

**J. Henry Shorthouse,
"The Author of John Inglesant"
(with reference to T. S. Eliot and C. G. Jung)**

by
Charles W. Spurgeon

ISBN: 1-58112-183-0

DISSERTATION.COM



Parkland, FL • USA • 2003

*J. Henry Shorthouse, "The Author of John
Inglesant"
(with reference to T. S. Eliot and C. G. Jung)*

Copyright © 1995 Charles W. Spurgeon
All rights reserved.

Dissertation.com
USA • 2003

ISBN: 1-58112-183-0
www.Dissertation.com/library/1121830a.htm

J. Henry Shorthouse,
"The Author of *John Inglesant*"
(with Reference to T. S. Eliot and C. G. Jung)

Charles Wayman Spurgeon

A Thesis Submitted
for the Research Degree
Doctor of Philosophy in English Literature

Birkbeck College
University of London
1995

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements and Dedication

| | |
|--|---------|
| Introduction..... | 4-31 |
| Chapter One: Historical and Biographical Background of J. Henry Shorthouse..... | 32-70 |
| Chapter Two: The Early and Middle Essays..... | 71-109 |
| Chapter Three: John Inglesant in England..... | 110-154 |
| Chapter Four: John Inglesant In Italy..... | 155-189 |
| Chapter Five: Shorthouse and his Public..... | 190-227 |
| Chapter Six: What We Shall Be: Constance, Eve, and Blanche..... | 228-265 |
| Chapter Seven: Where Three Dreams Cross..... | 266-291 |
| Bibliography..... | 292-320 |

Acknowledgements and Dedication

More than thirty years ago I first read and felt the "mystic" power of *John Inglesant*, which urged me to explore the history of Nicholas Ferrar's Little Gidding. I soon realised that Shorthouse's "philosophical romance" was urging me, as it had Shorthouse, towards "spiritual romance". Though intent on keeping my maturing consciousness in the twentieth century, T. S. Eliot's spiritual autobiography exploded my sense of time and meaning. *Four Quartets* "enspiritualises" personal and collective human experience and redefines philosophical meaning and psychological time and proves, I think, that past and future are gathered and contained in the presence of poetry.

After many visits and pilgrimages to Little Gidding, after much historical searching, literary study, and inner investigation, I find nothing ordinary about Little Gidding, and I humbly dedicate this thesis to the extraordinary **Community of Christ the Sower at Little Gidding**,¹ which lives in conscious awareness of the "familiar compound ghost / Both intimate and unidentifiable", to the worldwide charitable trust, **Friends of Little Gidding**, and to Valerie Peters, "Poet of Little Gidding".

As words may suffice in compelling recognition of "a double part", I acknowledge personal and professional debts: Thanks to my supervisor, Andrew Sanders, and to Birkbeck College for its unique educational opportunities; to the British University International Summer Schools programme, especially to Edwina Porter of the London University summer programme; to Regent's College for the opportunity to teach and study in London; to "The Librarians" and the many libraries in Britain and in the United States that carefully preserve and eagerly share the treasures of our heritage; to Sir John and Lady Sophie Laws for their kindness and hospitality, to Adelheid Birch for her enduring support, to Maureen Jupp, my spiritual friend at Westminster Abbey, and to my friends and colleagues at the Henry E. Huntington Library and at Marymount College, Palos Verdes, California.

¹ Since this thesis was completed in October 1995, the Community of Christ the Sower has moved away from Little Gidding, and the properties surrounding the Church of St John the Divine are administered by The Little Gidding Trust, Clermont House, Little Cressingham, Thetford, Norfolk IP25 6LY.

Introduction

By the time Joseph Henry Shorthouse began writing *John Inglesant* in 1866, the English novel had developed a considerable tradition of religious controversy. As many as 40,000 novels were written between 1837 and 1901 to persuade atheists to believe, agnostics to reconsider, and believers to accept specific doctrines or dogmas. As the studies of Baker, Drummond, Maison, Chapman, and Wolff have demonstrated, religious novelists attempted to inculcate faith in their readers and to challenge readers to theological correctness.¹ As defined by Woolf, the major religious controversies of the Victorian church provide, in retrospect, six classifications:

Catholic and anti-Catholic
High Church (Tractarian / anti-Tractarian)
Low Church (Evangelical / anti-Evangelical)
Broad Church
Nonconformist (Dissenting)
Varieties of Doubters²

However "ambiguous" Anglo-Catholicism may be today, as Pickering contends,³ and however debatable its origins in Catholic and High Church traditions, Anglo-Catholicism is a dynamic and powerful force in the national religious life of England that owes many of its greatest achievements and much of its theological tradition to the Oxford Movement.⁴

Launched by a daring and ardent sermon preached by John Keble before His Majesty's Judges of Assize at Oxford, Sunday, 14 July 1833, in St. Mary's Church, the Oxford Movement's political and religious ardour had effectively transformed the religious life of England before it reached its highest achievement in fictional form, *John Inglesant* (1880). As with other movements in the religious life of England and in the world-wide Anglican communion, Anglo-Catholicism finds its strengths in historical tradition, and in the Victorian Church, Anglo-Catholicism represents the "high serious" and "high earnest" aspirations towards a strongly united national life. Pickering's analogy expresses the relationship between the Oxford Movement and Anglo-Catholicism as that of "mother and daughter"⁵ as literary critics think of the relationship between major and minor authors or between specific genre and literary offshoots. The Oxford Movement still lives in its aspirations, and modern "interfaith dialogue" may lead to an "intercommunion eucharist" between the Anglican and Roman churches.⁶ Although there appears to be little difference between Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic services and places of worship, now or in the recent past, the deeply rooted conflicts of the Victorian Church have by no means been

resolved, though the fires of controversy have been generally quelled in the twentieth century, especially in the post-World War II, Vatican II era, by the modern ecumenical movement.⁷ However deeply rooted in the human psyche or in cultural traditions, the essential differences between Anglican and Roman religious convictions may be simplified to metaphoric terms. Patristic and matristic spiritual values conflict against each other as patriotic and nationalistic values conflict against international ones; so too spontaneity and emotional worship conflict against formalized liturgy and ritual as Protestant local authority conflicts against Papal or Roman authority. Religious hierarchy, religious orders, and questions of authority differentiate the Roman from the English church, even though within the Anglo-Catholics or "Anglican-Catholics" or "Catholic-Anglicans" "great variation is to be found...from the moderates to the extremists."⁸ Although infighting is inherent in all churches, the "vast amount of infighting" within Anglo-Catholicism "is virtually incomprehensible to the outsider [and] has much weakened the movement."⁹ Study of the "insider" religious literary and critical work of J. Henry Shorthouse and T. S. Eliot clarifies Anglo-Catholicism and provides philosophical and psychological grounding for appreciating their respective "minor" and "major" contributions to Victorian and modern literature. As their artistic achievements and personal commitments to the religious life of England and to the vitality of the Church of England help clarify the causes of infighting and strengthen the spirituality of Anglo-Catholicism, the analytical or depth psychology of Individuation developed by Carl Gustav Jung provides a critical basis for assessing how their literary achievements define, resolve and strengthen Anglo-Catholicism.

The primary concern of the present study is the "enspiritualised" literary achievement of Shorthouse and the relationship of his Broad and liberal churchmanship to the High and conservative religious convictions of Eliot. The literary and critical work of both authors will be considered in some detail to illustrate their religious sensibilities, to show how their Anglo-Catholic ideals inform their respective spiritual visions, and to demonstrate how Jung's psychology of Individuation provides an important theoretical and critical basis for appreciating religious literature. Analytical study of the interrelations and interconnectedness of religion, philosophy, and psychology in literature risks reduction and oversimplification of "the spirit in man, art, and literature".¹⁰ Study of *spirit* usually complicates, confounds, or simply denies the empirical value of formal methodology,¹¹ but the psychology of Individuation translates the "rhetoric of the soul" into a psychological frame of reference through "the empirical method". As Jung defines the psychology of the empirical method itself, process becomes more significant than causal analysis. Cause and effect categories which are

acceptable to the methodologies of the materialistic sciences become unacceptable in the study of acausal or synchronous relationships. The dynamics of consciousness and the psychodynamics of the unconscious require an acausal theory. To address the proverbial "chicken or the egg" and "cart before the horse" problems of deterministic methodology, Jung proposed the acausal theory of synchronicity which, at least, makes the problems of the *spirit* susceptible to psychological theory. Analogously, the "rhetoric of the soul" or the "poetics of the Self" provides a frame of reference for the study of the "dynamics of the spirit" in religious literature. Shorthouse and Eliot assumed and defined critical values from their own creative practices and consciously chose the language and imagination of Anglo-Catholic Christianity to give historical continuity and validity to their spiritual visions. Eliot's pre-Christian work contrasts against his Christian writings and does not reflect the lifelong religious sensibility and continuity of Shorthouse's work. Shorthouse's transition from the Society of Friends to the Anglican Church evoked philosophical considerations, whereas Eliot's conversion transformed the philosophical rhetoric of his Unitarianism into the psychological and spiritual vision of Catholic Anglicanism. As artists of religious experience, both accepted the literary logic of Christ and Christianity, the necessity of paradox, irony, and symbolic imagery as the only means of communicating "sacramental vision" in industrialized and commercialized, secularized and materialized culture. As Jung had to observe, study, and assess the perceptual patterns and unconscious attitudes of his own personality before he could define the objectivity of empirical psychology, Shorthouse and Eliot defined their own natures and assessed their artistic preferences and prejudices through the practice of literary criticism. Jung had to assume great indifference, detachment, wonder, and objectivity towards his own personality, which by all accounts was neither an easy endeavour, nor was his a simple personality. After his conversion, Eliot had to redefine and defend religion itself to readers who had shared the agnostic stance and modernism of his pre-Christian poetry. Never as self-conscious as Eliot and certainly not as intellectual, Shorthouse never had to struggle for objectivity or to win the sympathies of non-religious readers. Rather, he felt his way towards critical theory and romanced his religious convictions into his literary practice. His influence today is that of a "minor Victorian" writer, and his work is known to only a small audience, though his influence has been compared with that of Malcolm MacMillan's *Dagonet the Jester* (1886), Richard Blackmore's *Lorna Doone* (1869), Thomas A. Pinkerton's *The Spanish Poniard* (1890)¹², Walter Pater's *Marius the Epicurean* (1885)¹³ and his influence has been detected in Margaret Irwin's *Royal Flush* (1932), Rose Macaulay's *They Were Defeated* (1932), Charles Morgan's *The Fountain* (1932), and David Garnett's *Pocahontas* (1933), and

his experimentation with philosophical and spiritual romance and with musical rhythms ultimately makes him a predecessor of such diverse writers as Hermann Hesse, Andre Gide, and Virginia Woolf.¹⁴

However minor his role as church apologist, essayist, novelist, and public literary figure among late Victorian authors, Shorthouse's religious sensibility bears intellectual sympathy with Eliot's Anglo-Catholic values in poetry, drama, critical essays and lectures and prefigures Eliot's work, as Jung's psychology of Individuation gives value to Eliot's "mythical method". In his 1923 essay on "Ulysses, Order, and Myth", Eliot credited James Joyce with having invented the "mythical method", which Eliot celebrated as having "the importance of a scientific discovery". By "manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity", Joyce advanced "a step toward making the modern world possible for art"¹⁵ As poetry expresses "the most ancient and most modern" mode of religious thought, so the alternating philosophical and lyrical qualities of *John Inglesant* suggest a dialectical rhythm of mental time play between historical imagination and the contemporaneity of stream of consciousness. Writing in secrecy and privacy, Shorthouse did not, however, think of himself as a "conscious artist", as an author aware of his niche in English literature, during the years he worked on *John Inglesant*, and, indeed, he did not see the need to make art "possible for the modern world"; rather he saw the need to make religion and religious life an art.

The central symbols and themes of Shorthouse's "Broad Church Sacramentalism", as he described his own religious persuasion, and his personal tendencies towards Platonic mysticism disclose parallels with Eliot's struggles as churchman, apologist, and Christian poet-dramatist. Eliot's *Four Quartets*, in particular, owes much to Shorthouse's revival of interest in seventeenth-century Anglicanism and his recreation of Nicholas Ferrar's holy community at Little Gidding. By romanticizing Little Gidding, Shorthouse created a literary symbol that is at once spiritual epiphany and psychological vision, and he transformed historical interest in Little Gidding into a myth of Anglo-Catholic ecumenism. Eliot, inheriting the myth, combined historical interest in Nicholas Ferrar's community and the Church of St. John the Evangelist at Little Gidding, into an intense, poetically conceived universal, "the world's end", and made the "end" a place "where prayer has been valid".¹⁶ As *John Inglesant* inspired Emma Marshall's *A Haunt of Ancient Peace* (1897) and Elsie K. Seth-Smith's *The Way of Little Gidding* (1920?), so it prepared the way for Eliot's fourth quartet, "Little Gidding" (1942). Today a vital ecumenical community flourishes at Little Gidding and acknowledges both Shorthouse and Eliot inside the Church of St. John.

As the work of Elizabeth Drew, Joseph Henderson, and other

critics has shown, Jungian theory validates the archetypal qualities of Eliot's poetry and dramas and, in fact, Eliot's literary work exemplifies the stages of growth and development of Individuation psychology.¹⁷ Jungian theory also validates the archetypal nature of Shorthouse's work, but neither Shorthouse's life nor his work conform to the accepted pattern of Individuation. When Eliot first expressed awareness of the "agony of the artist" and the "pain of the poet", he did so in a bold and brash fashion. The Eliot of 1917, as he self-reflectively described himself in 1961, was immature, brash, and presumptuous in his literary pronouncements and had assumed an authority of certitude and conviction that made his criticism controversial, popular and quotable.¹⁸ Shorthouse's youthful and mid-life enthusiasms also gives his work a sense of urgency and authority, but his more mature work claims authority almost too dogmatically. The older he became the more he reacted against the Church of Rome, although he never experienced "the agony of the artist" to "escape from emotion... [or] from personality".¹⁹ In "Tradition and the Individual Talent" Eliot defines "historical perspective" as necessary to sound criticism and argues that the artist must be separated or divided from his medium in order to make possible the "Impersonal theory of poetry". Only an impersonal theory, he asserts, can "save" poetry, and poetry must be saved because only "poetry is capable of saving us", as I. A. Richards declared, from the pernicious "onslaughts" of that "most dangerous of the sciences...the whole subject which includes Psychoanalysis and Behaviourism."²⁰ Eliot shared the belief of theorists like Owen Barfield and Rudolf Steiner that romanticism had failed to give the Victorian age a new basis for truth²¹ and had not resolved the "dissociation of sensibility" within English poetry. When Eliot defined "the historical sense" as "the pastness of the past" and "perception of its presence",²² he was not a Christian, and, in retrospect, the "dissociation of sensibility" reflects his search for the historical continuity of religious emotion as it prefigures his later struggle for an Anglo-Catholic interpretation of English history, especially of the Reformation. Shorthouse, on the other hand, celebrates romanticism as revelation of spiritual truth and reaffirmation of "providential aesthetic".²³

After dissociation from his immediate past and reintegration of personal experience into ancestral perspective, Eliot found a new basis for truth itself in "the historical sense". "Ash-Wednesday", "Marina", *Four Quartets*, and each of his dramas reflect Eliot's maturing. His philosophic and intellectual attempts to understand history develop into profound struggles to comprehend time, meaning, and consciousness, as his experiencing of moral order transforms the perception of the past's presence into moments of potential transcendence and symbols of divine providence. In *Four Quartets* he posits "the still point of the turning world"²⁴ and

attempts to make the strictly personal moments of life (like the "evening with the photograph album")²⁵ into impersonal patterns of experience; then he expands generalizations into theory: "for history is a pattern / of timeless moments".²⁶ The transforming of "personal and private agonies" through knowledge and experience into universals and absolutes is, in fact, the dominant theme, the poetic action, and the great achievement of the *Four Quartets*. In essence, resolution of the struggle illustrates the "progress of the poet" through what Jung called "symbols of transformation" towards unitary culmination: the point of perception when "[we] arrive where we started / And know the place for the first time" and at which "the fire and the rose are one."²⁷ Shorthouse's correspondence and friendship with Lady Victoria Welby, a pioneer of semantics and "significs", and Jung's pioneering of the "word association test" point towards what Eliot called "the intolerable wrestle with words and meaning",²⁸ the wrestle to give words figurative and associational implications, to deepen metaphor through contextual development into literary symbol, to create the dynamic qualities of literary archetypes.

To qualify, "art never improves", Eliot asserts, "but the material of art is never quite the same."²⁹ In Eliot's view, the material of art is transformed or "reordered" whenever an artist creates the "truly new", a process that requires the poet to separate in himself his personality and personal life from "the mind which creates": "The more perfect the artist, the more completely separate in him will be the man who suffers and the mind which creates." The "suffering" of the artist confronts him with his "business" as a craftsman: "The business of the poet is not to find new emotions, but to use the ordinary ones and, in working them up into poetry, to express feelings which are not actual emotion at all." Thus, only by recognizing that "the poet has, not a 'personality' to express, but a particular medium" can a poet effect the necessary internal separation.³⁰

Although Eliot regarded "Tradition and the Individual Talent" as "perhaps the most juvenile" of his essays, he did not repudiate his early views about "depersonalization", which enabled him to define the "Dissociation of Sensibility". "What I see, in the history of English poetry", he asserted, "is...the splitting up of personality."³¹ His acute personal and artistic struggle to "possess integrated or undissociated sensibility...to embody thought and feeling together, fused in a single indissoluble expression"³² presents his reworking of the dilemma he first defined in "Tradition and the Individual Talent" and which later becomes part of his argument in favour of an Anglo-Catholic view of history. He redefines the problem in "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca", an essay that "smacks of Old Possum"³³ and, according to Virginia Woolf, of the "damned egotistical self".³⁴ He asserts "that which alone constitutes life for a poet" is

the struggle "to transmute the personal and private agonies into something rich and strange, something universal and impersonal."³⁵ As the "poet makes poetry, the metaphysician makes metaphysics", so "Tradition and the Individual Talent" "proposes to halt at the frontiers of metaphysics of mysticism". Had Eliot rewritten the tradition essay or redefined his position, as he qualified "Milton, I" (1936) in "Milton, II" (1947), he may have restated his assertion that "this essay proposes to halt", and he may have re-introduced the "I" into his essay. Only five years after he wrote "Tradition and the Individual Talent" he underwent psychological treatment.³⁶ No essay halts itself unless produced by "automatic writing", a process of composition that Eliot specifically repudiated.³⁷ Eliot never incorporated Jungian terminology into his critical works, yet a transition from Freudian to Jungian orientation is as clear in Eliot's development as is his pre-Christian to Anglo-Catholic conversion, and his dramas are decidedly Jungian, not Freudian.³⁸ Applied to Eliot's mature poetry or dramas, Freudian interpretations, which prescriptively assume the sublimation of libido or subconscious neuroses as the "cause of creativity", are quite misleading.³⁹ No "King Bolo" or "Sweeney Erect" appears in Eliot's post-conversion poetry, and after the poet's private life encounters *The Rock* in 1934, the persona of "Sweeney Agonistes" disappears abruptly and never reappears.⁴⁰ None of Eliot's pre-Christian work affords comparison with Shorthouse's work.

As Shorthouse's public reputation grew from 1881 until his death in 1903, he became more rigid and authoritarian in his convictions, especially those regarding the Church of England and his literary tastes. As Eliot's public reputation grew, he became self-conscious about his earlier judgments and pronouncements. Particularly in public lectures, he defined his qualifications and limited his critical authority. Most notably, as the "elder statesman" of poetry, he re-evaluated his career as a poet-critic in his 1961 lecture "To Criticize the Critic" and explained his declaration that he was "a classicist in literature, a royalist in politics, and an Anglo-Catholic in religion". He made the original declaration of his conservative nature in the 1926 "Preface" to a collection of essays entitled *For Lancelot Andrewes*.⁴¹ (In the first edition "anglo-catholic" appears; Eliot never explained the change from small case to capital letters.) Ironically, Eliot explained that "the sentence in question was provoked by a personal experience". He had made the declaration of allegiances because he had "felt obliged to acquaint" Irving Babbitt, under whom he studied at Harvard University, with the fact that he "really had been baptized and confirmed into the Church of England." Certainly, he also had his Harvard professor in mind when he published "The Humanism of Irving Babbitt" in 1928. Announcing his convictions in print, Eliot commented that "what must have been a greater shock to Babbitt was the 'defection' of Paul Elmer More from Humanism to

Christianity".

Interestingly, it was Paul Elmer More who declared *John Inglesant* to be "the one great religious novel of the English language".⁴² Eliot refers not only to More but also to Edmund Gosse, who became a personal friend of Shorthouse in 1883, two years after the first public publication of *John Inglesant*. Gosse, of all of Shorthouse's reviewers and critics, described the "author of *John Inglesant*" as a man of postures and covers, not unlike Eliot's own usage of pseudonyms and his Old Possum persona.⁴³ Yet, Eliot never mentions Shorthouse or *John Inglesant* in any of published essays, reviews, or letters. When he taught English literature in 1916 at the University of London, Eliot demanded a great deal of reading from tutorial students, as the course syllabus suggests, but he skipped over Shorthouse completely, including Disraeli, Peacock, Reade, and Trollope as "minor novelists".⁴⁴ Of course, 1916 was a decade before Eliot's conversion. Yet, within three years of his conversion, Eliot composed "Arnold and Pater" (1930) as a study of the "fluctuating relations between religion and culture" and as a valuation of Pater's role in developing "aesthetic religion" in *Marius the Epicurean* (1885), the novel that shares critical comparison with *John Inglesant*. Again, and this time as a Christian, Eliot ignores "the greatest Anglo-Catholic novel of the Victorian age".⁴⁵

Eliot's ignoring of Shorthouse's achievement is a literary mystery in itself, especially in light of Eliot's own pilgrimage to Little Gidding and his personal interest and involvement in creating the trust society, Friends of Little Gidding. His neglect of Shorthouse has led more than one critic to bafflement, among them, Dame Helen Gardner, who, during her lifetime, was an acknowledged authority on Eliot scholarship:

I find it difficult to believe that this book, so famous in its day, was not known to the Eliot family, with their passionate interest in religious discussions, and that Eliot had not read it as a boy.

"But, even if he had not read it when young," she argued, "it seems likely he would have done so in later life." Noting More's "distinguished book" on Anglicanism, Gardner adds,

And even if More's praise of it as the finest of religious novels had not stimulated his interest, it seems likely that Smyth's praise of it would have done so.⁴⁶

Eliot's ignoring of Shorthouse remains a mystery which continues to provoke speculation and research. Eliot formed several connections of varying sorts with many persons interested in Little Gidding. Among them were Canon George Tibbats, Canon Charles Smyth, critic and reviewer Bernard Blackstone, and Alan Maycock, librarian at Magdalene College,

Cambridge. When Eliot gave the Clark Lectures in January--March 1926, he concentrated attention on "The Metaphysical Poets of the Seventeenth Century", which gave him scholarly responsibility for assessing George Herbert and Richard Crashaw, both of whom were directly connected with Nicholas Ferrar and the Little Gidding community. Assessing the Anglican divine and the Catholic poet, Eliot, though not yet formally a convert to the Church of England, defined the principle of "dissociation of sensibility" that occurred while the Ferrars were at Little Gidding. Discussing how a poet's mind "is constantly amalgamating disparate experience" and asserting that "the greatest two masters of diction are also the greatest two psychologists, the most curious explorers of the soul", Eliot argues that to understand why "English poetry has remained so incomplete" since Milton and Dryden, "One must look into a good deal more than the heart. One must look into the cerebral cortex, the nervous system, and the digestive tracts."⁴⁷ Thankfully, it is not possible to look into the "digestive tract" of Eliot, except in Francis Bacon's metaphorical sense,⁴⁸ which leaves one with another Shorthouse mystery. Edmund Gosse excluded his friend and correspondent from his four-volume study of English literature, which was published after Shorthouse's death, published by Shorthouse's publisher, Macmillan, and published at a time when tributes and assessments of Shorthouse were being offered in abundance to the public.⁴⁹

A decade after giving the Clark Lectures, Eliot made his one and only visit to Little Gidding in May 1936.⁵⁰ At the time he was editor of *The Criterion*, which two and a half years later published reviews of both Blackstone's and Maycock's books on Little Gidding.⁵² Shorthouse, according to Maycock, created "the myth of Little Gidding", and it strains credulity to believe that Eliot did not know about *John Inglesant* or Shorthouse's role in resurrecting interest in Little Gidding and Nicholas Ferrar's community. As *John Inglesant* transforms historical interest in Little Gidding to "spiritual romance", so Eliot's "Little Gidding" creates the ideal of ultimate pilgrimage: "the world's end... [where] the intersection of the timeless moment is England and nowhere. Never and always," where history can be seen as "a pattern / Of timeless moments".⁵³ Shorthouse redeemed Little Gidding from the neglect of history by transforming history and vitalizing it as myth; Eliot transformed the myth into an absolute reality, a symbol of permanence, where modern man may "kneel / Where prayer has been valid" and listen to "the communication / Of the dead", which, he declares, "is tongued with fire beyond the language of the living".⁵⁴

After privately printing 100 copies of *John Inglesant*, Shorthouse added a preface to the first public edition published by Macmillan in 1881. Regretting that James Hinton's *The Mystery of Pain* had not been "thrown...into the form of story" which would have given the book a greater

audience, Shorthouse asks, "Do you not think that for one sorrowful home which has been lightened by his singular genius, there would have been hundreds?" Yet, not until friends urged public publication, and, in fact, not until Alexander Macmillan wrote to Shorthouse saying he thought *John Inglesant* "a work of real genius"⁵⁴ and offered to publish the novel at his own expense.⁵⁵ The preface stands as the boldest declaration of the power of romance that Shorthouse ever made. His reference to *The Mystery of Pain* merely hinted at what he believed throughout his life to be the real efficacy and power of storytelling:

"But," you say, "it is only a Romance."

True. It is only human life in the 'highways and hedges' and in 'the streets and lanes of the city' with the ceaseless throbbing of its quivering heart; it is only daily life from the workshop, from the court, from the market, and from the stage; it is only kindness and neighbourhood and childlife, and the fresh wind of heaven, and the waste of sea and forest, and the sunbreak upon the stainless peaks, and contempt of wrong and pain and death, and the passionate yearning for the face of God, and woman's tears, and woman's self-sacrifice and devotion, and woman's love. Yet, it is only a Romance. It is only the ivory gates falling back at the fairy touch. It is only the leaden sky breaking for a moment above the bowed head, revealing the fathomless Infinite through the gloom. It is only a romance.⁵⁶

Shorthouse proclaims romance as revelation of the transcendental and supernatural seen through the realities of daily life. His argument, however, betrays his sense of audience and glorifies the suffering of women and their need for romantic stories. Throughout his life he always read his work aloud, almost on a daily basis, to his wife Sarah. Though he never thought of the novel as an art form "for women", he most assuredly appreciated women readers; his letters to Lady Victoria Welby and to his female cousins are among his most insightful and revealing, and his sense of the feminine in audience and of the masculine in narrative style are vital to *John Inglesant's* speaking "immediately to human intuition... without regard to the reader's own faith or philosophy".⁵⁷

Because *John Inglesant* so directly penetrates through readers' individual prejudices and preferences, through conscious values and beliefs and, more subtly, through subconscious or unconscious attitudes, it cannot properly be called a "religious novel", as it often has been.⁵⁸ A more appropriate appraisal must consider the psychological and intuitive dynamics of "philosophical romance", especially non-religious readers, and such analysis

leads to the essential differences between Jungian and archetypal criticism.

Eliot's reputation as a literary critic and his firmly established stature as a dramatist and great poet need no argument here. Indeed, the number of scholarly works and critical appreciations, appraisals and re-examinations of Eliot's work still claims much attention in international criticism and in the popular media. The publication of his letters, begun in 1988 to mark the centenary of his birth, public readings, presentations, performances, videos and recordings of his poetry and drama testify not just to his popularity but to the serious questions and challenges his work commands. Shorthouse's reputation, however, is another matter altogether, and his last claim to popular attention was in 1961 with the republication of *John Inglesant* and the inclusion of a special preface by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Rather ironically, the republication contained only those episodes that take place in England, though most of Shorthouse's critics agree his best writing occurs in the Italian sections of the novel. His vehement attack on the Church of Rome was, in the interests of Anglo-Roman reunification efforts, not published. His novels and essays still have, though, a significant number of admirers, and critical studies have maintained a steady, if trickling, attention to his achievements, though sadly the attention comes more from the United States, Canada, and Germany than from England. Unlike the critical "touchstones" Eliot has given to literary scholarship (concepts and principles like "auditory imagination", "objective correlative", "the dissociation of sensibility", and the revaluation of the Elizabethan and Metaphysical dramatists and poets), Shorthouse's critical ideas are neither applicable nor specifically useful in studies outside of romance literature and religious novels, and very few of his ideas afford serious intellectual challenge to modern literary criticism and its highly specialized terminology. Indeed, by modern standards, Shorthouse's critical work seems amateurish, lacks intellectual sophistication, and reads like ardent enthusiasm for the simple sake of enthusiasm, but such a judgment is shortsighted and incomplete, and it overlooks his interpretation of the history and achievement of the English novel and his advancement of the genre towards the lyrical and intuitive "great musical novel" that he believed would be "a revelation to mankind". Much of Shorthouse's early essay writing is highly polished in style and exhibits wide reading, zealous interest in history and landscape, and in art, music, and nature as realisations of God as the "Divine Principle" of daily life.

From his youthful membership in the Friends Essay Society in Birmingham through his public career as "the author of *John Inglesant*", Shorthouse developed critical ideas from rather voracious reading and from close attention to his own nature. Probably none of his critical essays will ever appear in a general critical anthology, but it must be remembered that

Shorthouse wrote to please a small circle of friends, that he had no public literary ambitions until after the publication of *John Inglesant*, which forced reputation upon him, and that he never sought to earn his livelihood as author, critic, or literary spokesman. Certainly, he never entertained any sense of himself as an academic. Literary scholarship as we know it today simply did not exist in his day. During Eliot's lifetime, on the other hand, academic literary scholarship and the study of language and literature became institutionalized. As Bradbrook asserts, Eliot's critical method in "Homage to John Dryden" (1924) and *The Sacred Wood* (1920) were "canonized in the Cambridge of the time".⁵⁹ In Shorthouse's defence, it should be remembered, too, that Eliot himself regarded two of his famous touchstones, the "objective correlative" and "the dissociation of sensibility" as little more than "conceptual symbols for emotional preferences".⁶⁰ Shorthouse's emotional preferences, critical tastes, and convictions continue to represent "significant curiosities" of historical, religious, philosophical, psychological, and musical interest in the English novel. He laboured with a genuine mission to transform and redirect England's literary tradition towards a new art form, one that could inform historical fiction with philosophical dilemmas and subtly resolve them into ideals, then into spiritual realities, through the power of romance and the appeal of musical rhythms. "Enspiritalising" history and daily life into a lyrical aesthetic, he hoped to unite "the godlike and the beautiful in one". "What we want", he wrote Canon Boyd Carpenter in 1884, "is to apply [spiritual aesthetic] to real life. We all understand that art should be religious, but it is more difficult to understand how religion may be an art."⁶¹ Shorthouse's aesthetic is deeply rooted in his romantic zeal and self-dedication to Platonism, his lifelong admiration for Wordsworth and Tennyson, especially for Wordsworth's "The Excursion", and his goal of going beyond Matthew Arnold's Hellenism versus Hebraism and Literature versus Dogma, to create a new understanding of "humour" in literature. Believing that "All history is nothing but the relation of this great effort--the struggle of the divine principle to enter into human life", Shorthouse sought repeatedly to inculcate "fundamental reality" in his novels and tales: "...we have nothing but what *is* real life" and writers, especially poets, must "enter into the struggle" to make the reader engage himself in "mental fight" to hear, or as his Quaker background had taught him, to listen to the Inner Voice.⁶²

To establish Eliot's literary kinship with Shorthouse it is not sufficient to talk of "the music of Inglesant's life" as having a "kinship with Eliot's personal music", nor does it suffice to argue that Shorthouse's English Civil War theme "finds expression in words that anticipate Eliot's in 'Little Gidding'", as Max Sutton has done.⁶³ However minor Shorthouse's critical and artistic achievement now is in the broader valuations of English

literature, his overall contributions to the late Victorian era and his success as a novelist cannot be questioned, and his work is of special interest in understanding the continuity and transition from Victorian to modern literature. One approach to understanding the continuity between authors has its roots in Shorthouse's era and virtually spans Eliot's lifetime and was introduced into English literary criticism in 1934, the year of Shorthouse's centenary. Applying Jung's theory of Individuation to the study of literary imagination, Maud Bodkin identified *a priori* "determinants of individual experience" in *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry: Psychological Studies of Imagination*. Individuation theory describes the psychodynamics of how consciousness itself evolves and centres within the Ego and how the Ego interrelates with its unconscious "principle of order", the archetype of the Self. As a literary artist struggles to create an "integrated text", a unified and coherent whole, so all psychologically alive personalities must work to integrate the autonomous and objective contents of the collective unconscious into personal consciousness. As Individuation theory provides literary criticism with descriptive metaphors of the creative process, it grounds psychological interpretation of literature in the texts themselves, not in the biography or psychology of the artists, and in the psychodynamic processes of critical reading. Bodkin, viewing the archetypes as unconscious potentialities of experience, defines literary taste as "readiness to assimilate...themes, patterns of images and emotional associations". The patterns themselves are various "pre-text" orientations, "pre-existing configurations" of "ordering tendencies" which lead readers to "an organized, living unity". According to Individuation theory, archetypal potentialities of experience make possible "the city of God within" because they are activated and actualized by "that within each individual human mind which imposes these patterns, the organizer, the logic of the human mind".⁶⁴

"What, then, occurs", Bodkin asks, "in the mind of a student/critic who attempts to trace through analysis and synthesis the successive movements of these archetypes, of literary 'plots' or themes?" "In effect," she argues, "the imaginative thinking of the student will discern patterns of emotional forces that operate within his own imaginative activity." By tracing and analyzing the motivations of literary characters, the student synthesizes and objectifies "the lineaments of his own personality." Such traits of personality "are consciously observable [and have] cause-effect relationships...centered in Ego, in that dimension of mind which sees the self, the individual, as source and recipient of the data under study". The dynamics of the process suggest that the writer may unconsciously or very deliberately project, displace, or transfer his own "self" into or upon the text as "at once the subject and object" of study. Paradoxically, the reader "finds

these cause-effect, pleasure-pain 'realities' to be valueless", which forces the imaginative reader's mind "to find another energy with which to discover order." The processes of analysis and synthesis do not, in themselves, "impose order on the literary texts". "Herein", Bodkin states, "begins the active process of creation; Ego ceases to be an efficient frame of reference and a new, active, seemingly beyond-imagination 'frame' is created: the archetypal Self actualizes."⁶⁵

Theories, however, are "the very devil": "It is true that we need certain points of view for orienting an heuristic value, but they should always be regarded as mere auxiliary concepts that can be laid aside at any time."⁶⁶ The imposition of theory upon texts or "determinism in criticism" fails to achieve a "critical attitude for criticism" and merely substitutes "one of a miscellany of frameworks outside literature", as one of Bodkin's critical heirs, Northrop Frye, has insistently pointed out. "If criticism exists, it must be an examination of literature in terms of a conceptual framework derivable from an inductive survey of the literary field", or criticism cannot properly be said to exist.⁶⁷ The imposition of Bodkin's theorizing would dictate that critics read the creative works of Shorthouse and Eliot as psychological, fictive autobiography and would suggest that students and critics alike are paradoxically seeking "self-knowledge" when they study Shorthouse or Eliot. Eliot's declaration that a new work of art radically effects a reordering and revaluing of all previous works of art confines his critical view to the literary field, but it also literally "sets him up" by self-imposing a theoretical ideal, the creation of the "new". "Tradition and the Individual Talent" holds the same place in Eliot's artistic achievement as the "Preface" to *John Inglesant* does in Shorthouse's, and these two early critical declarations align both authors in the quest for "ideal order". Having defined their artistic goals in such ideal and visionary terms, both men had to confront in private and in public the intense psychological, religious, and spiritual anxieties of their self-chosen literary tasks. One thinks immediately of the great task of justification Milton set himself in *Paradise Lost* and of the self-study of imagination Wordsworth undertook in *The Prelude*, but neither Shorthouse or Eliot could invoke Milton's "heavenly Muse" nor could they "stand and wait"⁶⁸ for inspiration. Wordsworth, perhaps more than any other writer, had prepared the way for Shorthouse, and Eliot, too, found more than impersonal "historical perspective" in Wordsworth's "general Truths... Elements and Agents, Underpowers, Subordinate helpers of the living mind".⁶⁹

Eliot's profound personal disruption has been read out of "The Waste Land" by numerous critics and the reordering of his personality, which can be dated outwardly and publicly, at least, from 29 June 1927 with his baptism at Finstock Church in the Cotswolds, has been read out of *Four*

Quartets. Shorthouse never experienced such personal stress, but he, too, sensed the "great work to be done" early in his life and often contemplated what his family and friends called "Henry's book" long before he began writing *John Inglesant*. His religious struggles and transition from the Society of Friends to the Church of England in August 1861 provide the background and motivation for composing his philosophical romance and afford comparison with Eliot's conversion from Unitarianism to Anglo-Catholic Christianity. Indeed, both artists accepted the heritage of the Oxford Movement and confronted the religious struggles of their respective eras with serious "mental fight", though they certainly did not evolve personal myths of meaning or share the more Protestant vision of Blake's "Jerusalem". "The intolerable wrestle with words and meanings" was certainly more than the "mug's game"⁷⁰ of poetry to Eliot, for it directed his mind towards historical and traditional catholicity, as the perception of historical parallels led Shorthouse to modernize and recreate Christian mythology rather than evolve or express personal myth.

Although meaning may be myth that informs literature with autobiographical representations,⁷¹ Shorthouse and Eliot were too orthodox to seek truth in the "individual and local" and sought it instead in the "general and operative".⁷² Had they expressed only their own personal psychologies, they should have reduced their creative work to autobiographical metaphor and not have achieved the qualities that distinguish metaphor from literary symbol. The critic and the biographer reduce the symbol to metaphor, not the artist who creates the symbol. "The artist is not a person endowed with free will who seeks his own ends, but one who allows art to realize its purpose through him."⁷³ Literary symbols express the unknown and the unknowable, that which is mysterious, mystical, and ineffable. Through critical analysis, comparison, contrast, and assimilation, the critical mind translates and reduces symbol to metaphor. Metaphor is "essentially a way of knowing...the unknown through the known", a psychological and linguistic process that supplies the connection between "a wholly new sensational or emotional experience" and "another experience already placed, ordered, and incorporated".⁷⁴ Thus a symbol may be felt and experienced but cannot be consciously understood, even though it may seem to have specific biographical reference, unless it is reduced and assimilated through metaphor. Nonetheless, it is not necessary to translate Shorthouse or Eliot out of the conventions, figures of speech, and literary rhetoric of their day to appreciate the value of their work in contemporary critical theory. Modern critical terminology does not superannuate Shakespeare by imposing more modern "dress of the day". "The difference between the present and the past", as Eliot realised, whether in art, criticism, or the art of criticism, "is that the conscious present is an

awareness between the present and the past in a way and to an extent which the past's awareness of itself cannot show." When someone argued, "The dead writers are remote from us because we *know* so much more than they did", Eliot countered, "Precisely, and they are that which we know."⁷⁵ Jung, too, developed his "primary intuitions" about language into a clear warning: "Not for a moment dare we succumb to the illusion" that we can actually and finally explain anything of symbolic power: "Even the best attempts at explanation are only more or less successful translations into another metaphorical language. (Indeed, language itself is only a metaphor.) The most we can do is *to dream the myth onwards* and give it a modern dress."⁷⁶ Maud Bodkin, Herbert Read, Wingfield Digby, Leslie Fiedler, Theodora Ward, Walter Abell, James Olney, and Northrop Frye are among critics who have demonstrated the essential metaphoric and symbolic distinctions that make archetypal theory one of the modern dressings of literary criticism.⁷⁷

Eliot's "intolerable wrestle" is the "perpetual vexation of the intellect" towards some "Ideal Order".⁷⁸ As though he were experiencing *a priori* determinants, Eliot argued that the "existing monuments [of literature] form an ideal order among themselves".⁷⁹ Eliot was not as concerned with identifying such *a priori* determinants as he was with defining "the historical sense...[which] compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order".⁸⁰ Just as the "new (the really new) work of art" modifies and alters "the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole", so anything new within the poet's personality affects "the individual as a whole"--be it dream, vision, fantasy, or active life experience--and activates the "metaphors of Self" process in distinguishable stages:

...expression in symbolic language; the attempt to reduce the direct experience to a rational sequence, giving personal and impersonal origins; and the hope of assimilating the experience to the now revised whole of the personality.⁸¹

As Jung, "made his own soul" and gave "the face of humanity a new aspect",⁸² artists of moral experience may represent the search for Ideal Order as analogous to psychological Individuation. After completing *John Inglesant*, his most complete metaphor of Self, Shorthouse dissolved his personal, masculine persona, experimented with feminine personae, and actively sought a public literary audience for the "now revised whole" of his personality, even as Eliot ended his writing of "impersonal poems" in *Four Quartets* and thereafter wrote poetic dramas which are personal enough to invite autobiographical interpretation. The "many voices" of the impersonal

figures and "personages" of "The Waste Land" abandon their allusive, hidden, and obscure qualities and take on identities as dramatic personae and characters in his plays. "Old Possum" baited critics and sent scholars "into temptation" with the "Notes" to "The Waste Land". *The Elder Statesman* deliberately "spiked" the dedication of his last drama to spur readers into autobiographical digging and interpretation. As if he were answering the critics who had accused him of plagiarism in his impersonal poems,⁸³ Eliot offered *The Elder Statesman*, "To My Wife":

...to return as best I can
With words a little part
 of what you have given me.
The words mean what they say, but some have a
further meaning
For you and me only.⁸⁴

Indeed, as the impersonal, creative voices of Eliot tease and activate imaginal experience, his personal, critical voices provoke sophisticated readers and tempt them to re-examine his creative works.

"Occupied with the frontiers of consciousness beyond which words fail, though meanings still exist",⁸⁵ Shorthouse and Eliot captured and contained intuitive ideas in *John Inglesant* and *Four Quartets* "lie beyond the bourn of our understanding" and cannot be "formulated in any other or better way [because] no verbal concept yet exists".⁸⁶ The texts, therefore, invite analysis grounded in Jung's intuitive vision of "the spirit in man, art, and literature". To Jung, the mysterious, ineffable, transcendent "something of the spirit" can only be expressed symbolically as a "metaphor of Self". However grounded in the psychology of an author's personality, symbolical or visionary literature cannot be reduced to personal causes or interpreted as some *alter* of the author's *Ego*. Jung denigrated psychologists and literary critics who presumed a "psychology of literature" without studying the relations between "psychology *and* literature", and he warned that reducing literature to psychology was a blatant denial of "the spirit in man, art, and literature" that would ultimately reduce itself to an illogical pseudoscience that worships its own rationalism.⁸⁷ Jung insisted that true symbols, like the archetypes of the collective unconscious, defy rational reduction to specific signification. He asserted that the Self "cannot be distinguished from the God-image, the God-concept, the God-theory"⁸⁸ and that translating symbols into metaphors cannot proceed upon any definitive, prescriptive means or methodology of interpretation. As Tagore observed, "We may imagine that our mind is a mirror", that it can more or less accurately decode and translate symbols from subjective experience to objective meaning. "On the contrary, our mind itself is the principal element of creation. The world [and the literary text], while I am perceiving it, is being incessantly created

for myself in time and space."⁸⁹ Thus, to effect a contemporary interpretation is to make a "forward step in culture...an extension of consciousness...that can take place only through discrimination."⁹⁰ Words might fail, as Eliot noted, to extend the frontiers of consciousness, but only in words can one successfully posit the essential meanings and differences between psychological literature and visionary literature. As dreams may be interpreted, psychological literature may be understood; the fictive disguises of metaphoric imagery may be decoded and translated into representations of the psychodynamics of personality, but "visionary literature" creates true symbols in the mind, thus expresses irrationality, which, as Jung said, ultimately "mocks all our rationalistic undertakings".⁹¹ Though literary critics may apprehend and interpret the psychological aspects of art works, no critical discourse can finally or absolutely reduce the mythic and mystical effects of visionary literature, and both *John Inglesant* and *Four Quartets* extend the psychological mode of literary creation into the visionary mode. The critic may seek "a magic lantern" to "throw the nerves in patterns on a screen", but, when dealing with visionary material, the critic may ultimately share J. Alfred Prufrock's frustration: "It is impossible to say just what I mean!"⁹² and may decide it is only possible to let art speak for itself in its own terms.⁹³ As Virginia Woolf admonished her listeners in her talk "How Should One Read a Book?", "Do not dictate to your author; try to become him. Be his fellow-worker and accomplice".⁹⁴

To advance culture, to extend the "frontiers of consciousness", to develop one's own literary sensibility and taste, it is necessary, of course, to be intellectually critical. A strictly historical, biographical, or "placing" evaluation of art that invites other methods of investigation cannot suffice as adequate criticism for the modern mind, though modern attempts to assess the achievements of minor authors like Shorthouse and to define the continuity of English literature that minor authors create and maintain must locate perspectives within the continuity of tradition.⁹⁵ Application of psychological theory in the practice of literary criticism may describe and attempt to explain how meaning is created within a given text and may help a sensitive reader discover new meaning, but reducing artistic experience to sublimation or transference of neuroses misdirects criticism towards the psychology of the artist. The theory of Individuation, however, does not attempt to reduce art to probable causes; rather it amplifies artistic responses through "active imagination". Amplification or "willful imagining" is a therapeutic technique used by Jungian analysts to enable their patients to dialogue with repressed psychic and emotional material, and to a student of literature the process enhances understanding of the emotional and imaginal grounding of sub-texts, images, and concepts like Eliot's "objective correlative" and "dissociation of sensibility".