A special tool, Neil R. Ker's *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957) is invaluable for listing, describing, and locating literary (and other) manuscripts.

In Middle English, John E. Wells's basic *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1916), with its extensive bibliography and nine supplements, is being revised, updated, and extended to 1500. This project, under the general editorship of J. Burke Severs, has been under way for some ten years. Publication will be in the form of fascicles, the first of which is now in press. Lena L. Tucker and Allen R. Benham's *A Bibliography of Fifteenth Century Literature* (Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1928) is an attempt at a comprehensive recording of primary and secondary materials and must be supplemented by the alphabetical list of authors and anonymous writings in H. S. Bennett's *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1947). The

latter and E. K. Chambers' *English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1945)—both in the Oxford History series—supply classified and directive bibliographies.

In poetry, Carleton Brown and Rossell H. Robbins' *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, printed for the Index Society by Columbia University Press, 1943), with an important 1965 *Supplement* (Lexington, University of Kentucky Press) by Robbins and John L. Cutler, provides a conspectus of religious and secular poems from about 1100-1500. Its manuscript references are invaluable to scholars working in the field. As for the drama, Carl J. Stratman's thorough *Bibliography of Medieval Drama* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1954) includes collections of plays, bibliographies of bibliographies, and reviews of the more significant books. Much bibliographical material is available also in such standard histories as E. K. Chambers' *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903, 2 vols.) and Karl Young's *The Drama of the Medieval Church* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933, 2 vols.).

No large-scale specialized bibliography on Old English and Middle English literature is appearing in any of the learned journals as is the case for the Renaissance, the Romantic Movement, and other periods. Current coverage is supplied by the relevant sections in the MLA "Annual Bibliography," *The Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, the *Year's Work in English Studies*, and two mimeographed bibliographies. The latter are available five months earlier than the MLA bibliography, which they supplement in several ways. The *Old English Bibliography*, which is compiled by Fred C. Robinson, chairman of the Old English Research and Bibliography Committee of the MLA, contains additional titles, draws more material from Scandinavian as well as Russian and East European publications, records all reviews of books in the field, reports on recent and forthcoming reprints, and includes a section on works in progress. The *Chaucer Research Report* of the Committee on Chaucer Research and Bibliography, MLA, is edited by its chairman, Thomas A. Kirby, and consists of four parts: work in progress, completed work but not published, desiderata, and publications. These two mimeographed bibliographies, which ought to be more widely known, are distributed at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association to members of the Old English and Chaucer groups respectively, but are also available to other interested scholars.

English Literature

Renaissance to the End of the Eighteenth Century

A general indispensable guide to Renaissance studies is A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave's *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England . . . 1475-1640* (London, The Bibliographical Society, 1926), with its supplementary lists. Although not a census of copies, it informs users where copies can most conveniently be consulted. Yet this great work contains a good many bibliographical ghosts which will surely be laid in a revised edition that has been in preparation for a long time.

The best guide to English literature of the Renaissance is C. S. Lewis' authoritative *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1959) with its rich and detailed bibliography. Useful, too, as a guide to bibliographies covering the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is V. de Sola Pinto's compendium *The English Renaissance 1510-1688* (New York, R. M. McBride, 1938; rev. 1951). Not to be forgotten either are the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* and the forty-odd *Elizabethan Bibliographies* by Samuel A. and Dorothy R. Tannenbaum (New York, Samuel A. Tannenbaum). The latter range from Marlowe (1937) to Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* (1950) and are concise listings of primary and secondary works.

Shakespeare's unique position in English literature is strikingly reflected in the bibliographical apparatus surrounding him. Beginning with the massive and comprehensive bibliography by William Jaggard (*Shakespeare Bibliography*, Stratford-on-Avon, The Shakespeare Press, 1911), which contains about 36,000 entries, through the Walter Ebisch and Levin Schücking work and supplement, *A Shakespeare Bibliography*, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1931, 1937), to Gordon Ross Smith's *A Classified Shakespeare Bibliography 1936-1958* (University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1963; listing about 20,000 items for the years 1936-1958), the coverage is practically complete, except for the period between 1911 and 1936, for which no comprehensive bibliography exists. These years, however, are in part well served by the bibliographies in the *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* (Shakespeare Association of America, New York, 1924-49). The current period is thoroughly covered by annual bibliographies in the *Shakespeare Quarterly* (1950-), which list practically everything of interest to the Shakespeare scholar (and actor and producer), including excellent book reviews. The publication of Shakespeareana is so overpoweringly

large that it is difficult enough simply to list the current output and patently impossible to survey it critically. Nevertheless, the *Shakespeare Survey* (Cambridge University Press, 1948-), notable, too, for its articles reviewing the scholarship of the last half century on a particular Shakespeare topic; the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (Weimar, 1865-); the *Shakespeare Newsletter* (New York, 1951-) and, occasionally, the *Shakespeare Quarterly*, in addition to the *Year's Work in English Studies*, make heroic attempts to arrive at some kind of a preliminary evaluation.

What the Pollard and Redgrave *Short-Title Catalogue* is to the Renaissance, Donald Wing's *Short-title Catalogue . . . , 1641-1700* (New York, The Index Society, 1945-51, 3 vols.), together with its supplementary lists, is and more to the seventeenth century. The best annotated bibliography is provided by Douglas Bush in his *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660* (2d ed., rev., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962), which supplements and updates the relevant sections in the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*.

The latter is still the most helpful retrospective tool for the eighteenth century. James E. Tobin's *Eighteenth Century English Literature and Its Cultural Background* (New York, Fordham University Press, 1939) supplies critical and background materials and brief bibliographies of individual authors. Concerned with but one aspect of author bibliography is Iolo A. Williams, who in his *Seven XVIIIth Century Bibliographies* (London, Dulau & Co., 1924) lists the first editions of the following eighteenth-century authors: John Armstrong, William Shenstone, Mark Akenside, William Collins, Oliver Goldsmith, Charles Churchill, and Richard Brinsley Sheridan.

Various checklists provide a fairly continuous coverage of fiction for the period from 1500 to 1800. Sterg O'Dell furnishes *A Chronological List of Prose Fiction in English Printed in England and Other Countries, 1475-1640* (Cambridge, Mass., Technology Press of MIT, 1954) and indicates locations in libraries. Arundell Esdaile's *List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed before 1740* (London, East & Blades, 1912) is occasionally still useful because of its alphabetical arrangement and notes, but is otherwise superseded for the seventeenth century by Charles C. Mish's *English Prose Fiction* (Charlottesville, Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1952, 3 vols.) and for the first forty years of the eighteenth century by W. H. McBurney's *A Check List of English Prose Fiction, 1700-1739*

English Literature

(Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960). Chronological continuation is afforded by Andrew Block's *The English Novel, 1740-1850* (London, Grafton & Co., 1939; rev. ed., London, Dawson's, 1961), a work which is, however, not entirely trustworthy because of the author's undue reliance on secondary sources.

As for poetry, A. E. Case's *A Bibliography of English Poetical Miscellanies, 1521-1750* (Oxford, Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, 1935) needs to be supplemented by the list (extending to 1800) in the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. Two special bibliographies are devoted to one important feature of seventeenth-century literature, metaphysical poetry: Theodore Spencer and Mark Van Doren's *Studies in Metaphysical Poetry* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1939) and its continuation, Lloyd E. Berry's *Bibliography of Studies in Metaphysical Poetry, 1939-1960* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1964). The latter is a rather exhaustive work based on a search of over 1000 journals, a good part of which were not represented in the very extensive MLA "Annual Bibliography."

Drama is well provided for. In addition to the previously mentioned Greg *Bibliography*, the Bergquist *Checklist*, the Nicoll *History*, attention should be called to G. E. Bentley's *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1941-1956, 5 vols. to date), with its indispensable bibliographies, and *The London Stage, 1660-1800* (Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1960-1965, 4 vols. to date), which is a calendar of performances rather than a list of plays. Gertrude L. Woodward and James G. McManaway's *Check List of English Plays 1641-1700* (Chicago, Newberry Library, 1945) records plays and masques printed in that period. A supplement was compiled by Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville, Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1949).

Current coverage is excellent. The annual bibliography on "Literature of the Renaissance" which has appeared since 1917 in *Studies in Philology* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press) is both full and informative for English (and other literatures), including related background material. Annotations are given and reviews noted. Coverage extends to 1660 and continues in another remarkable annual bibliography, "English Literature 1660-1800," which is published in *Philological Quarterly* (Iowa City, University of Iowa, 1922-). Major items are annotated or reviewed, and ancillary sources listed. For the convenience of the user, the bibliographies for the years 1925-60 (so

far) have been collected by Ronald S. Crane and others and published by Princeton University Press (1950-62, 4 vols.). It would be appropriate to refer here again to the annual bibliographical surveys in *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* and, of course, to the pertinent portions of the MLA "Annual Bibliography," the *Year's Work in English Studies*, and the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*.

Nineteenth Century to the Present

Especially for minor authors of the nineteenth century the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* is still the best general source. Valuable, too, for initial research is T. G. Ehrsam, R. H. Deily, and R. M. Smith's *Bibliographies of Twelve Victorian Authors* (New York, H. W. Wilson, 1936), containing, as it does, fairly full listings up to 1934 for the most important Victorians, with the exception of Brown-ing, Meredith, and Hopkins.

For the modern period, *Contemporary British Literature: A Critical Survey and 232 Author-Bibliographies* by Fred B. Millet (3rd rev. ed., New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1935) is still a basic work. His bibliographies of authors born after 1850 are impeccable as far as they go but are more than thirty years out-of-date. More recent are the excellent selective bibliographies in John Mark Longaker and Edwin C. Bolles' *Contemporary English Literature* (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953) and David Daiches' *The Present Age in British Literature* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1958). Narrow in range but valuable for their special purposes are two older tools: Henry Danielson's *Bibliographies of Modern Authors* (London, *Bookman's Journal*, 1921; Series 2, by Charles A. and H. W. Stonehill, 1925) and John Gawsworth's *Ten Contemporaries: Notes Towards Their Definitive Bibliography* (London, E. Benn, 1932; Series 2, London, Joiner and Steele, 1933). The Danielson volume concerns itself with fifteen authors, ranging from Arthur Symons to John Masefield, and offers a complete collation of all first editions of their works. Gawsworth deals with minor writers (H. E. Bates, Stella Benson, etc.). Concerned with major authors is a recent volume in the Oxford History series, *Eight Modern Writers* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963), by J. I. M. Stewart, who furnishes a critical appraisal of the bibliographical aids available for Conrad, Lawrence, Joyce, and others.

Together with the brief but judiciously selected listings for the

English Literature

years 1900-1950 in the *Concise Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, 600-1950*, edited by George Watson; (2d ed., Cambridge University Press, 1965) the foregoing volumes provide a fair bibliographical coverage of the first half of the twentieth century. A convenient compilation, up-to-date and more comprehensive than any preceding bibliography of the period, will be found in Ruth Z. Temple's *Twentieth Century British Literature: A Bibliography and Reference Guide*, which will be released by Frederick Ungar in 1967. The listings in Part II (compiled with the assistance of Martin Tucker) of the more than four hundred authors selected are essentially complete for separately published works. Secondary materials usually consist of the standard bibliographies and studies. (Part I is an annotated subject bibliography and guide to reference and research materials.) The problems involved in compiling a bibliography of the present century are enormous: the masses of writings to be considered, the lack of critical distance and, partly related to it, the absence of a definitive literary history.

Aside from the general serial bibliographies—the MLA “Annual Bibliography,” the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, the *Year's Work in English Studies*—some first-rate period bibliographies are found in the learned journals. Material on the English Romantic Movement is set out, with descriptive and, when needed, critical annotations, in the international bibliography on “The Romantic Movement,” since 1964 in *English Language Notes* (Boulder, University of Colorado) and previously in *ELH: A Journal of English Literary History* (1936-48) and *Philological Quarterly* (1949-1963). Victorian literature is thoroughly recorded in the journal *Victorian Studies* (Bloomington, Indiana University, 1957-). Both bibliographies attempt to be comprehensive, appraise major works in their pages, note key reviews in other journals, and include considerable background references to the political, social, economic, religious, and intellectual scene. To facilitate the researcher's task, the Victorian bibliographies originally published in *Modern Philology* have been bound in two volumes entitled *Bibliographies of Studies in Victorian Literature . . . 1932-1944* and . . . *1945-1954*, edited by William D. Templeman and Austin Wright respectively (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1945 and 1956). It is still necessary to check each year, however, since the entries of the various years have not been integrated.

The latter part of the nineteenth century and the present century

are served by two bibliographies. *English Literature in Transition: 1880-1920*, a quarterly publication for the MLA Conference on English Literature in Transition (West Lafayette, Ind., 1957-), offering thorough and sometimes exhaustive bibliographies or checklists—witness two recent annotated bibliographies of writings about Rudyard Kipling and George Moore—and the annotated “Current Bibliography” appearing quarterly in *Twentieth Century Literature: A Scholarly and Critical Journal* (Denver, Swallow Press, 1955-).

Specific mention must be made of a number of bibliographical tools which focus on the major genres of the period.

In the current reappraisal of nineteenth-century literature, Victorian fiction receives a large share of critical and scholarly attention. There can be no doubt that adequate bibliographical aids are necessary for any serious literary student. Selective as it is, the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* can only be a beginning. Incomplete, too, is Andrew Block’s previously referred to *English Novel, 1740-1850*. By far the best bibliography in the field and the only truly descriptive one is Michael Sadleir’s *XIX Century Fiction* (London, Constable; Berkeley, University of California Press, 1951, 2 vols.). Yet Sadleir’s catalog, which records about 2,600 first editions, is highly selective and, incidentally, not confined to the best fiction of the century. There are other bibliographical lists but they are limited to special aspects. Lucien Leclaire’s *A General Analytical Bibliography of the Regional Novelists of the British Isles, 1800-1950* (Paris, Société d’Édition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1954) groups local-color novels according to counties but adds nothing new otherwise. A breakdown of Victorian fiction into various subject categories is Leo J. Henkin’s contribution in “Problems and Digressions in the Victorian Novel (1860-1900),” *Bulletin of Bibliography* (Vols. 18-20, 15 parts, September/December 1943-January/April 1950). A comprehensive checklist of nineteenth-century fiction remains to be compiled. For a critical survey of scholarship on Victorian novelists, a volume edited by Lionel Stevenson and entitled *Victorian Fiction: A Guide to Research* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1964) is indispensable. Additional references are available in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1945-) and another journal, *Modern Fiction Studies* (Lafayette, Ind., Modern Fiction Club of Purdue University, 1955-), which offers selected checklists of recent criticism on writers since 1880.

English Literature

The short story and the novelette since 1800 are treated in two rather similar compilations. Warren S. Walker's *Twentieth-Century Short Story Explication* (Hamden, Conn., Shoe String Press, 1961) supplies a bibliography of criticism published from 1900-1960. Supplements, covering 1961-63 and 1963-64 so far, keep the volume current. *Short Fiction Criticism*, compiled by Jarvis A. Thurston and printed in 1960 (Denver, A. Swallow), provides a checklist of interpretations since 1925. Both titles have become favorites with undergraduates.

Poetry is superbly served by three guides to research. Two deal with English Romanticism: *The English Romantic Poets: A Review of Research*, edited by Thomas M. Raysor (New York, MLA, rev. ed., 1956) and *The English Romantic Poets and Essayists: A Review of Research and Criticism*, edited by Carolyn W. and Lawrence H. Houtchens (New York, MLA, 1957; 2d ed., 1966). Both volumes complement each other. The third one is *The Victorian Poets: A Guide to Research*, edited by Frederic E. Faverty (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1956). Like the volume on *Victorian Fiction*, these three surveys have been sponsored by the Modern Language Association of America and include important evaluations of relatively recent biographical, critical, and bibliographical materials.

A very full but narrow source of current information is the annual bibliography of the *Keats-Shelley Journal* (New York, 1952-). Published by the Keats-Shelley Association of America, it is concerned only with Keats, Shelley, Byron, Hunt, and their circles. Its bibliographies—conveniently put between covers for the period July 1, 1950-June 30, 1962 and edited by David B. Green and Edwin G. Wilson in 1964—are meticulous (*Keats, Shelley, Byron, Hunt, and Their Circles*, Lincoln, University of Nebraska); its scope is extensive and international, drawing on Russian and Japanese publications among others. Of far wider range is the section on "The Year's Work in Victorian Poetry," a regular feature in the journal *Victorian Poetry* (Morgantown, W. Va. University, 1963-).

In the drama, Allardyce Nicoll's *History* and Stratman's *Bibliography of British Dramatic Periodicals, 1720-1960* must be referred to again. For current coverage, *Modern Drama* (Lawrence, University of Kansas, 1958-) offers in its September issue "A Selective Bibliography of Works Published in English" but not limited to English dramatists). In addition, it presents special selected bibliographies, such as "Yeats

and the Theatre." Likewise, the *Tulane Drama Review* (New Orleans, Tulane University, 1956-) which is very much concerned with the current theatre scene, prints in its summer issue an annual bibliography, which is a complete listing of all books in the theatre and related fields published in the United States.

Because they are too numerous, individual author bibliographies have not been included within the context of the period bibliographies. Only a few notable examples can be indicated here as well as some striking absences recorded. Like other bibliographies, author bibliographies can be divided into enumerative—given over primarily to the listing of titles—and descriptive—furnishing a minute and accurate description of the physical characteristics of the volumes listed. A fine example of a descriptive author bibliography is Geoffrey Keynes's *A Bibliography of William Blake* (New York, Grolier Club, 1921), which concentrates on the editions and manuscripts but also mentions secondary material. It is supplemented by G. E. Bentley, Jr., and Martin K. Nurmi's *A Blake Bibliography: Annotated Lists of Works, Studies, and Blakeana* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1964), which is an outstanding example of an enumerative bibliography and reflects the researches of the last forty years of scholarship and intense preoccupation with Blake. Another descriptive bibliography—but limited to primary sources—is J. J. Slocum and H. Cahoon's definitive *A Bibliography of James Joyce, 1882-1941* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953). Its enumerative complement—confined to secondary sources—is Robert H. Deming's *A Bibliography of James Joyce Studies* (Lawrence, University of Kansas Libraries, [Library Series, 18] 1964), which attempts to list and annotate all biographical and critical studies to the end of 1961.

Again like other bibliographies, author bibliographies are supplemented and brought up to date by listings in serial bibliographies, journals, especially those devoted to one author, e.g., the new *Chaucer Review* (1966-) or the *James Joyce Review*, (New York, 1957-) and such a general tool as the *Bulletin of Bibliography*.

English literature has a wide variety of author bibliographies, but many more are needed to please the researcher. There is, for instance no bibliography in book form for Gerard Manley Hopkins. No reasonably complete bibliographies are available for George Bernard Shaw, Shelley, Keats, or Matthew Arnold. In the case of another nineteenth-century writer, Thomas De Quincey, it may be doubted that we shall ever see a reasonably complete bibliography since no

English Literature

record exists of his widely scattered and generally unsigned contributions to periodicals.

From detailed author bibliographies to the *Dictionary of National Biography* is a wide step, but this may be as good a place as any to refer to this general bio-bibliography, which is of prime importance for English literary men. Practically every significant English author—if no longer living—has his niche here. The bibliographies that are part of the biographical articles are, of course, no longer up-to-date but they contain references to older titles which are still useful.

In addition to general, special, period, genre, and author bibliographies, two distinct types are deserving of some comment: manuscripts and dissertations. The scholar who needs to consult the original manuscripts of published or unpublished works is likely to find most of his material in three great depositories in Great Britain: the British Museum, the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and the libraries at Cambridge University. Printed catalogs of the manuscript holdings in the British Museum are available, but some are neither up-to-date nor wholly accurate. Most of the "name" collections will yield medieval and Renaissance manuscripts, while the so-called "Additional Manuscripts" are a mine of information on English authors of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries. Catalogs of their manuscript resources are also available at the Bodleian and Cambridge libraries. There are other bibliographical guides to the location of manuscripts which are discussed in Frank G. Burke's article on manuscripts and archives.

No survey of the literature of a field is complete without at least a glance at the vast and growing body of dissertations. Whatever may be their literary value, many unpublished dissertations are rich sources of untapped information and as such deserve consideration. English literature has nothing like *Dissertations in American Literature, 1891-1955*, (James Leslie Woodress, Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1957; *Supplement 1956-1961*, 1962) but—thanks to R. D. Altick and W. R. Matthews—scholars and graduate students specializing in Victorian literature have a comprehensive *Guide to Doctoral Dissertations . . . , 1886-1958*, written both at American and European universities (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1960.)

As for the rest, the researcher must consult ASLIB's *Index to Theses Accepted for Higher Degrees in Universities of Great Britain and Ireland* (1950/51-) and, for American dissertations, he must comb the lists published by the Library of Congress, and H. W. Wilson Co.,

as well as *Dissertation Abstracts* (1938-). Current listings of dissertations in progress are included in most of the publications listed in the section on research in progress on page 470.

Much work—although not readily accessible—is being done in foreign universities. German dissertations have been compiled, with some omissions, by Richard Mummendey in *Language and Literature of the Anglo-Saxon Nations as Presented in German Doctoral Dissertations 1885-1950* (Bonn, H. Bouvier; Charlottesville, Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1954), which needs to be supplemented by the *Jahresverzeichnis der deutschen Hochschulschriften, 1885-* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1887-). Current dissertations on English literature in German universities are also recorded in the *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* (Berlin, 1953-).

Potentially the most valuable supplements to bibliographies are abstracts. While in no way yet comparable to the great and long established abstracts in the sciences, *Abstracts of English Studies* (AES; Boulder, Colorado) has since 1958 been attempting to fill a definite need. An official publication of the National Council of Teachers of English, the AES now covers well over 1,000 periodicals in the field, including journals in peripheral disciplines which from time to time print articles pertinent to English studies. A major weakness is its lack of a good subject approach; its indexes (monthly, yearly and, in the future, cumulative) include far too few subject headings. Another shortcoming is the delay in the abstracting process. Some means for improving this service will be discussed in the section on "Future Prospects."

One way to keep abreast of new publications is to read book reviews assiduously. There is certainly no dearth of reviewing media; on the contrary, there seems to be an embarrassment of riches, and yet every year important scholarly volumes go begging for notice. At best they are reviewed—after an interval of two or three years—in the learned journals.

As far as the general reviewing organs are concerned, the English distinguish themselves by their consistently high level of criticism: *The Times Literary Supplement*, the *New Statesman*, the *Spectator*, and the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*—all weeklies in fact and numbering among their reviewers some of the best writers and poets as well as critics and scholars. Their American counterparts, the *New York Times Book Review*, *Book Week*, and the *Saturday Review*, have still not reached the same level of performance. A more recent arrival

English Literature

on the reviewing scene, *The New York Review of Books*, has made itself quickly known through its outspoken, provocative, stimulating but often savage criticism. More judicious—and serving primarily as guides to book selection—are the more tightly compressed reviews in *Library Journal* and *Choice*, the latter specializing in university press publications and including in its evaluations comparisons of new titles with the standard ones in the field.

Some of the best criticism has appeared in the so-called “little magazines,” such as *Partisan Review*, *Kenyon Review*, *Hudson Review*, *Sevance Review* and others on this side of the Atlantic, and *Encounter*, the *London Magazine*, and the defunct *Scrutiny*, to mention some of the most important ones in Great Britain.

As for the learned journals in the field, the *JEGP* (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Urbana, University of Illinois, 1897-) and the *Review of English Studies* (London, 1925-1949; new series 1950-) carry numerous reviews and maintain high standards; others limit themselves to a few but detailed reviews. Interestingly enough, some foreign journals give up a major portion of their pages to the reviewing of monographs on English literature. Here belong *Anglia*; *Zeitschrift für englische Philologie* (Tübingen, 1877-), *Études anglaises* (Paris, 1937-), and *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*. One of the best of the scholarly reviewing periodicals is the *Modern Language Review* (1905-), published by the Modern Humanities Research Association, with its great many and sound reviews. Obviously, it can give only a portion of its consideration to books on English literature. Somewhat similar, though regrettably too little known, is *A.U.M.L.A.*, *Journal of the Australasian Universities Modern Language Association*, which started publication in 1953 and excels in its book coverage. Here may also be mentioned *Medium Aevum* (Oxford, B. Blackwell, 1932-) with its numerous reviews on medieval literature, including English. Of learned journals devoted to one author or a single period, the *Shakespeare Quarterly* and *Victorian Studies* may be singled out as examples of scholarly reviewing.

Not at all to be slighted are the reviews and/or references to reviews in the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, the *Year's Work in English Studies*, and the annual period bibliographies in the learned journals. Together they constitute a kind of register of reviews of scholarly volumes. As for general indexes to book-reviewing media, the *Book Review Digest* (1905-), designed as it is to cover current material, can list but few scholarly reviews. The Index

to *Book Reviews in the Humanities* (1960-) contains many more but is slow in appearing. A new and promising tool, the *Book Review Index* (1965-), is notable for its speed of publication and diversity, covering many general, specialized, and scholarly periodicals.

Another minor way in which scholars and teachers can keep themselves informed is by consulting a special feature which some learned journals offer to their readers and which is usually entitled "Survey of Periodical Literature." The *Review of English Studies*, *Neophilologus* (Groningen, 1916-), *Études anglaises* and, to mention a journal with a broader spectrum, *Speculum* (Cambridge, Mass., Medieval Academy of America, 1926-) are among those periodicals which supply this regular service.

The scholar engaged in research is vitally concerned with any work being done that might be relevant to his own project. From 1948 to 1960 the Modern Language Association printed a bibliography of "Research in Progress" in its *Publications*, making it possible for those interested in current research to stay abreast of new work going on in their field, to consult the investigator and often the study itself long before it was published. Today no central clearinghouse of information exists, but there are listings of research in progress in a number of specific areas and periods. Fred C. Robinson reports annually on "Old English Research in Progress" and R. H. Robbins on "Middle English Research in Progress" (excluding Chaucer) in *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, a journal published in Helsinki since 1899. (The Robinson list is more complete than the corresponding section in his *Old English Bibliography*, and is arranged by subject, as is the Robbins listing). Chaucer is covered in the mimeographed *Chaucer Research Report*, which is edited by Thomas A. Kirby and which in the future will form a part of the *Chaucer Review*. As usual, Shakespeare has one publication just for himself, *SRO—Shakespearean Research Opportunities* (1965-). Other organs of MLA-connected groups or conferences which include work-in-progress sections are *Restoration and 18th Century Theatre Research* (Chicago, Loyola University, May 1962-), *Seventeenth-Century News* (New York, Milton Society of America and Milton Section of MLA, 1942-), and *Victorian Newsletter* (New York, English Group of MLA 1952-). *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* (Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1956-), which belongs in this category, became an independent annual publication with Volume 7 (1964) and changed its title to *Ren-*

English Literature

naissance Drama. The *James Joyce Review* and other journals devoted to one author also report on work in progress.

Lastly, the problem of ancillary studies needs to be noted. The modern English scholar, particularly if he is engaged in literary criticism, is concerned not only with the political, social, economic, and intellectual background scene but also specifically with psychology and psychoanalysis, with linguistics and statistics, science, and other disciplines. In fact, it has been said that all of recorded human history is in one way or another ancillary to English (and other) literatures. Thus the researcher or scholar working in the field of literature can no longer be content with bibliographies strictly confined to literature in the traditional sense, but must seek out the sources and tools which will afford him the widest possible perspective. As has been pointed out in this paper, the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* and most of the annual bibliographies, to mention retrospective and current tools, provide a background of related studies. No existing bibliography in the field, however, can even approach comprehensiveness in covering ancillary studies. A scholar in pursuit of such information will have to turn to many bibliographic aids in many fields.

A number of retrospective and current bibliographies reflect the increasing cross-fertilization between literature and other disciplines. They include such titles as *Literature and the Other Arts: A Selected Bibliography, 1952-1958* (MLA General Topics 9, Bibliography Committee, New York, NYPL, 1959); *Literature and Society, 1950-55 and 1956-60* (so far) (MLA General Topics 6, Coral Gables, Fla., University of Miami Press, 1956 and 1962); *The Relations of Literature and Science: A Selected Bibliography, 1930-1949* (Fred A. Dudley, et al. Pullman, Wash., Dept. of English at the State College of Washington, 1949); and *Psychoanalysis, Psychology and Literature: A Bibliography* (Norman Kiell. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1963), plus the annual bibliographies in the journal *Literature and Psychology* (1951-). All these are concerned with English literature.

The annual bibliographies in the *Abstracts of Folklore Studies* (Philadelphia, American Folklore Society, 1963-) and the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* (Cleveland, American Society for Aesthetics, 1941-) attest to the close relationship between English literature and folklore on one hand and English literature and aesthetics on the other. As for the study of the parallels between English literature and other literatures, Fernand Baldensperger and Werner Fried-

erich's *Bibliography of Comparative Literature* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, Studies in Comparative Literature, No. 1, 1950) and the bibliographies in the *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* (Bloomington, Indiana University, 1952-) furnish ample substance.

Future Prospects

As for future trends, the lines of development seem clear. One will be traditional: the production of bibliographical aids by conventional means, and the other will be modern: the production of bibliographical aids by electronic means. For some time to come, these trends will continue side by side. Even now, however, it is safe to predict that the day of making concordances by hand is gone forever and that all will be computer-produced. The unbelievable saving in time and energy and the avoidance of drudgery are too obvious to be ignored. The technical problems involved in making computer concordances of poetry have been solved, and quite a few already are being used in libraries. Many others are in preparation or the planning stage. For instance, the Cornell group, headed by S. M. Parrish, which constructed its first and somewhat primitive concordance on Matthew Arnold in 1959 (*A Concordance to the Poems of Matthew Arnold*. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1959) and a much more sophisticated version on Yeats in 1963 (*A Concordance to the Poems of W. B. Yeats*. Programmed by Allen Painter, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1963), will soon include Beowulf, Blake, Byron, and many others in its series. The Blake concordance, incidentally, will contain the prose in addition to the verse. The making of prose indexes presents no technical problems either, but, for the time being at least, the cost is prohibitive. It seems also safe to predict that machine techniques will increasingly be used for the construction of indexes to periodicals and, especially, cumulative indexes. The 1964 and 1965 indexes to the *PMLA* were done by electronic data processing, and the editors of other journals will undoubtedly follow suit sooner or later.

While the case for automated concordances, prose indexes, and indexes to periodicals appears to be clear-cut, no such claim can as yet be made for bibliographies, of which many more conventional than computerized ones are being prepared. Unless there is a new change of plans, a new edition of the foremost bibliography in the field, the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, will appear in its tra-

English Literature

ditional form. It will be a completely revised—and to the regret of some future users at least—will be a streamlined version. According to its editor George Watson, it “will confine itself to literary authors native to, or mainly resident in the British Isles,”⁴ thus excluding the Commonwealth. The term “literature” itself will be more strictly defined, omitting writings in the areas of science, economics, and the like. Similarly, the historical bibliographies on social and political background sources will go. The work is a long-term product, scheduled to begin with the third volume, the nineteenth century, which may be in print by or before 1970. Volumes 1 (600-1660) and 2 (1660-1800) are projected for the decade between 1970 and 1980. There is a sound reason for not starting with Volume 1. Its revision must await the completion of the revised *Short-Title Catalogue*. Good news is also awaiting specialists in twentieth-century literature. Ian Willison of the British Museum and several collaborators are working on a comprehensive bibliography of English literature, considering writers who established themselves between 1900 and 1950. The project is expected to be published in about three years and will form Volume 6 of the (old) *CBEL*.

Not to be outdone, Oxford University Press is planning a complete revision of the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Recent research has made it imperative to introduce significant new material, rewrite entirely a number of biographies and, of course, update the bibliographies.

On a more modest scale, Appleton-Century-Crofts has undertaken the publication of a series of bibliographies on English studies to begin this year. These Goldentree bibliographies, under the series editorship of O. B. Hardison, Jr., are designed primarily for graduate students and will serve as authoritative guides to scholarship on major authors, genres, and periods.

In the field of the theatre, J. F. Arnott and J. W. Robinson have completed work on *English Theatrical Literature 1559-1900: A Bibliography*. Wisely, they have incorporated into their volume Robert W. Lowe's *Bibliographical Account of English Theatrical Literature . . .*, which was published in 1888 (London, J. C. Nimmo) but is still useful for research in English stage history. The entire work is scheduled to be issued within a year by The Society for Theatre Research in London.

Surveys of computerized research, including the section on computer scholarship (“Computational Linguistics”) reported by Joseph

Raben and appearing for the first time in the MLA "Annual Bibliography for 1965," list very few bibliographies in the area of English literature. The cost factor is undoubtedly a major reason. Here again the Modern Language Association is in the forefront. No other organization in the field has been as conscious of the need for bibliographical control and as generous in supporting it, subsidizing its "International Bibliography" to the tune of more than \$40,000 a year.⁵ Several years ago it sponsored a study by Stephen O. Mitchell and Loren Sears, investigating the feasibility of applying information retrieval techniques to the MLA bibliography.⁶ Since the report was favorable, the Association proceeded with plans to automate its bibliography and expects to have a complete system in operation some time after 1968.

Another, even more ambitious project, an Integrated Bibliography for English Studies, was considered in 1958 by Lewis Sawin and Charles Nilon of the University of Colorado, discussed at the annual meetings of the MLA and the National Council of Teachers of English in 1960 and 1961, and publicly proposed by Lewis Sawin at the 1962 Conference on Bibliography at Pennsylvania State University. He defined "Integrated Bibliography" as "one bibliographical compilation containing every item which has ever been listed in any bibliography ever prepared in the subject field, with provision for continuous addition of new items."⁷ This Integrated Bibliography would present a maximum effort at comprehensiveness and would also be capable of providing "print-out" one-subject bibliographies on demand. Ralph R. Shaw, who participated in the same conference, persistently questioned whether—in the absence of data indicating how often scholars have to prepare their own special bibliographies from a multiplicity of sources—the effort at an integrated bibliography was really worthwhile and more efficient than the present method of checking the various bibliographies to compile the special bibliography needed. He doubted the economic soundness of such a plan and suggested, in place of a mechanical solution, a more adequate bibliographical and reference staff in support of scholars of English studies.⁸

As far as they go, Shaw's arguments are cogent, but the weight of quantitative usefulness would seem to lie on the side of the advocates of an integrated bibliography. The U.S. Office of Education apparently considered Sawin's proposal promising, for it awarded him and his co-workers at the University of Colorado a large grant over three years to conduct a pilot study. A progress report⁹ was issued in June

English Literature

1965 and the final report¹⁰ submitted at the end of the year. The pilot study, being a more sophisticated experiment than the original proposal, confined itself to major bibliographies (fourteen in the field of American literature) but went beyond the original proposal in investigating the feasibility of an Information Service for English Studies based on an Integrated Bibliography. The investigators concluded that such an automated system was viable.

The idea of an electronic information service or research center based on an integrated bibliography is not new. Louis Marder, for instance, has been advocating a Shakespeare center for years and recently urged again a "central bibliography where all the known Shakespeareana of the world would be digested and available for reference."¹¹ As he and other proponents of automation have discovered, there is no need to be concerned about an immediate mass surrender of English literary scholars—or humanistic scholars in general—to the blandishments of the machine. More resistance than acceptance still seems to be the rule. Attitudes toward the computer vary widely among scholars, teachers, and librarians and range from complete approval to outright rejection. At the risk of generalizing, it would appear that the younger group readily embraces the idea of having the drudgery taken out of research, while the older scholars have come to believe that the two go together. In a perceptive article, "Bibliographical Challenges in the Age of the Computer," Ilse Bry and Lois Afflerbach sound a pertinent warning: "as automation advances, we must watch out: it may claim as drudgery and take off our hands the work-a-day experience that may trigger the imagination and creativity for which we are supposed to be freed."¹²

Still the problem of coping with the mounting flood of publication affects all groups. As one young Canadian literary scholar expressed it: "If articles and books continue appearing at the present rate and only the existing tools are provided, it will rapidly become impossible for even the most conscientious scholar-critic to discuss a work with the clear conviction that he has examined (or at least located) all the relevant material on it. Indeed, this stage may have been reached already by a lot of people."¹³

But are ever more comprehensive bibliographies constituting mere finding lists the answer? To many scholars the problem of selection is paramount. What they would like to see is a sifting of the masses of material, and a preliminary expert appraisal which would allow them to choose and concentrate on the nuggets of scholarship. Critical

surveys, bibliographical guides, critically annotated bibliographies, competent abstracts, are their desiderata. Again it is the established scholars and, admittedly, the more creative ones who reject the quantitative approach and the implication that they should know of or be familiar with every secondary source. The test, as they see it, is the imagination, insight, and originality with which the scholar handles his primary texts. There can be no quarrel with this, yet it is still no reason why the literary scholar could or should not use the computer as a clerical helper, possessed of greater than human precision and speed. As long as the machine remains a tool for research and does not become an end in itself, its advantages far outweigh its disadvantages. Moreover, if the automated MLA bibliography of the future and the Information Service for English Studies based on an Integrated Bibliography can be designed to provide descriptive and critical annotations, reviews of the more important books and articles, and notices of reviews of other titles—in short a preliminary evaluation of the huge volume of publications—they will meet the demands also of those scholars whose primary need is for selectivity.

The proposed Information Service for English Studies will accomplish still another purpose. It will eliminate duplication of entries of which there is a large and needless amount in bibliographies, retrospective and current. To turn to the latter, the overlap between the MLA "Annual Bibliography" and the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* is still considerable; many of the same entries—admittedly with annotations—are found also in the *Year's Work in English Studies* and the specialized annual bibliographies in the learned journals. A scholar or teacher interested in current criticism of, say, Keats, will search the annual bibliography in the *Keats-Shelley Journal*, the one on the Romantic Movement in *English Language Notes*, the pertinent sections in the MLA bibliography, the *ABELL*, the *YWES* and, last but not least, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. The law of diminishing returns will be in inexorable action as he turns from one bibliography to the next and encounters again and again the same titles. There is a tremendous waste of energy, time, and money involved both for the scholar—some of whom view with trepidation the proliferation not only of books and articles but of bibliographies and checklists as well—and the compiler of these bibliographic aids. A development which would absorb all these general and special bibliographies into one integrated compilation, always up-to-date, could not come too soon for many scholars and also most

English Literature

of the editors of the learned journals who are greatly concerned with the financial burden of the annual bibliographies they publish. Perhaps the automated MLA bibliography will take over the bibliographic functions of the various journals involved. As for the *ABELL* and the *YWES*, their bibliographic entries would be incorporated into a future Information Service for English Studies, which, of course, would also include the MLA data.

There are a number of bibliographic proposals on which most scholars and librarians will readily agree, no matter whether these proposals will reach concrete form by conventional or electronic means. Probably foremost is the need for a *Short-Title Catalog* for the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which would resume the thorough mapping of English books begun by Pollard and Redgrave—hopefully the revised edition will be in print before long—and continued by Wing. The Bibliographical Society is considering a short-title catalog of eighteenth-century books, but no such prospect is as yet held out for the more difficult task of covering the nineteenth century.

More “guides to research” as sponsored by the Modern Language Association for the nineteenth century are needed for earlier periods and, perhaps, the present century as well. One on *The Medieval Literature of Western Europe*, edited by John H. Fisher and containing chapters on Old English and Middle English, is in press. Up-to-date concordances of all the poets, *indices verborum* of the major prose writers, word lists, variorum texts, and the like would be desirable. More subject bibliographies would be welcome and so would more author bibliographies. Some of the latter, however, must await the establishing of the author’s canon. It is here that computer studies may be most helpful by definitively ascribing formerly doubtful works. Also, with the aid of a computer, authorship of the numerous unsigned reviews and articles in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century periodicals may be established. Edward L. McAdam, Jr., for instance, will enlist the help of the computer in determining whether Daniel Defoe wrote about one hundred anonymous articles for British periodicals at the turn of the eighteenth century. As for the nineteenth, the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals* will—when completed—be invaluable for identifying authors of anonymous and pseudonymous articles and rectifying mis-attributions (Walter E. Houghton, ed. *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, Vol. 1, 1966).

A most important desideratum would be an annual record of "Research in Progress" in English literature. In his recent presidential address, Morris Bishop expressed the opinion before the members of the Modern Language Association that there are few worthwhile topics left for literary scholars to write about.¹⁴ When more and more is written about less and less, a continuing comprehensive listing of "Research in Progress" would seem to be a necessity. It would mitigate, if not obviate, unnecessary duplication of effort and sheer waste of time and energy. The Modern Language Association discontinued its listing for two reasons: cost and lack of a foolproof system which would effectively eliminate work in progress that had been completed or abandoned.

Another important desideratum is improved abstracting service. From a purely technical point of view, there would seem to be no reason why the humanities could not have abstracting services equal in quality of performance and speed to those in the sciences. In other words, there is a way of making *Abstracts of English Studies* as good an abstracting tool as *Chemical Abstracts*, *Biological Abstracts*, or *Psychological Abstracts*. The one so far insurmountable obstacle is, of course, lack of funds. The Index to *Abstracts of English Studies* is now produced automatically from punched cards. Perhaps the whole process could be computer-based as is *Chemical Abstracts*. It may then be possible to increase the number of journals abstracted and to begin abstracting parts of books, in particular, chapters devoted to a single author or subject. Another way of speeding up publication and, most likely, improving the quality of the abstracts would be found if writers of accepted articles in the field of English studies and closely related areas could be persuaded (which, admittedly, will take some doing) to submit abstracts to the respective journals or, possibly, send them to *Abstracts of English Studies* directly.

But no matter how efficient an abstracting service may be developed, it can never have the same vital significance that abstracts possess in the sciences. Scientific theory is progressive, and, in general, the research is concerned with current investigations only. Literary theory, however, does not advance in the same sense; the theories evolved in the past are still alive in current discussions, as seen, for instance, in the neo-Aristotelian writings of the "Chicago Critics." Thus retrospective bibliographic coverage of English literature is as important as current coverage, both of which are provided in the Information Service of English Studies proposed by Sawin and Nilon.

English Literature

Looking ahead, one may safely assume that the automated information service of the future will expand beyond present proposals to include not only reviews and references to reviews, as suggested above, but abstracts, digests, and data on research in progress anywhere, and, last but not least, a vast body of ancillary studies. To bring this millennium of the researcher about, the active cooperation of all the professional organizations in the field, here and abroad, will be required—plus, of course, large-scale, long-term financial backing. This support will have to come from the federal government to English literature and the humanities in general, as it has to the sciences.

References

1. Swank, Raynard. "The Organization of Library Materials for Research in English Literature," *Library Quarterly*, 15:49-74, Jan. 1945.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
3. Sawin, Lewis. "The Integrated Bibliography for English Studies: Plan and Project," Pennsylvania Library Association. *Bulletin*, 19:8-9, Feb. 1964.
4. Watson, George. *CBEL. The Making of the Cambridge Bibliography*. (Zeitlin & Ver Brugge Lectures in Bibliography, No. 5.) Los Angeles, School of Library Service and the University Library, University of California, 1965.
5. Letter from J. H. Fisher, Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association of America, dated March 1, 1966.
6. Mitchell, Stephen O., and Sears, Loren. "An Information Retrieval System for Modern Language Studies," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 58:270-278, Third Quarter, 1964.
7. Sawin, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
8. Shaw, Ralph R. "Integrated Bibliography—Another View," Pennsylvania Library Association. *Bulletin*, 19:20-24, Feb. 1964.
9. Sawin, Lewis, and Clark, Roger, eds. *Integrated Bibliography Pilot Study Progress Report*. Boulder, Colorado, 1965.
10. Sawin, Lewis, *et. al.* *The Integration, Storage, and Retrieval of Bibliographical Data in English Studies*. Final Report to the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Boulder, Colorado, 1965.
11. Marder, Louis. "Computer Scholarship in Shakespearean and Related Studies," *Shakespeare Newsletter*, 15:52, Dec. 1965.
12. Bry, Ilse, and Afferbach, Lois. "Bibliographical Challenges in the Age of the Computer," *Library Journal*, 90:818, Feb. 15, 1965.
13. Letter from J. Fraser, dated Jan. 2, 1966.
14. Bishop, Morris. "Research and Reward," *PMLA*, 80:3-8, March 1965.