THE GRAND STYLE IN ENGLISH PROSE

Thomas LaBorie Burns - UFMG

One conception of style is that it is the effect of inspiration, as Walter Pater put it, "the finer accomodation of speech to that vision within." Many critics of this persuasion have regarded style in a Platonic sense, as the soul or spirit of writing or speaking, a quality without which expression remains mere rhetoric[1], and this idea is reflected, I think, in the oft-quoted (and misquoted) maxim of Buffon's that "Le style est l'homme même," the style is the man himself, or in Schopenhauer's neat metaphor, "The style is the physiognomy of the mind," or even in the definition of style in a literary handbook which defines it as an arrangement of words that best expresses the intent, ideas and individuality of the author.[2] Style is written language that is unique for each writer.

This theory, while containing what most people would recognize as an undeniable truth – namely, that every writer is unique – brings us to an unacceptable plurality in which every writer writes in his own ideolect and there is an end to it. In speaking ordinarily of style, however, we also recognize that certain writers, often of a given historical period, tend to express themselves in similar ways: use similar sentence structures and kinds of diction, and tend toward either simplicity and clarity, or complexity and complication. These two theories or ways of regarding style are summed up in modern studies by the terms "individual style" and "period style."[3]

In Greek, the word *charater*, usually translated as "style" is really a more objective term than the English word, with its connotation of individual quality, suggests.[4] Greek critics conceived of style as a more objective quality and therefore a quality which could be studied and acquired, and the ancient handbooks of rhetoric have many suggestions as to how this can be done. The Aristotelian school of rhetoric considers style as generic rather than organic and, in accordance with the Stagirite's tireless tendency to categorize, style is the effect of many causes and therefore sub-categories are necessary to properly explain the genus.[5] In chapter nine of the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle makes the crucial distinction between an older, more formless way of writing, or loose style, and the periodic style. For the loose style he employs a term that means "strung-along" like beads on a string.[6] With the periodic style the sentence and sense are said to end together so that there is a correspondence between the grammatical pattern of the sentence and the thought. Flaubert has a similar notion with respect to the word when he writes "The exacteness of the thought makes for (and is itself) that of the word."[7]

Aristotle gave much advice on effective expression, including proper rhythm, which was important in classical prose as well as poetry. In the sections of the *Poetics* dealing with kinds of diction, he notes the importance of being lucid, but adds that "unusual words... give dignity to the language and avoid the commonplace."[8] In these observations, he is concerned with prose of a more elegant kind, the so-called high, grand, or elevated style. He is typically concerned, however, that writers should always avoid extremes. The Aristotelian mean implies that writers

should try to please without sacrificing lucidity. It appears that Aristotle thus plumps for the middle or mean style as that which is neither too grand nor too low and which best guarantees clarity.[9]

The origin of the formula of the three styles is obscure,[10] but Aristotle, as we have seen, seems to assume it, as does his follower Theophrastus, who recognized three kinds of diction, among which is the grand or "poetic" language of the orator-sophist Gorgias, though Theophrastus himself followed Aristotle in preferring a mean between the grand and the plain. Demetrius, who wrote a tract on style in the Hellenistic period recognized four styles, breaking up the grand into the "elevated" and the "elegant." The elevated requires, among other things, lengthy clauses, a periodic sentence structure, poetic language, and a dignified subject matter,[11] general features that later observers take to be the basic elements of the grand style. Grandeur, he says, "resides in three things: the content, the diction, and the appropriate arrangement of words."[12] Demetrius thus broadens Theophrastus' discussion of elevated diction to include subject-matter and sentence structure. He discusses the necessity of a periodic structure for the grand style, noting that the structure must be well-defined, since "long journeys seem shorter if one stops frequently at an inn, while a deserted road makes even a short journey seem long,"[13] a good description of the complex configurations of the periodic style.

In Roman rhetoric, the grand style is called *gravis*, solemn or grave, and the danger of its degenerating into bombast is already noted, since the defect of *gravis* is *figura sufflata*, overblown style. The master Roman orator Cicero does not discuss

the three styles in his main treatise on rhetoric, *De Oratore*, but elsewhere he follows Aristotle in insisting that a writer or speaker must be able to manipulate the three styles according to his purpose. He says that the grand style is for the purpose of moving the emotions, as opposed to instructing in the plain, and entertaining in the mean style.[14] This psychological emphasis on the listener or reader will also have influence later. Bacon, for example, thought "the duty and office of Rhetoric" is to "apply Reason to Imagination for the better moving of the will."[15]

A contemporary critic, Northrop Frye, has introduced a variation of Aristotle's distinction between the loose and the periodic style with a distinction between the "demotic" and "hieratic." The demotic is associated with ordinary speech and the hieratic with consciously literary language. This is similar to the Neo-classical doctrine that there is a style appropriate to the poetic, distinguished from that of ordinary speech, the distinctive poetic diction defended by Gray and later attacked by Wordsworth, who was concerned to point out there is no essential difference between the language of prose and verse. Frye, who loves systematizing almost as much as Aristotle himself, goes on to distinguish high, middle, and low levels in both of these groups.[16] Although the origin of the old formula of the three styles is unknown, and, as we shall see, has not been respected since classical times, it is still an idea that has force in critical circles.

To categorize kinds of styles in much broader terms, we may classify each style according to whether the adjective naming it refers to a particular author (like the Ciceronian or Tacitean), a particular time or place (the ancient Attic and Asiatic),the medium

of expression (lyrical, prosaic, dramatic, and epistolary), the audience intended (demagogic or courtly), and even the mood and intention of the author (the technical, diplomatic, and sentimental styles).[17] Such a scheme is inclusive but unsatisfactory for our purposes, as it mixes objective and subjective bases. The author of this scheme, in a dictionary of literary terms, characterizes the grand or sublime or majestic style as one "in which the author seeks to create the appropriate effects in his reader,"[18] which follows Cicero's description closely but is wonderfully evasive for a modern discussion. Does he mean the effects of grandeur, sublimity, and majesty, and how are such terms to be defined? A psychological effect the reader is meant to feel becomes the main feature of the style.

This is not to say that a reader may not actually experience such an effect. Robert Louis Stevenson called attention to how "we enjoy the pleasure of a most intricate and dexterous pattern, every stitch a model at once of elegance and of good sense."[19] Elsewhere he mentioned the importance of "an elegant and pregnant texture."[20] Undoubtedly, there is a great appeal to highly mannered prose, apart from, or perhaps because of, its sheer technical virtuosity, but the objection remains. The reader may or may not experience the desired effect. He may find, and many modern readers do find, the whole thing pompous or perhaps impressive enough but greatly redundant. High-flown language, it has been long recognized, is very effective for comedy, which may be a consequence of the traditional comic figure of the pedant. The danger of sustaining tricky constructions and figures is that the effect may turn out to be the opposite of what one intended. (As a teacher of mine, a professor of Latin prose composition, once

warned: be careful of asking the rhetorical question; you may get the wrong answer).

Intentions and their fulfillment aside, emotions themselves are notoriously difficult to identify, much less predict, and this, I think, is one major objection to so much classical criticism. There is nothing one can say with any certainty against the idea that similar emotions may arise from totally different causes. As Spinoza argues in the third book of the *Ethics*, "emotion is a confused idea." The urgent sublimity one reader may feel for a certain passage may cause another to break out in derisive laughter. The relevant point for emotion is not what the reader is expected to feel but what the author is expressing, what he means, when he manipulates the complex set of relationships we sum up by the word style. This is the importance of style for rhetoric.

> *Style adds the force of personality to the impersonal forces of logic and evidence, and is thus deeply involved in the business of persuasion.*[21]

Here is perhaps the true meaning of the statement "the style is the man himself."

Modern views of style regard it not as verbal embellishment or decoration but meaning itself, as "the last and most detailed elaboration of meaning,"[22] or as "the hidden thoughts which accompany overt propositions..."[23] The common analogy of clothes can be invoked. To the unreflective, clothes are merely garments to cover nakedness, or fashionably shaped cloth to decorate the body with. But besides these obvious uses, clothes express

personality and in some recent analyses have been analyzed as illustrating meaning. The choice of a piece of clothing, like that of a phrase or a grammatical construction, may be both conscious and unconscious but in either case is revealing of what the chooser means to express. A complete analysis of a given writer's style would reveal what he means by the choice he makes among the available choices, what he says as well as how he says it.

To continue with the analogy of clothes but to take it a bit further, we might see the idea of style, as in the Renaissance and Neo-classical traditions, as clothing for thought, something chosen or added,[24] which implies that there are a number of choices available to select from, some of which may be rejected, and proper style means proper selection. An opposing, more intimate view of style is associated with the Romantics but occurs in at least one classical critic, Longinus - the notion of style as organic.[25] A defender of this theory, John Middleton Murray, explained that "Style is organic, not the clothes a man wears, but the flesh and bone of his body." While this theory admirably tries to preserve the uniqueness of each individual style, it has the defect of confusing the terms author and style: one is the product or effect of the other, not the equivalent of it.

If we think of style, then as something added, though not in a mechanical or artificial way, but in the Aristotelian sense of shaping or corresponding structure to thought, we see that the classification scheme mentioned above is a way of completing the idea of kinds of thoughts to be shaped. The traditional classification of styles into high, middle, and low, therefore, relates style to subject. Style is specifically the kind of language appropriate for a given subject-mater. The high or grand style is appropriate for

epics or tragedy and all those kinds of works that treat lofty or serious subjects, while the mean or middle is appropriate for the ordinary business of men and the low or plain reserved for the baser aspects of life and so-called lower orders of men.[26]

It is obvious that in this scheme, too, subjectivity has hardly been eliminated, since style is intimately related to the concept of *decorum*, and social class determines the hierarchy of what is appropriate. One of the principal arguments in Eric Auerbach's great book of criticism, *Mimesis*, is that this doctrine of decorum was not respected in the actual development of western literature. The kind of realism that developed in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance was made possible by mixing levels of style.[27] The inspiration for this mixture was Jesus Christ himself, who furnished the example of his humble beginnings and daily life opposed to the sublime tragedy of his death. The son of God becoming man, the Word made Flesh, meant that the divine could be described in human terms and in concrete language, as in the Gospels themselves, which were written in a plainer unclassical Greek, the *Koinê*. Auerbach's view is that this mixing of styles has enriched our literature, since the separation of styles in antiquity had the effect of narrowing the limits of realism.[28] The changes in Roman social structure brought about by the introduction of Christianity into classical culture would therefore have its parallel in literature. The mixture of social classes in the early Christian communities previewed the mixture of styles in later literatures.

If the mixture of styles has been liberating for the history of literature, specifically for the needs of prose fiction, it has in any case been the practice of first-rate authors in other genres.

Shakespeare may be cited as the outstanding example of a poet and dramatist who mixed language both sublime and plain. If he frequently observed the convention of reserving prose in his plays for scenes spoken by rustics or low characters and for passages of comic relief, he also used it for Lear's madness and Hamlet's speech on the nature of man. And the sublime poetry of his kings and noble characters is riddled with colloquialisms: this despite the Renaissance doctrine of decorum or "seemliness." Fortunately, writers do not always listen to critics.

Elizabethan prose was itself a mixture of the native and classical traditions. The new humanism of the Continental Renaissance spread to England, bringing the prose of Cicero and the theories of Quintilian into fashion. Most important writers learned to write Latin prose in school, which was bound to have an influence on how they wrote English.[29] Cicero was the model for the 16th century English[30] and has remained identified with the "periodic" grand style. The Ciceronian period or sentence is a masterpiece of verbal architecture.Clauses are carefully and elaborately subordinated and triumphantly resolved by the tendency of the Latin verb to come at the end. Other typical devices are a judicious use of figures, a subtly varied rhythm, and a lofty level of diction appropriate to the subject. Matters of rhythm and diction aside (as they are, we have seen, important aspects of any so-called grand style), the structure of the Latin period is not very suitable to the demands of the English sentence. A more native style favors a coordination rather than subordination of clauses, or a paratactic structure, with the linking coordinators (the *ands* and *buts*) absent and the clauses simply juxtaposed, two methods of linking clauses that were most common in Old English and have

remained characteristic of good prose in every kind of writer.[31] Nor can English word order, unlike Latin, be easily wrenched around to effect felicitous juxtapositions, as anyone who has tried to translate a Latin sentence into English come to realize. Nevertheless, some writers have succeeded brilliantly in producing the effect of a Latin period. Consider the first sentence of Boswell's (18th century) biography of Dr. Johnson, where the force and the sense are suspended till the last word:

> *To write the Life of him who excelled all mankind in writing the lives of others, and who, whether we consider his extraordinary endowments, or his various works, has been equalled by few in any age, is an arduous, and may be reckoned in me a presumptuous task.*[32]

Despite such acrobatics, the implications for style of the importance of word order is great. English has less possibilities for changing emphasis by changing positions of words and a greater reliance on "function" words.[33] Although Ciceronian prose with a few notable exceptions had ceased to be imitated by the 17th century, the heritage of the Latin humanists continued long after, with a periodic style extending even into the 19th century and the expansion of vocabulary made possible by Latin influence becoming a permanent feature.[34] The Anglican clergyman Thomas Hooker, who flourished at the end of the 16th century is a good example of the eloquence that Latinity furnished in English prose. Note the balance and antitheses of the following period:

> *Where Rome keepeth that which is ancienter and better, others whom we much more affect leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them we like not, than in defects resemble them whom we love.*[35]

We should not get the idea that English prose was exclusively Latinate at certain times and more native at others. Usually several tendencies have co-existed. While some writers were adapting Cicero to English in the 16th century, others were defending English "as an adequate and even superior medium for prose."[36] This is noteworthy especially with men who were trained as Latinists. The outstanding figure here is the philosopher Thomas More, who was a classical scholar and accomplished Latin stylist but a man who wrote in plain English, finding his mother tongue "for the utteraunce of a mans minde verye perfecte and sure."[37] Another important element was the English Bible. The Bible, which first appeared in English translation in the early 16th century, became the first classic of English prose and has had an enormous influence on it till the present day. It is not in a grand style, as it is structurally simpler, but it is not a plain style either, as its diction tends to be archaic.[38] Careful attention to rhythm and expanded vocabulary, however, give an overall impression of sublimity that is adequate to the subject, and both rhythm and metaphor make Biblical prose closer to the feeling of poetry.

The 17th century, which has been called the richest period of English prose, inherited, then, several different tendencies, as well as the respectability the translation of the Bible had given to prose as a serious medium. One important development was

the search for a new classical model other than Cicero. Seneca and Tacitus began to fill the gap. The Senecan and Tacitean styles were less grandiloquent, more concise, epigrammatic, and colloquial than the Ciceronian so that, since excessive ornament was being deplored and a new plainness in vocabulary came into demand, they replaced it in the 17th century.[39] Some idea of the pithy style of Tacitus can be given by the first sentence of his *Histories*:

> *Opus adgredior opimum casibus, atrox praeliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace saevum.*[40]
>
> *(I enter on a work rich in disasters, horrid in wars, clashing in civil uprisings; even its very peace was cruel).*

The brevity of the Latin sentence is evident in the number of words (12) compared to that of a literal English translation (21). That this became a model is not surprising when writers began to complain of the Ciceronian as a style in which three words do the work of one.

Francis Bacon introduced the concise style into English though he was to eventually react against its excesses, as he had earlier reacted against the excesses of Ciceronian prose.[41] His stated concern was for "matter" over excessive preoccupation with expression. The new style appeared less polished and more pithy; it was a prose of short statements whose strength was its concision. Here is Bacon on "Studies:"

> *Studies serve for pastimes, for ornaments and for abilities. Their chiefe use for pastime is in privatness and retiring; for ornamente is in discourse, and for abilitie is in judgement.*[42]

The discovery that good English could be written in a style that was not Ciceronian led to the next phase; a looser and freer style, with clauses that were not carefully interlocked by subordination but added to one another in series by connectors like neither, nor, for, so that, and so, and, but, whereas, etc..[43] Here is a sentence from a sermon of John Donne's:

> *It was his Fathers, and so his; And his, and so ours; for we are not joynt purchasers of Heaven with the Saints, but we are co-heires with Christ Jesus.*[44]

Bacon himself took up this new development on wearying of the Senecan-Tacitean style and it established itself by mid-century as a style which seemed to allow the writer to "think in the act of writing,"[45] rather than have everything carefully worked out beforehand as in the architectural style of the Ciceronians. But a more elaborate style was to return in still another prose that had the lengthy sentences of the old grand style as well as its ornate vocabulary, but,under the influence of the looser style preceding it,was structurally loosely connected rather than tightly subordinated. Good practitioners of this style are John Donne and Sir Thomas Browne, whose style has been compared to a linked chain, with each period loosely connected with the one that comes

before it.[46] His language and sentence length are in the grand manner, though the effect of the whole is one of vigor rather than polish:

> *We whose generations are ordained in this setting part of time, are providentially taken off from such imaginations. And being necessitated to eye the remaining particle of futurity, are naturally constituted into thoughts of the next world, and cannot excusably decline the consideration of that duration, which maketh Pyramids pillars of snow, and all that's past a moment.*[47]

The full variety of the 17th century is evident when we consider that, besides the early Senecan-Tacitean and later freer-looser styles, the century also supported both a plain speech-based prose and the old-time Ciceronian periods of John Milton:

> *The Parliament of England, assisted by a great number of the people who appeared and stuck to them faithfullest in defence of religion and their civil liberties, judging kingship by long experience a government unnecessarie, burdensom and dangerous, justly and magnanimously abolished it; turning regal bondage into a free Commonwealth, to the admiration and terrour of our emulous neighbors.*[48]

This is a long way from speech. The features of Milton's prose are

lengthy sentences, Latinate diction, subordination of clauses, controlled rhythm, balance and contrast, and a long-windedness which compels one to read right through to the end with little pause.

It was, however, the plainer, more colloquial prose that won out over the others by the end of the 17th century and established itself in the great age of prose of the early 18th. This was a prose that made a fetish of clarity, the opposite of the polysyllabic and complex prose of the grand style. Swift, one of its masters, followed the practice of reading his manuscripts to a chambermaid and eliminating what she could not understand.[49] Noteworthy authors who wrote an essentially speech-based prose are the novelists Swift and Defoe, the essayists Addison and Steele, and even the philosophers Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. There is probably a close connection between the acceptance and establishment of this kind of style and the rise of the novel. In prose fiction, a middle or plain style was thought appropriate for the depiction of ordinary life. Richardson wrote *Clarissa* in the form of letters written by a young woman. Defoe had been trained in journalism and wrote in plain prose his *Robinson Crusoe* and *Moll Flanders*. Fielding wrote *Tom Jones* in three styles, but for the most part relates his "history" in a "mere narrative" style.[50] The epic style of Homer he employs only as a parody, and the passages in formal language occur in the introductory chapters in which the author explains and reflects on the methods he uses to tell his tale. These chapters stand apart from the fictional narrative and indeed are often quoted in literary textbooks as essays on the art of comic fiction. As one critic has pointed out, both the Homeric parody and the mannered essay styles are good fun,

but they "also point up the unsuitability in the novel of the 'elevation of style' used in more traditional forms of narrative writing."[51]

Thomas Hardy has explained the unsuitability of the grand style for prose fiction as an artistic necessity not to over-polish lest the work seem lifeless:

> *The whole secret of a living style and the difference between it and a dead style, lies in not having too much style – being a little careless, or rather seeming to be, here and there. It brings wonderful life into the writing... Otherwise your style is like worn half-pence – all the fresh images rounded off by rubbing, and no crispness at all.*[52]

Even the French master of the grand style, Chateaubriand, once had his style characterized in a letter by the novelist Stendhal as "ridiculous." Elegance in fiction is in fact more characteristic of comedy. One thinks of Fielding, Stern, Jane Austen, Trollope, and nowadays, Anthony Powell. It is even difficult to characterize styles of prose fiction historically, since "conventional descriptions of period style tend to be less applicable to the novel than to other forms."[53] I would suggest that this is owing to the nature of the novel as a contingent genre, one that depends more on contemporary fashions in language and thought, one not so subject to classical models, and one relatively free from the more formal structures of poetry and drama.

In the latter part of the 18th century, the simple style that had been so fruitful for English literature gave way once again to a grand style.[54] The new textbooks on English grammar advocated a return to the percepts of Quintilian and the periodic sentence as a prose model, with stateliness and pomp becoming terms of praise rather than censure,[55] and a separation between the spoken and written languages that has always been characteristic of the grand style. The masters of this new classical prose are two of the greatest stylists in English: Samuel Johnson and Edward Gibbon.

Johnson's prose was shaped for his more formal purposes. It lost the conversational tone English style had in the age of Swift and Dryden and increased the distance between writer and reader, achieving a greater impersonalization of the audience.[56] Johnson, who wrote the first great English dictionary, had an immense vocabulary at his command and a fondness for words with classical roots. He tended to use (some think overuse) the balanced phrases and antithesis of classical authors, with the late-in-the-sentence emphasis of Latin. Johnson on Dryden:

> *The persecution of critics was not the worst of his vexations: he was much more disturbed by the importunities of want. His complaints of poverty are so frequently repeated, either with the dejection of weakness sinking in helpless misery, or the indignation of merit claiming its tribute from mankind, that it is impossible not to detest the age which could impose on such a man the necessity of such solicitations, or not to despise the man who could submit*

to such solicitations without necessity.[57]

And on fortitude:

The cure for the greatest part of human miseries is not radical, but palliative. Infelicity is involved in corporeal nature, and interwoven with our being: all attempts therefore to decline it wholly are useless and vain: the armies of pain send their arrows against us on every side, the choice is only between those which are more or less sharp, or tinged with poison of greater or less malignity; and the strongest armour which reason can supply, will only blunt their points, but cannot repel them.[58]

Edmund Burke's prose, said to be closer to the conversational than Johnson's,[59] often had its compositional origin in speeches, but was often too a recognizable example of a complex grand style. In this passage Burke, the apostle of conservatism, writes of those principles:

When the useful parts of an old establishment are kept, and what is superadded is to be fitted to what is retained, a vigorous mind, steady persevering attention, various powers of comparison and combination, and the resources of an understanding fruitful in expedients are to be exercised; they are to be exercised in a continued conflict with the combined force of opposite voices; with the obstinacy that rejects all improvement,

> *and the levity that is fatigued and disgusted with everything of which it is in possession.*[60]

Gibbon sustained his multi-volumed work on Roman history in the most elegant and subtle prose, the grand style as its best. Although many of his historical notions have been superseded by the research of specialists, the *Decline and Fall* is still read; in large measure, we may suppose, for the delights and wit of its language:

> *She was doomed to weep over the death of one of her sons, and over the life of the other.*
>
> *Like the modesty affected by Augustus, the state maintained by Diocletian was a theatrical representation; but it must be confessed that, of the two comedies, the former was of a much more liberal and manly character than the latter.*[61]

Even in writing elsewhere about himself, dignified distance is a mark of Gibbon's style:

> *According to the scale of Switzerland, I am a rich man; and I am indeed rich, since my income is superior to my expense, and my expense is equal to my wishes.*

This cool distance may even border on parody:

> *The present is a fleeting moment, the past is no more; and our prospect of futurity is dark and doubtful. This day may possibly be my last: but the laws of probability, so true in general, so fallacious in particular, still allow about fifteen years.*[62]

Reaction, as usual, set in and in the early 19th century, besides Wordsworth's attack on poetic language, which I have mentioned above, Coleridge raps the grand style by saying of Johnson that "he creates an impression of cleverness by never saying anything in a common way."[63] While there is some justice in this judgement, one feels he has overlooked much of Johnson's real power. The verdict of time has surely overturned Coleridge's censure of Gibbon in the same passage, when he says, damning the grand style in general, that Gibbon's manner is the worst of all; it has every fault of which this peculiar style is capable." He might well have added "and every virtue:"

> *With the venerable proconsul, his son, who had accompanied him to Africa as his lieutenant, was likewise declared emperor. His manners were less pure, but his character was equally amiable with that of his father. Twenty-two acknowledged concubines, and a library of sixty-two thousand volumes, attested the variety of his inclinations; and from the productions which he left behind him, it appears that both the one and the other were designed for use rather than ostentation.*[64]

NOTES

[1] Joseph Shipley, *Dictionary of World Literature*, New Revised ed. (Totowa: Littlefield, Adams, 1972), p. 398.

[2] C. Hugh Holman, *A Handbook to Literature*, 3rd ed. (New York: Odyssey, 1972), p. 514.

[3] Massaud Moisés, *Dicionário de Termos Literários*, 2nd ed. (São Paulo: Editora Cultrix, 1978), p. 205; *estilos de época/estilos individuais*.

[4] G.M.A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p. 111.

[5] Shipley, p. 398.

[6] Grube, pp. 97-8.

[7] Miriam Allott, *Novelists on the Novel* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1959), p. 313.

[8] Quoted from Grube, p. 83.

[9] Grube, pp. 94 ff.

[10] Grube, p. 138.

[11] Alex Preminger, ed., *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, enlarged ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), p. 141.

[12] Quoted in Preminger, p. 142.

[13] Quoted in Grube, p. 113; Preminger, p. 143.

[14] Grube, p. 180.

[15] *Advancement of Learning* (1605), quoted in Boris Ford, ed., *The Pelican Guide to English Literature*, Vol. 2 , *The Age of Shakespeare* (Penguin, 1955), p. 90.

[16] M.H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 3rd. ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971), p. 166. For the Neo-Classical theory and Wordsworth, see, for example, Preminger, p. 815.

[17] Shipley, pp. 398-9.

[18] Shipley, p. 399.

[19] Philip Stevick, ed., *The Theory of the Novel* (New York: The Free Press, 1967), p. 189.

[20] Allot, p. 319.

[21] Richard M. Ohmann, "Prolegomena to the Analysis of Prose Style," *Theory of the Novel*, ed. Stevick, p. 205.

[22] W.K. Wimsatt, *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson*, p. 63, quoted by Ohmann, p. 200.

[23] Ohmann, p. 203.

[24] Preminger, p. 814.

[25] Preminger, p. 814, and the following quote.

[26] Preminger, p. 814.

[27] Eric Auerback, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, 1956; trans. Willard Trask (Garden City: Anchor, 1957), p. 490, for example.

[28] Auerbach, p. 27.

[29] L.G. Salingar, "The Elizabethan Literary Renaissance," *Pelican Guide*, Vol. 2, ed. Boris Ford,pp. 71 ff.; Preminger, p. 815.

[30] Kenneth Muir, ed., *The Pelican Book of English Prose*, Vol. I: *Elizabethan and Jacobean Prose* (Penguin, 1956), p. xvii-xviii.

[31] Ian A. Gordon, *The Movement of English Prose* (London: Longman's, 1966), p. 29.

[32] Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, Oxford ed., rpt. 1966, p. 19.

[33] Ohmann, p. 198.

[34] Gordon, pp. 74 and 81.

[35] Quoted from Gordon, p. 83.

[36] Gordon, p. 85.

[37] Gordon, p. 89.

[38] Gordon, p. 100.

[39] Muir, p. xix; Gordon, p. 105 f.

[40] Quoted from F.L. Lucas, *Style* (London: Cassell, 1955), p. 92.

[41] Peter Ure. ed., *Pelican Book of English Prose*, Vol. II: *17th Century Prose* (Penguin, 1956), p. xxiv.

[42] Quoted in Gordon, p. 110.

[43] Gordon, p. 114.

[44] Quoted in Gordon, p. 115.

[45] Gordon, p. 109.

[46] Ure, p. xxii.

[47] Quoted in Ure, p. 204.

48 *Selected Prose*, ed. C.A. Patrides (Penguin, 1974), p. 328.

49 Gordon, p. 135.

50 Leonard Lutwak, "Mixed and Uniform Prose Style in the Novel," *Theory of the Novel*, ed. Philip Stevick, p. 204.

51 Lutwak, p. 210.

52 Allott, p. 318.

53 Stevick, p. 186.

54 Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature*, 1949; rpt. Peregrine, 1970, p. 165.

55 Gordon, pp. 141-42.

56 Gorron, p. 144.

57 *Lives of the Poets – A Selection* (Oxford: J.P. Hardy, 1971), p. 157.

58 Quoted in D.W. Jefferson, ed., *Pelican Book of English Prose*, Vol. III: *18th Century Prose* (Penguin, 1956), p. 94.

59 Raymond Wright, ed., *Pelican Book of English Prose*, Vol. IV: *Prose of the Romantic Period 1780-1830*, p. xx.

[60] Quoted in Wright, p. 85.

[61] Both quotes from Jefferson, p. xxvii.

[62] Both quotes from Jefferson, pp. 60-1.

[63] Quoted from Wright, p. xix.

[64] Quoted from Lucas, p. 142.