unaided have evolved out of Romanticism the naturalistic doctrines it contained in a dormant state. "I have been to Constantinople," Théophile Gautier has said, "to be a Mussulman at my ease; to Greece, for the Parthenon and Phideas; to Russia, for the snow and Byzantine art; to Venice, for Saint Mark and the palace of the Doges" [Cf. Bergerat, Théophile Gautier, pp. 126, 127]. Is it not clear that Gautier, when he ceases thus to be a mere traveller or tourist, and constitutes himself the historian or the painter of the countries he traverses, adopts an attitude which amounts to a resolve to put aside his personality, so as to leave himself free to receive the impressions the places he visits will make on him?

revolution of 1848.—Still, amid the conflicting action of these various influences,—she is mindful of her native district of Berri;—and she retains her love of nature;—and her taste for peasant manners [Cf. La mare au diable, 1846; La petite Façette, 1849; François le Champ, 1850].—And the success of these novels,—on the morrow of the adventures of the Revolution,—has a twofold result:—it reconciles her with the general public;—on whom she had seemed disposed to turn her back with a view to addressing herself exclusively to the "populace",—while the general public, coming to regard her as a great talent reclaimed from party spirit, is reconciled with her in turn.

For her part she profited in two ways by her connection with socialism:—in the first place she was brought to perceive the danger of "individualism";—and in the second place to understand that the world is wiser than the little we can learn of it by our personal experience would lead us to suppose.—We are not the only human beings, and our ills are not the sum total of ills;—there are other and more cruel misfortunes than to have made a loveless marriage like Valentine;—or than to have found, like Léna, that pleasure ends in disgust. —Hence the new character of the novels of her last period;—with the exception of Elle et Lui, 1859, which is her rather tardy answer to the Confession d'un Enfant du siècle.—Jean de la Roche, 1860; —the Marquis de Villeroy, 1861;—Tamaris, 1862;—Mlle de la Quintinie, 1868 [a rejoinder to Octave Feuillet's Histoire de Sibylle]. —She does not abjure her ideas;—she is always ready to plead what she believes to be the cause of liberty;—she is opposed to all moral
Neither Musset nor Hugo would have been capable of this self-suppression. Moreover, as it is impossible for any brain to convert itself naturally, spontaneously, into a "photographic dark-room," as it were, the principle has for consequence that we shall begin by arranging to keep our impressions as far as possible from the influence of our personality—an attitude directly opposed to that of the Romanticists. Moreover, as the only chance of this effort being successful lies in our exercising perpetual attention in the choice of the means we shall employ to express our impressions, there results a constant and scrupulous regard for style, an anxious vigilance in the matter, which the Romanticists were

or political restraint;—but the ardour of her apostolate abates;—and still more the ardour of her faith in revolt.—Antonia, 1868;—the Confession d’une jeune fille, 1865;—Monsieur Silvestre, 1866;—Le Dernier Amour, 1867;—Mlle Merguem, 1868.—If she does not apply herself to making her imagination "subservient" to her models;—she nevertheless introduces much less of herself into her depictions of them;—and her interest is centred in the lifelike air,—if not in the reality she lends them [Cf. her correspondence with Flaubert, and below the article Flaubert].—She experiences vaguely the retrospective influence of the daily growing popularity of Balzac;—and of that "realism" which she helped to bring into existence.—Her last works: Francia, 1871;—Nanon, 1872;—Flamarande, 1875;—the Tour de Percemont, 1876.—If we do not allude to her plays, the reason is that they can scarcely be said to be her work;—the rare successes she met with on the stage,—being due to the technical skill of those who collaborated with her.

Of the main defect of George Sand's novels;—and that apart from the naïve immorality of certain of them;—it lies in the fact that while they have a realistic starting-point;—they all of them fall away into vagueness as they continue or before they are concluded.—This feature may be expressed in other terms;—and in such a way as to include both the good and the bad qualities;—by saying that from Italiene to the Marquis de Villemer,—all George Sand's novels are poems in prose,—rather than studies of manners;—and it must be added: "improvised" poems in prose.
also without, at which, indeed, they had been a little inclined to scoff [Cf. Lamartine, Lettre à M. Léon Bruys d’Oujilly; and Musset, Après une lecture], and the absence of which carries with it the penalty that even their masterpieces have a certain air of negligence or improvisation. With the author of Émaux et Camées a generation of artists succeeds a generation of improvisators. To his name might be joined that of Théodore de Banville, in virtue of his Cariatides, 1842, his Stalactites, 1846, and his Odelettes, 1856, were it not that too often the art in these works leaves the impression that it has been achieved for the sake of amusement or even of a wager, and further that the author of the Odes funam-

8. The Works.—George Sand’s principal novels have been mentioned in the course of the above notice.—Her complete works form over a hundred volumes [Michel Lévy’s edition];—not including the four volumes of the Histoire de ma vie;—and the six volumes that have appeared up to now of her Correspondence.

V. Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve [Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1804; † 1869, Paris].


2. The Writer.—His extraction;—and that it would be useless to note that he was born at Boulogne-sur-Mer,—if the circumstance had
bulesques, 1857, too frequently seems to be making fun of his subject, his public, and himself.

If all these influences be considered together, it is not surprising that towards 1850,—between 1848 and 1855—the reaction already started against Romanticism should continue and be crowned with success in every branch of literature simultaneously. The politics of Romanticism, of which the Revolution of 1848 was the bankruptcy, are attacked at the same time as its ethics and its aesthetics. The Châtiments, indeed, are applauded because, side by side with nameless scurility, they contain some of Hugo's finest verses; but for various reasons, some of them political and others, more numerous, literary,

...not procured him the patronage of Daunou,—who belonged to the same town;—whose conversations imbued him with the spirit of the eighteenth century;—to whose influence he perhaps owed his admission to the staff of the Globe, 1824;—and on whose advice it was that he wrote his first work: the Tableau de la poésie française au XVIIe siècle, 1827–1828.

A. The Poet;—and his rôle in the Romantic revolution.—He contrived, by connecting Romanticism with the Plead and André Chémer,—to provide the innovators with a long line of ancestors;—less illustrious, but dating further back than those claimed by the pseudo-Classicists.—Having recognised in Ronsard [Cf. above the article Ronsard],—the greatest inventor of rhythms and the craftsman who had handled them most skilfully in French literature,—he taught the Romanticists in general,—and Victor Hugo in particular,—the power and virtue of form [Cf. the celebrated piece:

Rime, qui donnes leurs sons
Aux chansons . . .

—or again, in the Pensées d'août, the Épître à Vilménil].—Later, in the Confessions de Joseph Delorme, 1829;—and in his Consolations, 1881,—he carried lyricism,—so far as it is the expression of the personality of the poet,—to positively morbid lengths;—and in this respect he was one of the forerunners of Baudelaire.—Finally in the Pensées d'août, 1887,—as if convinced that lyricism thus conceived could only last for a limited time,—finding that he had nothing left of interest to
it occurs to nobody to imitate them. The prodigious facility of the poet resembles incontinence, and the torrent of his invention assuredly bears along in its course more words or sounds than ideas! To the "unappreciated woman" of the novels of George Sand,—who herself is reverting to the peasant heroines of the *Mare au diable* or *La Petite Fadette,*—or of her imitators, the school "of good sense" is opposing the bourgeois comedies of Camille Doucet and Augier. The courtesan is stripped of the poetic halo with which Romanticism had endowed her, and in the place of Marion Delorme or of Lélia she becomes Marguerite Gautier [*Cf. the Dame aux Camélias, 1852*], Suzanne d'Ange [*Cf. the Demi-Monde, 1855*], or

say in verse,—he wrote poetry which is merely rather poor prose;—but which nevertheless acclimatised in contemporary French poetry a taste for the insignificant;—and sympathy with the mediocre.

B. The Critic.

1. *From 1824 to 1837.*—This is the period of the *Portraits littéraires* and of the *Portraits contemporains*;—a militant and active period,—during which, when his criticism does not serve him as a means to satisfy his grudges;—and to rank the authors he treats with a view to the position to which he himself pretends as a poet;—it is little else than the diary of his personal impressions;—and in this sense purely Romantic.—The nature, however, of his impressions seems to indicate that he is already primarily concerned with learning the conditions under which the works he deals with were written;—while satisfaction at pointing out their defects;—the desire to judge them;—or even the pleasure of enjoying them,—are but secondary considerations with him;—and thus it comes about that from a purely subjective criticism,—there is evolved and there is already disengaged,—a psychological criticism,—whose tendency is to subordinate the study or examination of the "works" to a knowledge of their "authors";—and of their mode of life.—Novelty at the time of this style of criticism;—and that it was not without analogy with the nature of the investigations which Balzac was declaring to be the object of the novelist's art;—a fact which is perhaps the explanation of the bitter hostility between the two writers—*Ruta concordia fratrum!*—fraternal feuds being especially common in
Olympe Taverny [Cf. the Mariage d'Olympe]. A not less significant example is that of a young writer [Octave Feuillet] who, after beginning his career, towards 1845, under the auspices of Romanticism, parts company little by little with his masters, and leaving them discreetly, without fuss or hubbub, in a word politely, starts in Le Village, 1852, in Dalila, 1853, in the Petite Comtesse, 1856, a campaign he will continue until his death, no longer merely against the courtesan, but against "passion" itself.

In the meantime, from the solitary retreat where he is toiling at the most laborious of masterpieces, another writer reviews the glories of Romanticism, according his literature;—and nothing separating men more profoundly than the circumstance that they are employing opposite means to compass the same end.—And the fact is that, in spite of differences, Balzac's novels and Saint-Beuve's criticism are marked by the same kind of "indiscretion";—the same "anatomical" treatment or the same "dissection" of the "subjects";—the same calm audacity;—while, finally, they produce the same lifelike effects.—Comparison, in this respect, between the criticism of Villenau and the criticism of Saint-Beuve;—and how much more abstract, more unsubstantial, less keen and less penetrating the first is than the second.

2. From 1837 to 1850;—or from the lectures delivered at Lausanne on the Port-Royal, to those at Liège on Chateaubriand and his literary group.—This is the really fruitful period;—that in which a reconciliation is effected in Sainte-Beuve's criticism, freed from the trammels of Romanticism,—between the criticism which "feels" and the criticism which "explains";—through the medium of a deeper and more exact knowledge of history.—The Port-Royal, and of its importance in this respect.—How its author pays simultaneous attention to three matters:—examination of works;—analysis of sentiments;—and appreciation or judgment of ideas [Cf. in particular the chapters devoted to Pascal].—How three qualities are combined to their mutual strengthening in the work:—the precision of the historian;—the subtlety of the psychologist;—the decision of the judge [Cf. in particular the chapters on Montaigne, Saint François de Sales, Corneille and Boileau].—And how, from the example thus given, there
approval to none of them with the exception of Hugo, complaining that Lamartine writes badly, blaming Musset for having believed "neither in himself, nor in his art, but in his passions," mocking at his "dandyism," and finding fault with the "emphasis with which he sounds the praises of sentiment, the heart and love" [Cf. Flaubert, Correspondance, vol. ii., p. 110, 1852]. His voice is echoed by that of a poet:

Tel qu'un morne animal, meurtri, plein de poussière,
La chaîne au cou, hurlant au chaud soleil d'été,
Promène qui voudra son cœur ensanglanté,
Sur ton pavé cynique, ô plèbe carnassière. . .

Both Flaubert and Leconte de Lisle proclaim in reality resulted three definite obligations for criticism:—the obligation to explain;—the obligation to classify;—and the obligation of tending, by means of the interpretation of literary works, towards a "philosophic" knowledge of the human intelligence.—That for all these reasons Port-Royal is beyond question one of the great books of the century;—and the work of Sainte-Beuve one of the most original of our time;—as well as one of the most fertile in consequences.

8. From 1850 to 1870.—The period of the Cauriers du lundi and of the Nouveaux lundis;—the most vaunted portion of Sainte-Beuve's work;—but not however the best;—since the author is too constantly influenced in his appreciation of works and still more of men by "topical" hatreds;—since not one of his contemporaries dies [Balzac, 1850; Musset, 1857; Vigny, 1863] without his using or abusing the opportunity to settle his old quarrels with them;—and since by dint of carrying his method to extremes he is brought to concern himself almost exclusively with the men and scarcely at all with the works.—The truth is that towards 1860, the necessity of defending his own originality against certain writers who claimed to be his disciples,—Edmond Scherer, Ernest Renan, and Taine for example,—forces him to lay stress on two points which he declines to abandon.—He establishes victoriously that what is interesting in a literary work is in the first place the work itself. —He then establishes no less surely that no general considerations are capable of explaining what is individual about a masterpiece;—and that given "race," "environment," and "the moment," which
that the world has had enough of "confessions" and "disclosures." Nature and society, art and life, truth and beauty invite the poet, the novelist, and the dramatist to look beyond themselves, to open their eyes on the universe around them. Everything is "material for literature" with the single exception of what served the Romanticists as such. And while Flaubert, Feuillet, Dumas, Augier, or Leconte de Lisle as the result of study or observation are arriving at this conviction almost unintentionally, Taine and Renan appear to strengthen it, to lend it the weight of their authority and to establish it as a principle.

A writer is not always fully alive to the nature of his

are the same for all,—the great problem is to explain how it is that there has been only one Tartufe and one Phèdre;—one Voltaire and one Rousseau;—one Eugénie Grandet and one Valentine.—Having made this demonstration, however, he grows indifferent to his own principles;—as to the most pronounced of his former tastes;—history proper attracts him more and more;—he takes his title of "Senator of the Empire" seriously;—and scarcely anything remains of the author of Port-Royal in his Étude sur Jomini, for example, or in his Essai sur Proudhon.

C. The Philosopher;—and first of all whether this be not a decidedly ambitious appellation for him;—so far at least as to have a "philosophy" is to have a connected system;—a general view of things, or merely a "doctrine" [Cf. below the article Taine].—That in this sense, not only did Sainte-Beuve never possess a "philosophy";—but his great defect as a critic and as an historian of literature, —was his inability to rise above the "monograph."—His theoretical contradictions and his naturally versatile humour.—But that this very versatility and these contradictions imply a sort of philosophy;—the principle of which is the perfecting of his taste by the variety of the disciplines to which he subjects it;—and this attitude is that to which the name of dilettantism is given.—Sainte-Beuve was the dilettante of criticism;—and it seems to have been more particularly in virtue of this fact that he exerted an influence on his contemporaries.

8. The Works.—Sainte-Beuve's works comprise:—(1) his Poems;
work, or to the real influences by which he has been formed. Thus Renan would never admit, perhaps he never suspected, the extent to which he was imbued with the spirit of Auguste Comte; and Taine, who gloried on the contrary in being a Positivist—though a Positivist modified by the study of Stuart Mill—was more than astonished, was positively grieved when his attention was called to the works for which his *Essai sur Balzac*, 1858, and his *Histoire de la Littérature anglaise*, 1863, must be held responsible. No doubt there is a distinction to be drawn. The "naturalism" of Taine, as also that of Flaubert, was a broader and in particular a more intelligent conception of art than the realism, say, of a Courbet

*Joseph Delarue, 1829;* the *Consolations*, 1880; and the *Pensées d'août*, 1887;—(2) his *Novel*: *l'olupté*, 1834;—and (3) his *Critical Works*:

*Portraits littéraires*, 3 volumes;
*Portraits de femmes*, 1 volume;
*Portraits contemporains*, 5 volumes;
*Port-Royal*, 5 volumes in 8vo or 7 volumes in 8vo;
*Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, 2 volumes;
*Consecrés du lendemain*, 15 volumes;
*Nouveaux lundis*, 13 volumes.

To the above may be added: his *Tableau de la Poésie française au XVIe siècle*;—his *Premiers lundis*, three volumes issued after his death and containing articles he had not collected himself;—his *Étude sur Virgile*;—and two or three rather insignificant short tales.

Only three volumes of his Correspondence have been published as yet, and scarcely anything of his famous "Notebooks."

**Third Period.**

**Naturalism.**

**1859-1875.**

I.—*Alfred de Vigny* [Loches, 1797; † 1863, Paris].

1. The *Sources.*—*Journal d'un poète*, edited by M. Louis Ratisbonne; and the Notice preceding the *Journal*, Paris, 1867;—Sainte-
or a Champfleury; for example it did not escribe the "representation" either of beauty or of the past [Cf. 
Salammbó, Hérodiás, la Légende de saint Julien], in the consciousness that to have done so would have been to 
exclude from art the very notion of art. Again it was 
all very well for the author of the Histoire des langues 
semitiques, 1848, and of the celebrated Essai sur les 
Religions de l'antiquité, 1853, to believe and to declare 
that "M. Comte, not being a philologist, had no com-
prehension of the sciences of humanity" [Cf. l'Avenir 
de la science, p. 148]. It is true that M. Comte was 
not a philologist, and his style was bad, but Renan's 
"philology" bore a closer resemblance than he imagined

Bouve, portraits contemporains, vol. ii., 1826, 1825; and nouveaux 
lundis, vol. vi., 1864;—Émile Montégut, nos morts contemporains, 
1867;—Théophile Gautier, rapport sur les progrès de la poésie, 1868; 
—Émile Faguet, xix° siècle, Paris, 1887;—Maurice Paléologue, 
Alfred de Vigny, Paris, 1891;—F. Brunetière, essais sur la littérature 
contemporaine, 1891; and l'évolution de la poésie lyrique, 1893, 
vol. ii.;—Dorison, Alfred de Vigny, poète philosophe, 1892.

2. The Poète.

A. The years of Romanticism.—Vigny's extraction;—his educa-
tion;—and his military vocation.—His first published verse: Hélène, 
1822, and Éloa, 1824;—and, in this connection, of André Chénier's 
influence on Alfred de Vigny.—Character of his early verse, and how 
visibly inspired it is by the eighteenth century [Cf. Montégut, loc. 
cit.] ;—but in particular how little Romantic it is.—The novel Cinq-
Mars, 1826;—and Mose, 1826.—Vigny's personal relations with the 
Romanticists;—and the part he took in the conflict with Classicism; 
—with his Othello, 1829;—his drama the Maréchale d'Ancre, 1831;— 
and his "symbolical" novel Stella, 1882.—Three at least of the charac-
teristics of Romanticism are met with in Chatterton, 1835:—striving 
after "local colour"; assertion of the "sovereignty of the poet" and 
that of the "rights of the individual."—Already, however, in his 
Grandeur et servitude militaires, published in 1895,—Vigny appears 
to have renounced the egoism of the Romanticists;—as too in the 
portions of his Journal belonging to this period;—and since his 
attitude in this matter constitutes the principle and nature of his
to the "sociology" of the founder of Positivism, the
difference between them being not even one of method,
but lying in the particular application of the same
general method to matters so utterly dissimilar as, for
instance, the study of the functions of the liver and that
of the composition of the Bhagavata Pourana. This
will be apparent if, inserting a middle term between
two extremes, the work of Emile Littré be interposed
between that of Taine and that of Renan: on the one
hand his treatise on the philosophy of Auguste Comte,
and on the other his writings on the history of the
French language. It will then be plain, that whatever
differences there be between the respective talents of
originality,—the question of his exact rank among the Romanticists
becomes futile.

B. The philosopher;—and, in this connection, of Pessimism in
general;—and that it is not the doctrine of death or inertia it has
been asserted to be;—but, on the contrary, a source of fruitful action;
—and in any case the principle of all moral elevation:—Vigny's
Pessimism;—and that it is to rob him of what is best in him,—to
look for its cause in the narrowness of his domestic life;—or in the
humiliations to which his pride was subjected;—or, as some "clever"
persons have done, in the physiological presentiment of the disease of
which he was to die [cancer of the stomach].—Vigny's Pessimism is
a philosophic doctrine;—based on the reasoned conviction of the
hostile attitude of nature towards man [Cf. the Maison du Burger];
—in the isolation that is the consequence of the possession of
intelligence [Cf. Moïse];—on the corruption of human nature [Cf.
la Colère de Samson];—and on the indifference of the Gods to our
sufferings [Cf. le Christ au Mont des Oliviers].—That in all these
respects Vigny's Pessimism is akin to that of Pascal;—and that
proof of this is furnished by the consequences that he deduces from
his Pessimism;—for the horror inspired him by the human state
changes into pity for his fellow men [Cf. his Journal from 1835
onward];—this pity into love [Cf. la Flûte];—this love into the
resolution to strive to vanquish nature [Cf. la Sauvage];—and
finally this resolution terminates in a cry of hope [Cf. la Boutefille
à la mer].—Haughty but real nobleness of this Pessimism;—and
Littré, Taine, and Renan,—and it may be maintained that the excellent Littré was entirely without talent—the three of them together constituted naturalistic criticism, or rather, and as it may better be put, their criticism gave "Naturalism" that doctrinal adhesion, consistency and solidity which Romanticism had always lacked.

It is this circumstance that makes it easy to-day to distinguish the true characteristics of Naturalism, and to perceive clearly that works so different in appearance as the Poèmes antiques, 1852, the Demi-Monde, 1855, and Madame Bovary, 1857, have nevertheless, in the first place, this in common, that they are what we call that to appreciate its worth,—it is only necessary to compare it with the realistic Optimism of Hugo;—the childish Optimism of Musset;—and the vulgar Optimism of the author of the Dieu des bonnes gens.

C. The influence of Alfred de Vigny;—and that it is in opposition on almost every point with the influence of Romanticism.—Vigny freed the poet from the slavish cult of his personality;—and from the superstitious worship of nature.—For the lyric "themes" of Romanticism;—which could not be other than general or indeterminate themes,—and like those of pianists a pretext for the exercise of virtuosity,—he substituted precise "ideas";—of which his fictions [la Mort du Loup; la Maison du Berger; la Bouteille à la mer] are merely the envelope;—and for this reason he was a true symbolist;—and a great poet.—Finally he wrote "poems";—which have a beginning, a middle and an end;—the development of which is proportioned to the human importance of the idea they express;—and thus is not solely measured by the caprice of the virtuoso;—or the "long-windedness" of the poet.—For all these reasons it cannot be too much regretted,—that Vigny too often shows himself deficient in certain qualities that go to make the artist or even the writer.—Still he is nevertheless a very great poet;—and the author of some hundreds of verses;—if there be any superior to which in French, they are few in number.

3. The Works.—The Works of Alfred de Vigny comprise:

(i) His Poetry. He has himself sacrificed some of his earliest pieces. What remains forms two volumes: the Poésies, divided into
“impersonal” works. It is important to state exactly what is meant by this epithet. It does not convey that a Flaubert, a Dumas, or a Leconte de Lisle are absent or severed from their work to such a degree that it is impossible to gather from their writings their conceptions of art, nature, and man. What is meant is that the object of their observation, the matter of their literature, is not they themselves; that the man in them is subordinate to the artist; and more especially that they made their originality consist in expressing, not things appertaining to themselves, but things which before them had passed unperceived. The radii of a circle were equal before the figure had been drawn, and it was not Galileo who set

three books, the Livre mystique, the Livre antique, and the Livre moderne, 1822–1826;—and the Destinées, 1863 [the Destinées were first collected and published under this title in 1863, but the majority of the poems which compose the volume were written during the years 1843, 1844, 1845 and 1854, and appeared at those dates in the Revue des Deux Mondes].

(2) His Plays, including his translation [in verse] of the Merchant of Venice, 1828;—his adaptation [in verse] of Othello, 1829;—the Maréchal d’Ancre, 1881;—Quitte pour la peur, 1883;—Chatterton, 1885.

(3) His Novels: Cing-Mars, 1826;—Stello, 1882;—Grandeur et servitude militaires, 1885.

(4) His Journal, published in 1867 by M. Louis Ratisbonne, his literary executor; and some Letters [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, Portraits contemporains], the most considerable series of which appeared in the Revue des Deux Mondes for January, 1897.

There are two editions of his works, one in eight volumes in 8vo, Paris, 1866–1870, Michel Lévy; and the other in six vols. in 12mo, Paris, 1888–1885, A. Lemerre.

II.—Pierre-Jules-Théophile Gautier [Tarbes, 1811; † 1872, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Vte de Seelberch de Lovenjoul, Histoire des œuvres de Théophile Gautier, Paris, 1887.

Sainte-Beuve, Nouveaux lundis, vol. vi., 1868;—Émile Montégut,
the earth moving around the sun! Similarly French provincial life existed before Madame Bovary, and the author of the Poèmes antiques invented neither the Gods of India nor those of Greece, neither their legend nor even their attributes. The unique ambition of these writers was to present the object they were imitating "under its eternal aspect," and to do so they concerned themselves solely with what they believed to be its permanent characteristics.

"Art," wrote Flaubert, "consists in representation, and we ought to confine ourselves to representing"; and in another passage of his Correspondance: "Art should have nothing in common with the artist." He declares,


2. The Artist.—The critics were long unjust to Théophile Gautier;—reasons for this injustice;—the extent and diversity of his work;—its negligent or improvised air;—and the scrupulousness with which he confined himself to his "trade" of poet and story writer.—Pedantic indignation of Edmond Schérer in this connection;—and the reproach he addressed Gautier that "he was without ideas."—It is the truth that Gautier was without political or theological ideas;—but he had ideas about his art, or about art in general;—very clear and very fruitful ideas;—which he has expressed in very happy terms [Cf. his Notices on Balzac and Baudelaire, his Rapport sur la poésie, &c.].—It is for this reason that his rôle, the importance of which it was possible to overlook thirty or forty years ago,—has been seen to have been considerable,—in proportion as the relations between and the common or contradictory elements in Romanticism and Naturalism have been more clearly perceived.
in other words, that nature and history lying before us as models, and our momentary view of them being powerless to prevent them being what they are, what they were before our time, and what they will be after we have passed away, we ought to employ the resources of art to render the models with truth and fidelity. The imitation, or, to use a stronger term, the reproduction of nature, ought to be the object of art; scrupulous following of the model its method; while its triumph will be the annihilation of the personality of the artist in virtue of the truth of his creation. Does one think of Shakespeare when Othello kills Desdemona, or are readers of the Odyssey concerned with knowing what manner of man was

Thus it is in his work [Cf. the Grotesques and Capitaine Fracasse] that the affinities between Romanticism and the school, not of Ronsard,—as Sainte-Beuve erroneously taught,—but of the Scarrons and the Saint-Amants,—come into view and assert themselves openly;—and in this respect an entire portion of his work is nothing more than an "illustration" or a "demonstration" of the Preface to Hugo's Cromwell.—The great ambition of Romanticism was to combine the high-flown "sublimeness" of the Cid;—with the extravagant comedy of Dom Japhet d'Arménie.—It was Théophile Gautier, too, who formulated the doctrine of "art for art";—and though the doctrine is open to discussion;—its first effects were nevertheless excellent.—The doctrine of art for art put an end to everlasting self-contemplation on the part of the poet;—it again confronted him with an "exterior world," the significance of which had been disfigured by Romanticism;—and it reawakened in him the sentiment of the power of style.—That in this respect, and taking into account the difference between the periods,—there are similarities between the role of the author of Émaux et Camées and that of Malherbe and Boileau;—and that he was indeed the legislator of a new Parnassus.—Finally it was Théophile Gautier, and not Hugo;—or any other of the Romanticists;—who effected in the art of description [Cf. España, or, in prose, the Roman de la momie]—the "picturesque" revolution which Sainte-Beuve announced, or of which he had a presentiment, but which he did not realise.—"Seeing" is an art;—and independently of the emotion they procure us,
Homer. But these theories, though expressed in more pretentious terms,—a fashion set by Romanticism,—are easily recognisable as among those which formerly were dear to the most illustrious Classicists; and the truth is that as regards the simplicity of its scheme and its force of expression there is no novel more "classic" than *Madame Bovary*. I am not aware that finer—and again I mean more "classic"—verses exist than those of Leconte de Lisle, and when I search for a work with which to compare the *Demi-Monde*, after reviewing the literature of the century I pass it by, and do not find what I want until I come to the period of the *Barbier de Séville* or of *Turcaret*.

There exists in things,—and especially in human things,—qualities with which others, prior to ourselves, have endowed them.—It is these qualities that we ought to try to see in them;—and to present "under their eternal aspect";—without regard to ourselves or to our pleasure.

That Théophile Gautier was more than once successful in this endeavour;—and, in this connection, that it is strange that such stories as the *Roi Caudaule*, or *Arria Marcella*, or the *Roman de la momie* are not held in at least equal esteem to *Carmen* or *Colomba*—Théophile Gautier's travels;—and that if the date of the first of them (1839, 1840) be kept in view,—it would seem that they revealed to him the nature of his talent.—His three volumes of poetry: *Albertus*, *España*, *Émaux et Camées*;—and that it is in them that the "lack of ideas" with which he has been reproached is particularly visible.—It will be noted that the case of Malherbe is parallel,—for while Malherbe, like Gautier, is the author of a certain number of very beautiful verses;—his value as a "critic" and a grammarian,—and as a "versifier,"—much surpasses his value as a writer.

3. The Works.—There is no edition of the Complete Works of Gautier. and doubtless there never will be, for it would run to from sixty to eighty volumes. His works comprise:

(1) His Poetry: *Poésies*, 1880;—*Albertus*, 1883;—the *Comédie de la Génot*, 1888.—These three volumes, with *España* adjoined, were published in 1846 under the title *Poésies complètes*.—There remains for mention *Émaux et Camées*, 1852;
To say nothing, however, of the wealth and variety of meaning which has come to be expressed by the very word “nature” in the course of two hundred years, there is a difference between the new and the classic conception of art, and it lies in the fact that the standard by which the truth of artistic representations is judged is henceforth neither “common sense” nor the pronouncements of “society” nor considerations of “social interest”; this function is now filled by science, and the circumstance is a second characteristic of the new Naturalism. Not that which seems to be, but that which is, constitutes truth; and under certain rigorously defined conditions the individual may be right and the universe wrong. What is

(2) His Fiction, the principal works being: Les Jeunes France, romans goguenards, 1833;—Mademoiselle de Maupin, 1835;—Fortunio, 1837 [published under the title of l’Eldorado],—his Nouvelles 1845;—his Romans et Contes, 1857;—the Roman de la momie, 1858; and the Capitaine Fracasse, 1863;

(3) His accounts of his travels,—Tra los montes [His journey to Spain], 1843;—Constantinople, 1858;—Italia;—Voyage en Russie, 1867;

(4) His Critical Works: A. Literary Criticism, the principal being: les Grotesques, 1853;—his Rapport sur les progrès de la poésie, 1868;—the collection of anecdotic and biographical articles entitled: Histoire du romantisme, 1874; and various Notices, of which the most interesting are the Notice sur H de Balzac and the Notice sur Charles Baudelaire;—B. Dramatic criticism, only a portion of which has been published under the title Histoire de l’art dramatique depuis vingt-cinq ans, 6 vols., 1858–1859, Paris;—C. His Art criticism.

He has also left some dramatic writings, more especially ballet librettos, and a mass of occasional writings.

III.—Emile Augier [Valence, 1820; † 1889, Paris].

meant here? and are Flaubert's novels, "Leconte de Lisle's poetry, or Alexandre Dumas' plays "scientific work"? That they are such work is at any rate the belief of the authors. They expressly state so. "Art and science, wrote Leconte de Lisle, long separated in consequence of the divergent efforts of the intelligence, should tend henceforth towards a close union or even absolute identification. The one has been the initial revelation of the ideal contained in exterior nature; the other its luminous and reasoned explanation. But art has lost this primitive spontaneity, and it belongs to science to remind it of its forgotten traditions, which it will revive in the forms that are proper to it" [Cf.

The student may further consult in connection with Augier, and the other dramatic authors of this period, the dramatic criticisms of Théophile Gautier in the Moniteur, of Jules Janin in the Journal des Débats, and of Francisque Sarcey in the Temps. Also those of M. Jules Lemaitre, which have been issued in volume form under the title Impressions de théâtre.

2. The Dramatist.—His first efforts.—He is called the "lieutenant" of François Ponsard and the "School of good sense."—That if the author of La Cigale, 1844, of l'Aventurière, 1848, and of Gabrielle, 1849, was pleased to reconcile himself with Romanticism towards the close of his career,—it is nevertheless a fact that all his early pieces were directed against the Romanticists;—and Diane in particular is merely Maron Delorme rewritten by a "man of good sense;"—just as Gabrielle merely ridicules a bourgeois point of view the heroines of George Sand.—It was as an adversary of Romanticism that Augier was first hailed by his admirers;—and if his collaboration with Jules Sandeau;—the outcome of which was the Chasse au Roman, 1851; the Pierre de touche, 1854; and the Gendre de M. Poirier;—seemed for a moment to indicate that he was reconciled with the Romanticists,—it was not long before he ceased to find himself at home in comedy of this sentimental and average order.—And finally it was by renouncing Romanticism and declaiming against it,—in the Mariage d'Olympe, 1855, les Lionnes pauvres, 1858, and la Jeunesse, 1858;—that he achieved his originality.
Poèmes antiques, 1852, preface to the first edition]. And in truth if there exist in French literature poetry that can be called "scientific," is it not that of Leconte de Lisle? Again, who has had a clearer vision of the poetry of science than the author of the Histoire de la Littérature anglaise? Taine has boldly stated his views: "Two ways are open to man to arrive at a knowledge of the permanent and generating causes; the first is offered by science, by which he determines these causes and these fundamental laws, and expresses them in exact formulæ and abstract terms; the second is offered by art, by which he manifests these causes in perceptible fashion, appealing not only to the reason, but

It consists essentially in the rather brutal vigour with which he championed certain ideas,—whose defenders as a rule are wont to display some hesitation or timidity,—the ideas in question being in point of fact as commonplace as they are unexceptionable;—Augier, for instance, clearly demonstrated that "a good name is better than riches,"—and that a courtesan does not recover her innocence because she is stirred by a genuine passion.—He has also proved that what are called business men are often enough lacking in scruples [Cf. les Effrontés];—and that designing persons sometimes come to a bad end [Cf. la Contagion];—and all this, if it was not anti-romanticism, was something else than Romanticism.—Secondly, with a view to introducing Realism into his work,—he devised contemporary plots;—the personages of which were imitated from those of Balzac [Cf. les Effrontés, le Fils de Giboyer, Maitre Guérin],—or of Eugène Sue [Cf. Lions et Renards];—among them being two or three whose characterisation is fairly vigorous.—Moreover, after Balzac and in imitation of him, he gave a novel importance to the money question,—making the play turn on it,—instead of regarding it, as Scribe regarded it, as a mere subsidiary dramatic expedient.—To complete the resemblance, he in general turned to account in his plays the interests of every-day life;—industrial enterprise [Cf. les Effrontés], scientific discoveries or inventions [Cf. Un beau mariage; Maitre Guérin], political events [Cf. le Fils de Giboyer].—Finally, and here he parts company with Balzac,—he adopted the attitude of "a bourgeois of 1789";—the enemy of vain distinctions;—exclusively
to the heart and the senses of the most ordinary man” [Cf. *Philosophie de l’Art*, vol. i., p. 53]. It may be, however, that these arguments are specious rather than solid, and were there but a single one to adduce, an example at least would be desirable of art having “anticipated” science. Still it must be admitted that it never occurred to the Classicists to unite, solidarise or identify science and art in this way, if indeed it ought not to be said that they constantly insisted on their opposition to one another; and the observation is of interest for its own sake, and further because it leads up to another and a more profound difference, and one not less characteristic of “Naturalism.”

respecting “personal merit”;—and anti-clerical after the manner of Béranger [Cf. *le Fils de Giboyer*, *Lions et Renards*];—and this attitude largely contributed to his success.—It is doubtless this attitude too that his admirers propose to praise when they declare him to belong to “the family of Mohére.”

His dramatic merit proper, however, is not much superior to that of Eugène Scribe;—while too much has been made of his merit as a writer;—of his “sturdy frankness” and his “virile correction.”—His verse is curiously prosaic, except perhaps in certain passages of *Philiberte* or of the *Aventurière*;—and his prose is in general monotonous;—though natural enough.—His dramatic expedients are often very artificial;—and his plots decidedly fanciful [Cf. the *Genèse de M. Poirier*, *Mariage d’Olympe*, *Un beau mariage*, *Maitre Guérin*, *les Fourchambault*].—It does not appear, moreover, that he even suspected the existence of the great problems of life;—and thought is absent from his work;—which is that, however, of a highly estimable man;—whose literary ambitions did not outstrip his capacity;—and who cannot be better characterised,—in respect both to his shortcomings and his qualities,—than by comparing him with the author of *Turcaret* and *Gil Blas*.

2. The Works.—Apart from his plays Émile Augier’s works are restricted to two volumes of poetry: *Poésies complètes d’Émile Augier*, Paris, 1852, Lévy;—and the *Pariétaires*, Paris, 1855, Lévy;—and to some brochures of slight interest.

His plays comprise twenty-nine pieces, two of which, for unknown
For a third characteristic of contemporary Naturalism is that to which it has itself given the name of "impossibility," a term that must be held to signify not want of sensibility, but the most complete indifference to whatever is not art or science. Is the man of science in his laboratory moved to indignation by the poisons he manipulates; and what economic or moral value does he set on the animals he dissects? A fact in his eyes is a fact and nothing more: he notes it, but does not pass judgment on it. The attitude of the artist is identical. And it is for this reason that if Dumas fils, in whom there are traces of the Romanticism of his father, has an opinion about Suzanne d'Ange [Cf. the reasons, he eliminated from the complete edition of his dramatic works: the Chasse au Roman, 1851; —and the Méprises de l'amour, 1852.

Several of his plays were written in collaboration with other authors: with Musset, l'Habit vert, 1849; —with Jules Sandeau, la Pierre de touche, 1853; the Gendre de M. Poirier, 1854; —with Édouard Foussier, Ceinture dorée, 1855; the Lionnes pauvres, 1858; —with Eugène Labiche, le Prix Martin, 1876.

The plays of which he is the sole author are: in verse, la Cigale, 1844; Un homme de bien, 1845; l'Aventurière, 1848; Gabrielle, 1849; Sapho [an opera, music by Gounod], 1851; the Joueur de flûte, 1851; Diane, 1852; Philiberte, 1853; la Jeunesse, 1858; Paul Forestier, 1866; and in prose: the Mariage d'Olympe, 1855; Un beau mariage, 1859; Les Effrontés, 1861; le Fils de Giboyer, 1862; Maître Guérin, 1864; la Contagion, 1866; le Post-Scriptum, 1869; Lions et Renards, 1869; Jean de Thommeray [founded on a story by Jules Sandeau], 1873; Madame Caverlet, 1876; and les Fourchambault, 1878.

The last complete edition of his dramatic works [revised and corrected, according to the old-established practice] is that of 1889, in seven volumes, Paris, Calmann Lévy.

IV.—Octave Feuillet [Saint-Lô, 1821; † 1890, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Mme Octave Feuillet, Quelques années de ma vie, 1894, Paris; Souvenirs et Correspondances, 1896, Paris; —Émile
Demi-Monde], Flaubert has none about Emma Bovary, or about Salammbô, or about Frédéric Moreau [Cf. l'Éducation sentimentale], refuses to have one, and loses patience when his opinion is asked. "As to giving my opinion about the personagcs in my novels, he wrote to George Sand, no, no, a thousand times no! I do not admit my right to an opinion. If the reader does not draw from the book the moral that ought to be found in it, either the reader is a blockhead, or the book is at fault as regards exactness" [Cf. Correspondance, vol. iii.]. The author of the Poèmes antiques was of the same way of thinking. "The poet, in his estimation, should look on human things as a God might look on them from the heights of Olympus, should reflect them unconcernedly


2. THE NOVELIST.—It is as a Romanticist that he begins his career—and as a dramatist—writing in collaboration with Bocage:—Un bourgeois de Rome, 1845, and la Veilleuse de Richelieu, 1845.—His first novel, Bellah, 1850;—and its resemblance to Balzac's Chouans on the one hand;—and on the other to the novels of Jules Sandeau.—The Scènes et Proverbs, 1851;—Scènes et Comédies, 1855;—and that the author of these works has been not inaply described as a "family Musset."—His hesitations between budding Naturalism [Cf. le Village, 1852],—and expiring Romanticism [Cf. Rédemption, 1849, and Dalila, 1858];—and how he tries to conciliate the one with the other by writing romantic (not "Romantic") novels [Cf. La Petite Comtesse, 1856, and the Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre, 1858].

His chief works.—Histoire de Sibylle, 1882,—George Sand's rejoinder: Mademoiselle de la Quintinie;—M. de Camors, 1867;—Julia de Précocur, 1872;—Le journal d'une femme, 1878;—La Morte, 1886;—Honneur d'artiste, 1890.—Are Feuillet's novels "romantic" novels?—and that the epithet romantic is synonymous with
in his fixed pupils, and maintaining absolute indifference, should endow them with form, that higher kind of life” [Cf. Th. Gautier, *Rapport*, &c.]. Whether Leconte de Lisle always realised his ideal is another question, but he strove to attain to it, and his ideal in reality is that of “art for art.” The merit of the artist is to rise superior, as an artist, to the agitations or occupations of his fellow men; and while, as a man, he is constrained to live the life of other men, he is an artist and a “naturalist” in proportion only as he does not participate in this life.

The success and the vogue of these ideas was largely due to the fact that, by a consequence whose close connection with them will doubtless be perceived, they reawakened in the writer a sense of the difficulties of strange incidents;—arbitrary combinations;—systematic idealisation of the characters;—and excessive sentimentalism;—it is not applicable to Feuillet’s novels,—which, however, are “aristocratic” or “society” novels;—because the author himself was a member of “society”;—a sphere of existence in which the development of passion is not interfered with by the mean realities of life;—those who belong to it not being prevented, by the necessity of earning their living, from keeping a rendezvous;—and not being the slaves of the exigencies of material existence [Cf. in this respect, the princes and princesses of classic tragedy].—His novels in the second place are idealistic novels;—because the duties of ordinary life are suppressed in them;—because they owe their dramaticness in general to the conflict between “passion” and “honour” [Cf. Alfred de Vigny, *Grandeur et Servitude militaires*];—and because vanquished honour and passion find no other refuge in them than in death [Cf. the habitual dénouements of classic tragedy]. Finally they are novels with a purpose,—their author showing himself constantly concerned with the “rights” or the condition of women;—with the dignity of love and marriage;—and with the principle of social morality.—Comparison, in this connection, between Feuillet’s novels and those of George Sand;—and that in reality, in spite of a certain apparent analogy, they are more unlike than like.

8. The Works.—They comprise his Plays, the complete edition of which in five volumes [Callmann Lévy, 1892, 1893] includes all of his
the art of writing, and revived that respect for the language and that religious veneration for style without which nobody who has written in French has left anything lasting. "The French genius," wrote a good judge, "as represented by the writers of the present day (1858), is regaining qualities it seemed to have lost. Simplicity is taking the place of a confused and pretentious jargon, clearness that of magniloquence. Every writer now knows what he wants to say; tirades have ceased to pass muster; there is an end to declamation; authors are no longer open-mouthed as if their every word were about to shake heaven and earth"

[Cf. J. J. Weiss, le Théâtre et les mœurs: M. Alexandre Dumas fils].

pieces that have been put on the stage, among the number being some of those contained in the two volumes: Scènes et Proverbes, and Scènes et Comédies;

And his novels: Bellah, 1850;—La petite Comtesse, 1856;—the Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre, 1858;—Histoire de Sibylle, 1862;—M. de Camors, 1867;—Julia de Trécoeur, 1872;—Un mariage dans le monde, 1875;—Les amours de Philippe, 1877;—the Journal d'une femme, 1878;—the Histoire d'une Parisienne, 1881;—La Veuve, 1883;—La Morte, 1886;—and Honneur d'artiste, 1891.

V.—Charles-Marie-René Leconte de Lisle [Saint-Paul, Ile de la Réunion, 1818; † 1894, Paris].


2. The Poet.—A Romanticist at the outset of his career.—His residence at Rennes, and La Variété, a literary review, 1840–1841.—He comes to Paris and writes for the phalansterian publications;—
It is possible, and at the present day it is imperative to be even more precise. The insipid style—a legacy from the Ideologists or the Encyclopedists—which is exhibited ingenuously, without any sense of horror or consciousness of its lamentable shortcomings in the prose of a Vilemain for example, and often even of a Guizot; the license which a Musset or a Lamartine—who were proud of the feat—carried more than once to extremes; the incoherent metaphors which are almost a stumbling-block in some of Hugo’s masterpieces:

Quand notre âme en rêvant descend dans nos entrailles,
Comptant dans notre cœur qu’enfin la glace atteint;
Comme on compte les morts sur un champ de batailles,
Chaque douleur tombée et chaque songe éteint;

his first poems; *Hylas*, *Niobé*, *Hypatia*;—and his intervention in favour of the abolition of slavery.—He translates the Iliad.—Publication of the *Poèmes Antiques*, 1852;—of the *Poèmes et Poèmes*, 1853;—and of the *Poèmes Barbares*, 1882.—Effect these poems produce on G. Flaubert [Cf. his Correspondence, particularly towards 1852-1853].—The Preface to the *Poèmes Antiques* [suppressed in subsequent editions];—and its frankly anti-Romanticist declarations.

The poetic inspiration of Leconte de Lisle so far as it was derived from the ancients;—and that it is anti-religious [Cf. *Hypatia*];—and marked by the Pagan love of pure beauty [Cf. *La Vénus de Milo*].—Resulting consequences: the theory of the impersonality of the poet;—religious veneration for style;—and the doctrine of art for art.—Hindoo antiquity in the poems of Leconte de Lisle [Cf. *Surya, Bhagavat*];—and that to this source must be traced the poet’s Pessimism;—his exotic tastes;—and his conception of a “naturalistic and scientific” poetry.

Leconte de Lisle’s poetic inspiration so far as it was due to exotic influences;—and, in this connection, of the influence of the author of *Émaux et Camées*;—and of that of the *Orientalas*;—on the author of the *Poèmes Barbares*.—The influence of the Orientalists, however, seem to have been still more considerable,—in particular that of Eugène Burnouf [Cf. in Baudelaire’s Notice, cited above, a very happy comparison between Leconte de Lisle and Ernest Renan].—Variety and beauty of the descriptive passages in Leconte de Lisle:—his
the involved phrases and turns of expression which often cause the prose of Sainte-Beuve — particularly in *Les Port-Royal* — to be a model of preciosity; the powerful heaviness, but also, if I may so express myself, the unmannerliness, the vulgar familiarity which make it so difficult for some persons of delicate taste to read *La Cousin Bette*, or the *Lys dans la Vallée*, — these defects are all of them absent from the *Poèmes barbares*, from the *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, from *Madame Bovary*, or from the *Vie de Jésus*, and are only lighted on in the dramas of Augier and Dumas.

But this is not all, for the impression must not be leit that the Naturalists confined themselves in their writings

animals [Cf. *le Sommeil du condor*; *le Rêve du jaguar*; *les Éléphants*]; his landscapes [Cf. *le Bernica*; *la Fontaine aux lianes*]; — his sense of the diversity of races [Cf. *le Cœur d’Himalmar, la Vérandaï, la Tête du conte*]. — That these descriptions are widely different from those of the Romanticists; — in virtue of the author’s regard for exactness; — of his endeavour to keep them free from all trace of his personality; — of the intensity of the life with which he instills them [Cf. *la Panthère noire*; *les Hurleurs*]. — Whether it be a fact that these characteristics bring his poetry into a line with science; — and in what measure it is allowable to describe his poetry as scientific?

Leconte de Lisle’s poetic inspiration so far as it was derived from Pessimism, — and that this influence is the cause of the originality of his work. — Whether Vigny exerted an influence on Leconte de Lisle? — or whether they both derived their Pessimism from the same source? — That there is more nobleness in the Pessimism of Alfred de Vigny; — and in that of Leconte de Lisle not more sincerity, but a more communicative conviction. — Leconte de Lisle suffers, too, from his inability to rid himself of his rather narrow hostility to Christianity; — and from his disinclination to express any pity for “sorrowing humanity.” — That this callousness, however, must not be imputed to his personal insensitivity [Cf. *le Manchey, Quin l’Illusion suprême*]; — but to his resolve to give utterance in his verse solely to the miseries of humanity; — and not to the miseries of the individual; — and also perhaps to his conception of style.
to avoiding the defects of the Romanticists. By associating art more closely with the imitation of nature, Flaubert and Taine, Leconte de Lisle and Renan imparted to style a degree of precision, of fulness, of solidity, or, to use Flaubert's expression, of "density," in which it had long been wanting. Certain magnificent verses of Leconte de Lisle:

Le vent respectueux, parmi leurs tresses sombres,
Sur leur nuque de marbre errait en frémissant,
Tandis que les parois des rocs couleur de sang,
Comme de grands miroirs suspendus dans les ombres,
De la pourpre du soir baignaient leur dos puissant, .....

certain pages of Flaubert,—the description of the agri-

Of the qualities of Leconte de Lisle's style;—and that there are no "greater verses" than his;—none more plastic;—none more harmonious.—They are a little wanting, however, in ease, or in "air," so to speak;—and also a little in variety.—He would have been better advised too had he avoided certain affectations of local colour;—which do not add to the truth of his descriptions:—while they tend to give rather a pedantic idea of true "Naturalism."—There is nothing more "natural" in writing Phæbus instead of Phœbus in French;—and neither the sentiment of antiquity;—nor the accuracy of distinction;—nor the survival of a work of art are dependent on such minutæ.

3. The Works.—Leconte de Lisle's works comprise: (1) his Poems, arranged as follows in the definite edition issued by himself: Poèmes Antiques; Poèmes Barbare; Poèmes Tragiques.—There is further a volume of posthumous works, Derniers Poèmes, published in 1895;

(2) His translations of the Iliad, the Odyssey, Hesiod, Æschylus, and Horace, which are spoiled by excessive literalness and seem to have been "written for the booksellers."

(3) His Erinnyes, a mere adaptation from Æschylus, more "Æschylean" than the original, which form part of the Poèmes Tragiques, but must be classed apart, as they have been represented on the stage.

VI.—English Influence.
The English influence;—which had been undergone by everybody
cultural show in Madame Bovary, or that of the forest of Fontainebleau in the Education sentimentale, innumerable pages of Taine or Renan have impressed us as work that is "definite" and "finished." It may be questioned indeed whether they have not gone to extremes in this direction, for when they reached the point of believing, as Flaubert did in all seriousness, that an "assemblage of words" has "a beauty of its own" independently of what it expresses, were they not the dupes of a veritable artistic hallucination? I should be disposed, for my part, to hold that they were. However, it was their boundless faith in the virtue of style that recommended them in the first instance to their contemporaries;

to a slight extent since the beginning of the century;—and primarily by Chateaubriand;—but which had been chiefly felt hitherto in politics and history;—and in a somewhat vague manner;—begins to act on more definite lines towards 1855;—and by the intervention of certain writers,—Philarète Chasles, Émile Montégut, Taine,—in three principal directions.

1. By the writings of Émile Montégut;—who publishes in the Revue des Deux Mondes, 1851-1858, a more thorough study of the English and American novel than any foreign author has ever made at any period of a foreign literature;—a sort of "realism" at once sentimental and caricatural;—is revealed to French readers.—Dickens and Thackeray are its principal representatives;—David Copperfield or Vanity Fair become almost as popular in France as in England;—after the appearance of Taine's admirable and well-known studies of Dickens and Thackeray.

2. At the same time Darwin's celebrated book The Origin of Species, 1858, appears in England and arouses considerable attention everywhere.—It is at once translated into French by Mlle Clémence Royer;—Flourens makes a pitiable attempt to refute it;—but it gives an extraordinary impulsion to natural history studies;—and through them to "naturalistic" ideas in art and criticism;—which seem in consequence to enjoy added authority.—In France, as in England and in Germany,—Darwin's book causes "biological science" to be regarded as the typical science in the place of "mathematical science."
and the talent for writing for which they were admired brought about the vogue of their aesthetic doctrines.

Certain of the critics, those of the academic and university school, with Sainte-Beuve at their head, and among his following, J. J. Weiss, Cuvillier-Fleury, and Prévost-Paradol, had made, it is true, a show of resistance, but they had not been listened to, and still less had their lead been followed. On the contrary, the last of the Romanticists themselves, Victor Hugo, George Sand, and Michelet, were seen to incline towards Naturalism. Thus there is no overlooking the fact that it is the *Poèmes Antiques* and the *Poèmes Barbares* that Victor Hugo has imitated, imitated as he was able, as he

3. Finally, and to say nothing of Émile Montégut’s translation of Emerson’s *Representative Men*,—or of Taine’s study of English Idealism (*l’Idéalisme anglais*),—George Eliot’s novels, *Adam Bede*, *Silas Marner*, etc., are translated, and the attention is called to them of the French public.—The characteristic of these novels is,—that they are advisedly, deliberately, and staunchly “naturalistic,”—the author having the advantage over all her contemporary novelists.—Flaubert included,—of a considerable philosophic training.—And thus it happens that with her Naturalism,—which is far from stopping short at the surface of things,—is introduced at the same time, for use in the near future,—the means of correcting and “idealising” it.

VII.—Gustave Flaubert [Rouen, 1821; † 1880, Paris].


knew how to imitate, but still that he has imitated in his Légende des Siècles. Not that he ceased on this account to be a Romanticist! The Rose de l'Infante, or the Raisons du Monotombo continue to be, are above everything else the personal impressions and opinions aroused in Hugo by his subject. Nevertheless he strove, as far as his essentially lyric genius would allow him, to become epic, impersonal, and objective; and his efforts were occasionally successful. As to Michelet, he too did not abjure his method or refashion his "temperament." In the last volumes of his Histoire de France he continued only to concern himself with and to render in his prose the lyric thrill, so to speak, which events aroused in him.


2. The Novelist.—His extraction; —he is first attracted by Romanticism; —his early friendships with Louis Bouilhet and Maxime du Camp; —his travels; —His conception of art [Cf. his Correspondence with his "Muse," Louise Colet]; —and that it was originally the outcome of an excess of modesty: —"Little streams that overflow assume the airs of the ocean; and to be the ocean all they lack is dimension! Let us remain a river, and be content with turning our mill" [Cf. vol. ii., p. 190]. —Flaubert's hatreds; —and, in contrast, his singular esteem for "that old stick of a Boileau." —Hesitations and first efforts: La Tentation de Saint Antoine.—His preoccupation with style; —and whether he did not carry it to lengths which made it a mania?

Unity of Flaubert's work; —and that whatever be said of Madame Bovary or l'Éducation sentimentale; —is equally applicable to Salammbo or the Tentation de Saint Antoine.—It is only the subject that differs; —the methods remain the same; —and the conception of art does not vary. —The author's first concern is to abstract himself from the reality he is depicting; —and to note in depicting it only those features which will leave the same impression, —on all those who study it with equal closeness [Cf. on this subject Sainte-Beuve's discussion with Flaubert concerning Salammbo]. —But in the second
Still, in these very volumes, and more especially in the *Insecte*, the *Oiseau*, the *Femme* and *l'Amour*, he made the concession to Naturalism that he came to regard everything as a question of what may be termed physiological mysticism. In these works he is solely preoccupied by natural history; and henceforth the ultimate explanation of things lies in some veiled pathological detail. Shall I refer to George Sand? and shall I say that after the *Marquis de Villemer*, 1860, or perhaps *Monsieur Silvestre*, 1865, every fresh volume she adds to her work detracts from rather than increases her fame? Such is unhappily the truth, but in her decadence she too, she who was Valentine, who was Indiana, is bent on “getting place the depiction ought to be typical,—and not anecdotal;—a contrary condition to that observed by Romanticism;—since while Romanticism singled out in character what may be called the “accidental” or the “unique” [Cf. *Notre-Dame de Paris*, the *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*, *Colomba*],—character for Flaubert and Naturalism,—as for the science of his time,—consisted in the element which is durable and permanent in changing things.—In consequence, the experience of Emma Bovary may be treated in the same way as that of the daughter of Hamilcar;—and both may be regarded as embodying;—an entire “moment” of history;—an entire class of women;—and an entire civilisation.—This is what Flaubert means by the “solidity of the framework.”—Thirdly, the work must be endowed with “the higher life of form”;—by means of a style “as rhythmical as verse and precise as the language of the sciences”;—whose power is to some extent intrinsic or existent in virtue of itself;—“independently of what is expressed”;—and whose inherent beauty has some analogy with that of a line;—which is harmonious, graceful, and voluptuous in itself.—And Flaubert has complied with all these exigencies,—in *Salammbô* as in *Madame Bovary*, and in *l'Éducation sentimentale* as in the *Tentation de Saint Antoine*.

But all Flaubert’s “realisations,”—with the exception of *Madame Bovary*,—have been spoiled by the intervention of the author of *Bovard et Pécuchet*;—whose continuous irony is a perpetual breach of the principle of the impersonality of the artist;—and, in this connection, of Flaubert’s Pessimism.—Its origin is purely literary;—and
a closer grip of reality"; she descends from her cloudy heights, and with a modesty which does her honour consents to learn from Flaubert.

There is one point, however, on which they are unyielding, and happily so, since it is the vulnerable point of Naturalism. They do not admit that art should be severed from life, or that the artist should retire from the world and live in isolation. "Action!—wrote Michelet in 1866,—Voltaire in his Lettres anglaises has uttered the mighty word, the modern Symbol; Man's object is action" [Cf. Histoire de France, vol. xvi., 1st edition, 1866, pp. 426, 427]. George Sand, in turn, discussing her art with Flaubert, declares: "An author must

he is incensed against life and his fellow-men solely because they do not understand art in the same way as he does [Cf. his Correspondence].

—That this point of view is only legitimate—on the condition that he who adopts it confines himself strictly to his art;—and renounces the right to interpret or judge life, to do which is to go beyond his art.—Flaubert held that nothing existed outside art;—a belief that constituted his force,—but also, from another point of view, his weakness,—since there is more in life than art.—Narrowness, in this respect, of Flaubert's ideas;—and that they doubtless contributed to no slight extent to make the development of Naturalism follow narrow instead of spacious lines.—And that if this disdain for all that is not art is a characteristic of Romanticism,—the fact explains the Romantic element that is met with in work of the last representatives of Naturalism.

8. The Works.—Flaubert's works comprise:

(1) His Fiction: Madame Bovary, 1856 [in the Revue de Paris], and 1857, Michel Lévy;—Salammbô 1862;—l'Éducation sentimentale, 1870;—the Tentation de Saint Antoine, 1874 [fragments of the work had appeared in the Artiste in 1856 and 1857];—Trois contes;—and Bouvard et Pécuchet, 1881 [posthumous and unfinished].

(2) Two theatrical pieces: the Candidat;—and the Château des cœurs, 1879.

(3) Some short writings, of which the most important are the letter to Sainte-Beuve concerning Salammbô;—and the preface to the Dernières Chansons de Louis Bouilhet.
write for everybody, for all those who need to be initiated. There is all the secret of our persevering labour and of our love of art. *What is art without the hearts or the intelligences to which it ministers?*” [Cf. George Sand, *Correspondance*, vol. v., letter No. 616, October, 1866]. This is what Leconte de Lisle and Flaubert refused to understand;—and it is in the truth contained in this lesson that Naturalism, after having transformed literature, found the great obstacle to its propagation.

For other novelists, and foremost amongst them Octave Feuillet, the author of the *Histoire de Sibylle*, 1862, and of *Monsieur de Camors*, 1867, have realised the truth in question, and their influence in consequence has counter-

His complete works, less the Correspondence, have been issued in seven volumes, in 8vo, Paris, 1885, Quantin.

VIII.—Hippolyte-Adolphe Taine [Vouziers, 1828; † 1893, Paris].


2. *The Evolution of Taine’s Thought.*—Taine’s birth and training;—the years he passed at the École Normale [Cf. some letters on this subject in Gréard’s *Prévost-Paradol*, Paris, 1895];—he begins his career as a professor.—The *Essai sur La Fontaine*, 1858;—the *Essais sur Tite-Live*, 1858;—the *Philosophes français au XIXe siècle*, 1867;—and the *Essais de critique et d’histoire*, 1858.
balanced that of the Naturalists. It was taken to heart, however, still more profoundly by the dramatists, whose art, as we have seen, disappears entirely if they lose touch with the public. "How many simpletons are necessary to form a public?" insolently demanded Chamfort. What he should have said was: How many spectators are necessary of every age and every social rank, who are in no wise "artists"? who have not the right to be artists, and whom in consequence it is the function of art to raise to its own level? And it happens in reality that after the slight surprise caused them by the doctrine of art for art, such writers as Feuillet, Augier, and Dumas free themselves from its bondage,

That under the influence of the philosophy of Spinoza, Hegel and Auguste Comte,—and of history as conceived by Michelet,—Taine’s first act was to "purge" criticism of all moral intention,—and of all aesthetic pretensions;—and to reduce it to mere natural history. —The theory of the race, the environment and the moment;—and is it true that, as set forth by Taine, there is nothing new about it except its exaggeration?—It is Gustave Planche and not Sainte-Beuve who best appreciated the entire novelty of the method;—which lay in the fact that though its elements existed on every hand;—its "synthesis" had not been effected;—and still less had anybody perceived its consequences.—The application of the doctrine;—and the Histoire de la littérature anglaise, 1863.—Criticism in Taine’s eyes is "the natural history of intelligences";—the artist and the poet being in a very slight measure representative of themselves;—but rather the spokesmen at every period of an entire species of men, sentiments or ideas.

Taine continued to adhere to this theory until 1865. —At this juncture, having been appointed "Professor of Aesthetics and of the History of Art";—and being the most conscientious of men;—he came to recognise that it is impossible to discuss works of art without "judging" them;—or even to write their history without "classifying" them.—These new convictions are already visible in his Philosophie de l’art en Italie, 1865;—and more clearly so in his Voyage en Italie, 1866;—while they are openly affirmed in his Idéal dans l’art, 1869.—It is in this volume that, after having exhausted all the
write. "pieces with a purpose," and moralise to the top of their bent. Feuillet, indeed, is less successful as a dramatist than as a novelist, and I only mention him in this connection for the sake of completeness. But assuredly it is neither to "impassibility" nor even to "impartiality" that Émile Augier lays claim in the Effrontés, 1861, in the Fils de Giboyer, 1862, and still less in Maître Guerin, or in Lions et Renards, 1869; while Dumas, the bolder of the two, goes further still.

"We are lost,—he cries in the Preface he writes in 1868 to his Fils naturel—and dramatic art, that great art, is about to degenerate into a thing of tinsel, spangles and gewgaws; it will fall into the hands of the mountebanks

"natural" means of fixing the rank of works of art;—technical capacity;—permanence and depth of the character expressed by the works,—"convergence of effects";—he lays down as the decisive criterion,—"the degree in which their character makes for good."—And the criterion is open to discussion,—but it is a criterion, and one of a kind that no Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire would ever have invoked;—since it tends to rank the fox or the hyena much "below" the dog,—and the "aesthetic" consideration is reintroduced into criticism by its adoption.

In the meantime the events of 1870—1871, supervene;—they are a revelation to Taine. — He publishes his Notes sur l'Angleterre, 1872; —and conceives the plan of the great work—of which the first volume, l'Ancien régime, 1875,—is perhaps his masterpiece.—His study of the Revolution—acquaints him with a class of men he had hitherto had but a slight knowledge of.—He asks himself with an anxiety that does him credit,—if it be true "that a palace is beautiful even when it is burning or especially when it is burning";—and whether when we meet with a "crocodile" amongst our fellow men,—it is incumbent on us merely to describe and admire him?—His honesty causes him to reply in the negative;—with the result that unintentionally he reintroduces into criticism the "moral" consideration; — which assumes a preponderating importance in the closing volumes of his Origines, 1890—1892.—He thus finds himself back at the point in the circle from which he had started;—and he has employed forty years of uninterrupted labour; — to reinstate in eclecticism the principle he
and become the gross amusement of the populace, if we do not hasten to press it into the service of the great social reforms and the great hopes of humanity." For his part, suiting his action to his word, he will henceforth make it his constant aim to contribute to what he designates by the somewhat strange expression, "the rise in value of humanity." Is it not a pity, under these circumstances, that the "Naturalist" he had been in his earlier years should too often clash with the moralist or moraliser he had pledged himself to become; that his always vivacious, but at once violent and commonplace style should betray to the very end the persons and places he had frequented in his youth; and that his virtuous women, and still

had most bitterly derided;—the principle, that is, of the subordination of criticism and history to morality.

In the interval he has displayed admirable gifts as a writer;—or even as a poet;—gifts that are only impaired by a certain artificiality. —The reader is too conscious "how" his finest pages were composed. —They are marred by too much rhetoric;—by too many obvious artifices;—especially in his later writings;—and by effects of a harshness and violence,—that are not solely ascribable to the nature of the subject.

3. The Works. —It is somewhat difficult to draw up a hard and fast classification of Taine's works. With the exception of the Voyage aux Pyrénées, 1835; of the Vie et Opinions de Thomas Graindorge, 1868; and of the Notes sur l'Angleterre, 1872, they are all of them "critical and historical" works.

Essai sur les fables de La Fontaine [written to obtain his Doctor's degree, 1858], revised under the title La Fontaine et ses Fables, 1860;—Essai sur Tite Live, 1855;—Les Philosophes français, 1856;—Essais de critique et d'histoire, 1868;—Histoire de la littérature anglaise, 1868, 4 vols. in 8vo, or 5 vols. in 12mo;—Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire, 1865;—Philosophie de l’art en Italie, 1865;—De l’Idéal dans l’art, 1867;—Philosophie de l’art en Grèce, 1869;—Philosophie de l’art dans les Pays-Bas [four volumes, afterwards (1881) published in two volumes under the title Philosophie de l’art];—Voyage en Italie, 1866;—De l’Intelligence, 1870;—the Origines de la France contemporaine, 1876–1890;—Derniers essais de critique et d’histoire, 1894;—Carnets de Voyage, 1896.
more his dialecticians,—both of whom come to conclusions that are less impecable than the arguments they employ,—should seem to take an unconscious or paradoxal pleasure in celebrating the "hopes of humanity" in the somewhat unvarnished language of his Suzanne d'Ange or his Albertine de la Borde? "So much wit has never been made to serve the purpose of rendering us stupid," Voltaire formerly wrote to the author of the Discours sur l'inégalité: and similarly it will be said in the future that the cause of idealism has never been defended by methods more naturalistic than those of the author of l'Étrangère or of the Princesse de Bagdad. Impartial critics will add, however, that these methods were the

IX.—Ernest Renan [Trégui, 1823; † 1892, Paris].

1. The Sources.—His Correspondence, only portions of which have appeared as yet: Lettres à sa sœur Henriette, 1896, Paris; and Lettres à M. Berthelot, Paris, 1898;—Ernest Renan, Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse, Paris, 1876–1882;—Abbé Cognat, M. Renan hier et aujourd'hui, 1883, Paris.


2. The Man and the Writer.—His extraction;—his childhood;—and that while there was perhaps something in him of the "Gascon" and the "Breton,"—still his character, the nature of his intelligence and even his talent were more especially the work of his sister Henriette.—His early studies;—the seminary;—and was his estrangement from Christianity due to "philological" reasons?—It seems rather to have been due to reasons of a "philosophic" order;—of which it was not until later that he sought the justification in exegesis;—and
best or the most efficacious that Dumas could have employed at the time; and will remember, when reproaching him with their occasional vulgarity, that in the end they served the interests of art itself.

I would endeavour to prove this assertion, if I were in a position to do so; I mean if I had not been obliged to decide that I would offer no appreciation of any living author in this "Manual of the History of French Literature." There can be no history of contemporary matters; the thing is a contradiction in terms, we are too close to the men or the works of our time, and we lack the independence and the documents necessary to

much later still in natural history.—The *Avenir de la science*, 1849;—and that this work would be entirely representative of Renan,—if, at a later date, his popularity had not brought to the front,—the dilettante and the "trifler" in him,—whose existence had long been wholly unsuspected.

Renan's early works;—Averroès et l'Averroïsme, 1852;—Histoire générale des langues sémitiques, 1857;—Études d'histoire religieuses, 1848-1857;—Essai sur l'origine du language, 1858;—and that these works are not the least remarkable of those he has left.—Their common characteristic is that they display the desire, on the part of their author, to retain as much of "religion" as it is possible to retain in the absence of belief in religion;—an attitude which would simply be that of Voltaire;—were it not in a still greater measure that of Chateaubriand;—on account of the sincerity of sentiment Renan exhibits in this portion of his work;—and of the infinite charm of style with which he smooths over the contradictory nature of his enterprise.—Another characteristic of these early works is their solid erudition [Cf. the *Livre de Job*, 1858; the *Cantique des Cantiques*, 1860; and in particular the *Discours sur l'état des beaux-arts au XIVe siècle*].—Renan's contributions to the *Histoire littéraire de la France*.—How all these works helped to extend to a sensible degree the domain of literature,—by including in it, thanks to the power of style;—the results achieved by erudition, philosophy, and exegesis.

Publication of the *Vie de Jésus*;—emotion aroused by this book;
judge them. However, I may point out in general terms how considerable has been the influence of the ideas of Dumas; and to realise the fact it is sufficient to bear in mind how numerous are the influences over which the influence of Dumas seems to have triumphed at the moment at which I write.

It has triumphed over the Dilettantism, which certain belated disciples of Stendhal and Beaudelaire, impetuous self-admirers, Romanticists' unbeknown to themselves, attempted to restore to favour on the morrow of the events of 1870–1871,—as if the sole effect of these events on literature had been to widen the breach between art and life. I do not allude here to the ill-advised imita-

and the reasons for this emotion, 1868.—The work was the first to give the results of Biblical criticism stripped of all the pedantry of German scholarship;—"sacred" history is brought down in it to the purely human level of all other history;—and for the Divine personage of the Gospels is substituted another personage;—real, and no longer symbolical or "mythical" as was the Jesus of Strauss and the German theologians.—These characteristics are again met with in all the volumes of the Origines du christianisme, 1863–1881;—but as the work approaches its conclusion;—Renan's criticism comes more and more to resemble that of Voltaire;—by reason of a certain disingenuousness in the interpretation of facts;—of a positive contempt for humanity, which must be deceived if it is to be influenced even for its good;—and of an affectation of levity totally out of place in connection with a subject of such gravity.—The work still displays some of the qualities of the author of the Études d'histoire religieuse;—his art of evoking an entire series of ideas by a single word;—the clearness of his style;—and an ease that will be at once appreciated by comparing it with the metallic brilliancy of Taine's prose.—Still in the later volumes dilettantism begins to make its appearance,—the most regrettable bent of mind there is for an historian;—so far as it leads him to regard his subject merely as a source of self-satisfaction;—and as a pretext for displaying his intellectual graces.

Renan's last works: Cabihan, 1878;—l'Eau de Jouvence, 1880;—the Preface to the translation of the Book of Ecclesiastes, 1881—
tions of Renan, of the Renan of the Antéchrist, 1874, or of the Abbé de Jouarre, 1886: these writers have overlooked the element of indestructible and uncompromising dogmatism that underlies the jesting of the master: Saltavit et placuit: he danced and he raised laughter! but there are two or three points that he never abandoned, and these two or three points constitute the whole of Positivism. I do not refer to the writers who, nurtured on the Fleurs du mal, and full of admiration for the portrait which Stendhal has drawn of himself in the character of Julian Sorel, only demanded of art that it should serve them as an instrument of solitary pleasure, and thus confounded it, not merely

Prêtre de Némi, 1885;—the Abbé de Jouarre, 1886;—the Histoire d'Israël, 1887–1890.—Exaggeration of Renan's defects in these later writings;—and whether they are not the outcome in the main of a desire to show himself worthy of a popularity he had profoundly despised during his laborious early years?—They exhibit, however, that intellectual curiosity he retained to the very end;—the desire to understand his time;—and that religious veneration for science, that is all that remained to him in the shape of religion.—Taine was similarly situated;—but by a contradiction that finally characterises the two writers,—whereas Taine, whose starting-point had been pure "Naturalism," tended, almost from first to last, towards the reconstitution of the principles of the moral life;—Renan, whose starting-point had been a very lofty and very strict morality,—came, in his desire to make it broader, to disregard it,—and to adopt dilettantism as his rule of life.

His influence has been considerable;—as considerable as that of any of his contemporaries;—particularly during the last years of his life—as being of a more general character,—and exerted in connection with more universal questions;—or with questions whose interest is more universally felt;—than that of the problems of pure aesthetics or art.—He also did much towards amusing his contemporaries.—Finally he was prodigal of "confessions";—at a period when his fellow-writers had ceased to indulge in "personal literature";—and he persuaded a generation of young men,—that forty years of labour and meditation had merely enabled him to arrive at conclusions t
with its perversion,—optimi corruptio pessima—but
with intellectual dissoluteness and debauchery. Nobody
has protested more energetically than Dumas against
this confusion, which is among the most deplorable that
can be named, since it causes the name of art to serve
as a screen to the most egoistic of trades; and nobody has
denounced more energetically the dangers and the anti-
social side of diletantism.

He was no less energetic in his protests against Natural-
ism, more especially when this Naturalism, strangely
degenerated from the idea that a Taine or a Flaubert had
formed of it, became the exact opposite of what it had
promised to be [Cf. F. Brunetière, Le roman naturaliste].

which, according to his own expression [Cf. l'Ecclesiaste], "a street
arab arrives off hand."

8. The Works.—Renan's works may be divided into three principal
groups, according as they appertain to pure erudition, to the general
history of religions or of Christianity in particular, or to what we
should term philosophy, were it not necessary to distinguish in this
last group between the really serious works and those which are purely
fanciful.

(1) Works of pure erudition: Averroès et l'Averroisme [written in
view of his degree], 1852;—Histoire générale et comparée des langues
sémithèques, 1857;—Essai sur l'origine du langage, 1858;—his Papers
in the Journal asiatique or the Mémoires de l'Académie des inscrip-
tions;—and his articles in the Histoire littéraire de la France,
vols. 34iv. to xxx.

To the above should be added the important work entitled Mission
de Phénicie, 1865;—and his contributions to the Corpus inscriptionum
semiticarum.

(2) Religious history.—Études d'histoire religieuse, 1857;—and
Nouvelles études d'histoire religieuse, 1884; two volumes, the second
of which contains some of Renan's early writings on Buddhism and
on St. Francis of Assisi.—De la part des peuples sémithèques dans
l'histoire de la civilisation, brochure, 1861;—Vie de Jésus, 1868: les
Apôtres, 1866; Saint Paul, 1869; l'Antéchrist, 1873; les Évangiles,
1877; l'Église chrétienne, 1879; Marc-Aurèle, 1881, seven volumes,
completed by an index;—Histoire du peuple d'Israël, 1887—1892.
It is true that in this instance other influences; whose action still continues, singularly aided or amplified that of Dumas. Foremost among the influences in question is that of Schopenhauer, whose idealist Pessimism, differed so widely and so happily from that vulgar Pessimism which is a mere disguise for unsatisfied appetites and the pride of life. Another of these influences is that of George Eliot, of whose Naturalism it may be said that it is an ethical or a sociological rather than an aesthetic principle; a circumstance that distinguishes it from the purely artistic or unpassable Naturalism of the author of l'Éducation sentimentale or Madame Bovary. There is further the influence of Tolstoi and of Ibsen, of the

To the above should be added translations: of the Book of Job, 1858; of the Song of Solomon, 1860; of Ecclesiastes, 1881; and the volume entitled Conférences d'Angleterre, 1881.

(3) Philosophic works.—Essais de morale et de critique, 1860;—Questions contemporaines, 1868;—La réforme intellectuelle et morale, 1871;—Dialogue et fragments philosophiques, 1876;—Mélanges d'histoire et de voyages, 1878;—Discours et conférences, 1887;—l'Avenir de la science, 1890 [written in 1849].

The following works form a group apart: Caliban, 1878;—l'Eau de Jouvence, 1880;—le Prêtre de Némi, 1885;—1802: Dialogue des morts, 1886;—and l'Abbesse de Jouarre, 1886.

The Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse, 1876–1882, together with such of the Correspondence as has appeared, form a final category.

X.—Charles Baudelaire [Paris, 1821; | 1867, Paris].

Russian novel and the Norwegian drama, productions the exact nature of which cannot be determined, as they are too close to us, though it is clear that their principal source of inspiration is "social pity." It has been feared by some that the French genius would lose certain of its qualities, and even the consciousness of its power under the action, the apparently conflicting action, of so many influences; they have attacked these influences in consequence, but how? Simply by declaring that, before Tolstoi or George Eliot, French writers, notably George Sand, but more especially and more recently Alexander Dumas, had given expression to what it had been imagined was most Russian in Tolstoi and most "Anglo-Saxon" in George Eliot.


2. The Rôle of Baudelaire;—and that it is entirely posthumous.
—Even the *Fleurs du mal* would have attracted scarcely any attention, had it not been for the dubious popularity they acquired, owing to the judicial proceedings of which they were the object.—But his death in 1867 having recalled attention to him,—and removed the scruples many persons would have felt in professing themselves his admirers or disciples during his lifetime,—it is from this date that he exerted,—and that he still exerts a real, and in the main a threefold, influence.—He realised that morbid poetry,—which had been the dream of Sainte-Beuve’s earlier years,—and the principle of which is pride in suffering from some unusual or anomalous disease.—In this way he discovered and gave expression to certain phenomena,—whose morbid character is to some extent atoned for by the keenness of the sensations they procure,—and also by the very brutality of the words to which recourse must be had to express them.—Finally, by his efforts to express these phenomena,—he inaugurated contemporary symbolism,—if this symbolism consists essentially in a confused mixture of mysticism and sensuality.—The question, however, arises in connection with these "innovations"—as to how far their author was sincere;—and whether an entire school of writers has not been the dupe of a dangerous mystifier.

3. The Works.—In addition to his translations of Edgar Poe, His-
It is in this way that the influence of Dumas has also triumphed over the doctrine of art for art,—which, moreover, he did not understand when he reproached it with inculcating "the mere reproduction of facts," while he understood it still less when with his peremptory assurance he declared it "absolutely devoid of sense." The author of the *Poèmes Antiques* and the *Poèmes Barbares* was aware of what he was about! Indeed, he had a clearer view of his goal than Dumas, who wrote the *Visite de noces*, while he talked of utilising the stage as a moralising force. Still Dumas was right in recalling that man is not made for art, but, on the contrary, art for man: a point which nobody contests to-day. If the

toires extraordinaires, 1856;—*Nouvelles histoires extraordinaires*, 1857;—*Histoires grotesques et sérieuses*, 1865;—and to his *Fleurs du mal*, 1857, there seems to be nothing worth mention unless it be his *Paradis artificiel*;—and the very searching articles on various French poets he contributed to Crépet's *Recueil des poètes français*.

There is an edition in seven volumes of his complete works, Paris, 1868-1870, Michel Lévy.

XI.—The Influence of German Literature.

The German influence, after its introduction by Mme de Staël, continued to make itself felt,—but down to 1860 its effects were chiefly seen in the writings of certain members of the University, notably in those of Saint-René Taillandier.—But from 1860 onwards its importance increases,—and it makes itself felt simultaneously in three or four directions.

1. In philosophy;—through the medium of Ernest Renan;—Edmond Scherer [Cf. his study of Hegel in his *Mélanges d'histoire religieuse*, 1861] ;—and Étienne Vacherot [Cf. *la Métaphysique et la science*] ;—Hegelianism comes into vogue,—and there is endless talk of "the identity of the contradictory" [Cf. Gratry, *les Sophistes et la Critique*] ;—a formula in wonderful accordance with the budding idea of evolution.—It is towards the same period that the *Revue germanique* is founded;—and that Schopenhauer is discovered or rediscovered [Cf. Foucher de Careil, *Hegel et Schopenhauer*, 1862, Paris, and Challekel-Lacour, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March, 1870],
painter or the sculptor be justified in concerning themselves solely with the realisation of character or beauty, the case is not the same with the dramatist or the poet, because they have recourse to words, and words express ideas and ideas serve as causes or motives of action. Dumas had an insight into this truth, though he expressed it somewhat confusedly: "All literature the aim of which is not perfectibility, moralisation, the ideal, in a word the useful, is a weakly, unwholesome, and still-born literature." It may be regretted that he did not express himself better, but at least he raised his voice, and though to begin with he met with violent contradictors, it was his view, and not that of the Leconte

—whose doctrines, better understood, will later on, towards 1875, renew the philosophic conception of love, and in consequence that of life itself.

2. In erudition;—and more particularly in exegesis and philology;—Strauss and Baur;—Bopp and Diez;—Mouninien and Curtius being taken as masters.

3. In art and literature;—almost the whole of Schiller and Goethe is translated at this period;—the claims of Heinrich Heine are enforced against the most illustrious of the Romanticiests;—and "Wagnerianism" begins to gain ground both for musical reasons;—and in consequence of the artistic doctrines that are deduced from it [Cf. Ed. Schuré, le Drame musical, Paris, 1875].—Henceforth, in spite of some "patriotic" opposition,—no influence is destined to exert a more considerable action,—for the reason that it is not exclusively "musical";—but philosophic;—and yet more because it has provided up to the present,—one of the principal elements of resistance to be found in the entire domain of European thought;—to the invasion of naturalism,—and of a naturalism even more superficial than coarse.

XII.—Alexandre Dumas fils [Paris, 1824; † 1895, Paris].

de Lisles or the Flauberts, that was accepted in the end.

The foregoing observations may be summed up by saying that, after having been individualist in the hands of the Romanticists, and impersonal in those of the Naturalists, modern French literature, considered as a whole, has again become social. And if, in the guise of a conclusion, we express the wish that it may continue to deserve this epithet, it is in nowise because we ascribe to it some secret meaning or mystic value! Nor is it because we take our own personal opinion as the arbitrary standard of the opinion of others. It


2. The Man and the Writer;—and that to understand Dumas fils from either point of view,—and still more to judge him,—it must be kept in view that he affected all his life to be in revolt;—an attitude, however, whose independence was hunted—by that need of pleasing,—and of humouring opinion in order to please—which is always the stumbling-block of the dramatist.

A. The Realist;—and that to start with he was merely a descendant of the Romanticists,—and a weak imitator of his father,—in the Aventures de trois femmes et d’un perroquet, 1846–1847;—in le docteur Servand, 1849;—and in le Régent Mustel, 1852 [Cf. J. J. Weiss, loc. cit., Les Romans de M. Dumas fils].—These works are equally wanting in imagination, style, and anything in the shape of artistic intention;—and if anything is more striking than the prodigious ignorance of their author;—it is his self-sufficiency;—two legacies of his “big child” and “good fellow of a father” [Cf. Un père prodigue].—The success of the Dame aux camélias, 1848 (the novel) and 1852 (the play),—shows him the true nature of his talent;—which lay in the imitation of what he had observed himself;—doubt-
is that we have substantial reasons for adopting the view in question—the very reasons we have endeavoured to make clear in this summary of the history of French literature. For while _dilettantism_ has certainly had the happy consequence that by developing or exciting intellectual curiosity it has sharpened its insight or widened its scope, and while further it cannot be denied,—and we have been careful not to deny,—that _Naturalism_ has rendered us useful and even precious services on at least two or three occasions in the course of our history, at the same time there is nothing to prevent a "social" literature from appropriating the conquests of _naturalism_

less an inferior form of realism;—as is that of a Champfleury or a Courbet;—whose realism is solely due to the sterility of their invention;—but is nevertheless a form of realism.—Difference in this respect between the realism of _Dumas_ and that of _Flaubert_ or _Taine_.

—_Diane de Lys_ constitutes a sort of return to _Romanticism_;—but from the _Demi-Monde_ onwards (1855),—_Dumas_ confines himself to realism and the imitation of contemporary manners.—_The Question d'argent_, 1857;—_the Fils naturel_, 1858, which is a portrait of _Dumas_ himself;—the _Père prodigue_, 1859, which is the portrait of his father;—_l'Ami des femmes_, 1864;—and _l'Afrique Clémenceau_, 1866, are all of them works in which the realistic characteristics dominate;—as regards the nature of the plots,—the choice of the personages;—and the familiarity of the style.—There appears a further difference between _Dumas' "realism"_ and that of _Flaubert_ or _Leconte de Lisle_;—namely, his almost absolute indifference to form;—and his belief that an author writes sufficiently well if he succeeds in obtaining a hearing.—Another difference is his tendency to discuss "problems" and to moralise.

B. _The Dramatist._—It is under the influence of this tendency;—a tendency encouraged by the direct personal influence of _George Sand_;—by the less direct but not less unquestionable influence of _Michelet_;—and by the desire to rival the in some sort political successes of _Augier_ [Cf. _Les effrontés_ and the _Fils de Giboyer_],—that _Dumas_ invents a new type of drama,—of which the _Idées de madame Aubray_, 1867,—are the first example.—For while _Augier_ continued to undergo the influence of _Scribe_;—and moreover would be at a loss to
and diletantism. On the contrary, the "conquests achieved by a social literature cannot be taken over by diletantism or naturalism, since the former is synonymous with individualism, and the latter consists in the absolute submission of the writer to his subject; or more exactly, in his acceptance of his subject. In his eyes phenomena are what they ought to be, and when he has attained to a comprehension of them, he esteems them not merely legitimate, but "natural," and in consequence necessary. In the second place, a "social" literature has the advantage—in the land of George Sand and Lamennais, of Voltaire and Montesquieu, of Bossuet and Racine, of throw it off;—Dumas frees himself from it;—and each of his plays becomes a "thesis,"—of which the personages are merely the spokesmen;—and the plot the demonstration.—In general the object of the thesis is to demonstrate the iniquity of the Code [Cf. F. Moreau, Le code civil et le Théâtre contemporain];—the causes pleaded more especially being the right to prove affiliation, the right of divorce, and the identical responsibility of the man and the woman in cases of seduction or adultery.—The Prefaces to the complete edition of the Plays [that of 1866-1870];—and that it must not be overlooked that they are posterior by ten years to the plays they precede,—and that they correspond to the new conception of his art adopted by the author of the Idées de madame Aubray.

It was in conformity with these new principles,—strengthened in him by the spectacle of the events of 1870-1871 [Cf. Lettres de Junius, 1870-1871],—that Alexandre Dumas wrote La Visite de noces, 1871;—la Princesse Georges, 1871;—la Femme de Claude, 1878;—three plays in at least two of which it does not appear that the "thesis" is detrimental to the dramatic value of the work;—but, on the contrary, the obligation of "demonstrating" has rid the drama of several embarrassing conventions.—They reintroduced into the drama a simplicity of action Scribe had banished from it;—since he trusted solely for success to the unexpectedness of his combinations. —They further introduced a passionate element,—that would be sought for in vain in Augier's comedies or dramas,—in which it is never clear why the personages act in this way or that rather than in some other way.—And finally, they restored to the drama,—the
Montaigne and even of Rabelais,—of being in conformity with the traditions four or five centuries old of the French genius. *Omnia quae loquitur populus iste conjuratio est!* Whatever does not express in the language of the generality truths that interest or concern the generality, as well as whatever is not clear, is not French; and it will be remarked that it is for this reason that the majority of our Romanticists, and still more of our Dilettantes are ignored by foreigners. England or Germany have better writers of this class among their native authors! On the other hand, the socialisation of literature, if I may venture on this expressive barbarism,

literary, psychological and moral importance,—it had been almost wholly lacking in for a century past;—for what is the significance of the Aventurière, or the Verre d'eau, or of the Tour de Nesle, or even of Marion Delorme?

C. The Moralist.—Of the transformation of the "realist" into the "moralist,"—of the Dumas of Diane de Lys or of the Dame aux Camélias,—into the Dumas of l'Étrangère, 1876;—of la Princesse de Bagdad, 1881;—of Denise, 1885;—and of Francillon, 1887.—That it must be confessed that it is a pity that Dumas, the moralist, is sometimes wanting in good sense;—more often still in an adequate knowledge of the questions he deals with;—and always in moderation.—The deficiencies of Dumas' early education are only too perceptible;—even in his manner of stating the problems he treats [Cf. *les Femmes qui tyrant* and *les Femmes qui votent*] 1880,—or again la *Question du divorce*, 1880.—After adapting them to the requirements of the stage, he solves too off-handedly difficulties;—of which he is blind to the complexity.—He nevertheless did considerable good—if only in passing frankly and resolutely from "naturalism" to "fiction"; without effort and solely in consequence of the progress of his reflections.—He was one of the first among his contemporaries,—following an attitude he adopted in writing the *Idées de Madame Aubray* and maintained down to Francillon,—to reunite art and life,—which it had been attempted to separate.—Doubtless it is to be regretted that of all his plays,—those which are sure to survive the longest are his "realistic" dramas,—but this accidental contingency is no objection against his talent as a dramatist;—or against "pieces with a pur-
has allowed us in the past, not only, as has been seen, to resist foreign influence, and to assimilate mere such foreign elements as could be made to serve the turn of our genius, but to exercise in the world the intellectual supremacy we have wielded more often than any other people. Finally, if it be essentially characteristic of a "social" literature that it tends, as has been said, towards "the perfecting of civil life," or, as we should say to-day, towards the progress of civilisation, what more could we add? For four hundred years our literature and even our language have enabled us to promote both the greatness of France and the common

pose";—or against the generousness of his effort,—and still less against the idea—more generally accepted than ever at present—that art has "a social function."

8. The Works.—Omitting his early novels, which are now almost unreadable, his works comprise:

(1) The Dame aux camelias (novel), 1848;—and the Affaire Clémenceau, 1886;

(2) His Plays, the last edition of which in 7 volumes, Paris, 1890-1898, Calmann Lévy includes: la Dame aux camelias, 1852; Diane de Lys, 1853; le Bijou de la reine, 1855 (in verse);—the Demi-Monde, 1856; la Question d'argent, 1857; le Fils naturel, 1858: Un Père prodigue, 1859;—l'Ami des femmes, 1864; les Idées de Madame Aubray, 1867;—Une visite de noces, 1871; la Princesse Georges, 1871; la Femme de Claude, 1873;—Monsieur Alphonse, 1878; l'Étrangère, 1876;—la Princesse de Bagdad, 1881; Denise, 1885; Francillon, 1887. To the above are to be added two volumes entitled: le Théâtre des autres, in which he is responsible to at least as great an extent as Augier for les Lionnes pauvres or as Barrière for les Faux bouhommes. The other pieces are le Supplice d'une femme [in collaboration with Emile de Girardin], 1865; Héloïse Paranquet [in collaboration with Armand Duranti], 1886;—le Filleul de Pompagnac, 1899; la Comtesse Romani [in collaboration with M. Fould], 1877;—and les Danichec [in collaboration with M. Pierre Corvin], 1879.

He also "recast" some of George Sand's pieces, the best known being the Marquis de Villemer, 1864.
good of humanity. Who would not sacrifice to this generous ideal something of his "individualism" and the strange vanity of being alone in admiring and understanding himself?

(3) In addition to his novels and plays Dumas is the author:—of three volumes entitled Entr'actes, 1878–1879, and one volume entitled Nouveaux Entr'actes, 1890, in which the majority of his brochures and fugitive writings have been reprinted under his own supervision;—of la Question du divorce, 1880;—and of Une lettre à M. Rivet, député, sur la recherche de la paternité, 1883.

THE END.