

COMMENT

STILL slowly digesting the answers to our questionnaire on the 'cost of letters', I feel that it has somehow revealed only one or two external symptoms of the complicated illness of our culture and our times. Thus, when I write 'complicated illness' I already betray a certain pleasure in being ill. It is more interesting. We live in an age in which normality (health, peace, happiness) seems dull. Are these things dull? No one with toothache thinks the absence of toothache dull, yet health, peace, happiness, convey to us who are mentally sick and yet don't want to be cured an impression of stagnancy. But we know that these qualities are not really stagnant; health as skiers, for example, experience it, is a kind of intoxication. They seem stagnant because we are feverish. Our illness, then, is a fever, a rise in temperature which makes us impatient of the tempo of normal living. It expresses itself in our next-war talk, wherein we forget death and the black-out, but remember the heightened historical consciousness which flushed our cheek and brightened our eye, and the importance which we derived from expressing our opinions on each new crisis. It also expresses itself in our inability to settle down, to use our money to buy leisure: in fact the claim of so many writers in the questionnaire that they need a thousand pounds a year to live on could be translated to mean 'it is not until fully occupied on the thousand-a-year level that one entirely ceases to be bothered by the books one hoped to write'. The courage required to surrender a good job in some area of culture-diffusion in order to create that culture can be gained only through a sense of vocation. But how can an unknown or under-paid writer make that choice? The times are against it. Where is the writer who stays home in the afternoon and has crumpets for tea? Where is the disdainful unworldly group, the new Pre-Raphaelite brotherhood? It is here the State (in the opinion of nine out of twenty-one writers) must step in. It must give young writers scholarships and older writers Sabbatical years; it must, with its official blessing, thrust leisure as well as money on them and punish those who sneak back to London, to reviewing or the B.B.C. It was an older writer, Robert Graves, who remarked that, where the State and the artist are concerned, 'he who pays the piper, calls the tune'.

What is that tune? Here is the crux. We are now at the beginning of a socialist regime. 'The State' to most artists (ninety per cent of whom are by origin bourgeois individualists) is a large, sprawling, well-meaning young giant, dangerous as 'Rex' to criminals, but tolerant to artists and anxious to avail itself of them. Writers who have been pacifists or revolutionaries see the dangerous 'Rex' aspect, others who have done well as civil servants envisage it as wise and adult, but I am convinced that to the average writer, the State is a clumsy new master, amiable and ready to be teased or bullied in a way which the private patron, with his human vanity, would have resented. So far, in fact, the infant Hercules, while far from paying out to every piper, has warbled only approval of the tune. 'Graham Sutherland, Benjamin Britten, Henry Moore, very nice I'm sure, very pretty—how much?' The attitude of the artist to the State is still that of the middle-class child to the working-class window cleaner who is graciously asked to admire his toys. But supposing the window cleaner says 'I've no time for such rubbish now—you help clean my windows'. Immediately the other facet of the relationship appears—the bourgeois terror of the working class: 'you nasty, big, horrid man, go away. I'll tell my Daddy, he'll never let you clean these windows again.' But Daddy is outside, clearing the drains.

Thus one might say that, under a Conservative government the artist is either the 'good son' (Kipling) or the problem child, the mischievous adolescent Prince Hal (Byron, Wilde, Shaw). He invents Colonel Blimp. Under a Socialist government unless he is a Socialist, his top layer of gentlemanly condescension peels away to reveal an obscure guilt at not doing manual labour, beneath which is a sense of helplessness which will drive these artists who can't hit it off with the new Father figure into exile or the despised arms of the Conservative opposition. But supposing there is no opposition? Supposing party government (which really implies four possible attitudes of the artist to the State) comes to an end through a series of socialist victories and the State, now all-powerful, since the vague cultural opposition of an educated leisured class will have lost all political reality, begins to ask for the art it likes, then the answer will be social realism. Be a social realist or starve—(social realism and, for Conservatives, the pretty-pretty, are the only two kinds of art for which a politician can spare the

time). If in addition to liking social realism there are to be found patriotic reasons for encouraging it (i.e., increase of coal production, dismay of capitalist rivals, etc.), then the State will begin to feel positive anger against those artists who are not social realists. They must be brought into line. This is happening today in Russia, in an atmosphere which recalls an immorality scare in a bad public school, and what is happening is so important that HORIZON feels it necessary, at the risk of saturating our readers, to give a much fuller report of the case than has so far appeared, so let us pretend that we have heard nothing about it, that the writers mentioned, Zoshchenko and Mme. Akhmatova are their English equivalents, Zoshchenko something of Evelyn Waugh, of Nat Gubbins, of G. W. Stonier, Mme. Akhmatova something of a Virginia Woolf or Edith Sitwell, but in their seventies; and that the terrible new headmaster, Zhdanov, is Bevan or Strachey. And now we take you over to the Fifth Form at St. Joe's.

I. TROUBLE BREWING

From the editorial, first number of new Propaganda Department magazine *Culture and Life*, 28 June 1946:

A new historical period has begun in the life of our country . . . Life demands of us a development of ideological and cultural work in accordance with the historic tasks confronting the Soviet State . . . In forming the awareness of Soviet people, literature and art have enormous importance. Our people have a high opinion of the Soviet literary productions which appeared during the war years, but our writers, dramatists, directors and artists are lagging behind the demands currently being placed on Soviet literature and art. Publishing houses and literary journals frequently print mediocre works of little artistic value. There are still people among our *littérateurs* who stubbornly avoid contemporary themes and prefer to depict only the very distant past. A hopeless error is being made by the directors and writers who are assuming that the Soviet people after the war want only relaxation and diversions. Soviet literature and art must produce works full of passion and profound thoughts, penetrated with ideas of life-giving Soviet patriotism.

Literature must, by means of artistic words, reveal the world historical significance of the victories of the Soviet people, must show the vitality and invincibility of the Soviet democracy. Literature is called upon to show the spiritual wealth, the moral firmness, the moral cleanliness and loftiness of spirit of the Soviet man. Only an idealistically advanced, really just literature, based on the living experience of our peoples' struggle for Communism, can be a force raising Soviet people to the resolutions of the historic problems confronting them.

In order that literature may be able to fulfil its duty to the people, analyse

the complex problems of modern life, explain the nature of the social processes in our country, an authoritative literary criticism based on principle must come to the aid of literature.

But we do not have such criticism yet. The state of our criticism is unsatisfactory and its public authority is low. Criticism is not having the necessary effect on the forming of Soviet literature. Criticism is anything but exacting as to artistic form, is poor in thoughts and generalization.

Worthless and fruitless is the criticism which neglects the principle of the party-nature of literature and places the interests of the shop or department above general State interests. It loses its significance as the champion of advanced ideas of our time and becomes petty, servile, or fretfully impatient.

The chief sin of contemporary criticism lies in its having placed itself in the service of particular agencies and writers, lauding mediocre productions of these writers and frequently lamenting the valuable productions of other writers.

Modern criticism is detached from life which means that the literary critics are not in a position properly to evaluate and analyse the great productions of Soviet literature, to define the tendencies of its development.

Our critics do not know how to combine an analysis of the idea content of literary works with an analysis of artistic form.

II. BEFORE THE WHOLE SCHOOL!

The magazines *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*. Decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of 14 August 1946. From *Pravda*, 21 August.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union notes that the literary-feature magazines *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* which are published in Leningrad are operating in a very unsatisfactory manner.

In the magazine *Zvezda*, alongside significant and successful works by Soviet writers, there have recently appeared many works which are devoid of ideas and ideologically pernicious. The grave error of *Zvezda* lies in offering a literary rostrum to the writer Zoshchenko, whose works are alien to Soviet literature. The editors of *Zvezda* were aware that Zoshchenko has long specialized in writing empty, inane and trivial things, propounding rotten works without ideology, which are trivial and indifferent to politics and calculated to disorientate our youth and poison its consciousness. The most recent of the published stories of Zoshchenko 'The Adventures of an Ape' (*Zvezda* Nos. 5-6, 1946) is a vulgar lampoon on Soviet life and Soviet people. Zoshchenko portrays Soviet customs and people in ugly caricature form, slanderously depicting the people as primitive, uncultured, stupid with Philistine tastes and customs. The maliciously hooligan description by Zoshchenko of our life is accompanied by anti-Soviet attacks.

To offer the pages of *Zvezda* to such vulgar dregs of literature as Zoshchenko is the more inadmissible since the editors of *Zvezda* were thoroughly familiar with the character of Zoshchenko, and with his unworthy behaviour during the war when Zoshchenko, not at all helping the Soviet people in their fight

against the Germans, wrote such an abominable thing as *Before Sunrise*, an evaluation of which, along with an evaluation of all the literary 'creations' of Zoshchenko, was given on the pages of the magazine *Bolshevik*.

The magazine *Zvezda* also broadly popularizes the works of the writer, Akhmatova, whose literary and social and political personality has long been familiar to Soviet society. Akhmatova is a typical representative of the empty poetry without ideas which is alien to our people. Her poems, which are imbued with a spirit of pessimism and decadence, expressing the tastes of old drawing-room poetry which have never progressed beyond the attitudes of bourgeois aristocratic aesthetics and decadence—'art for art's sake'—and which did not wish to keep in step with its people, damage the task of bringing up our youth and cannot be tolerated in Soviet literature.

The effect of granting Zoshchenko and Akhmatova an active role on the magazine was doubtless to introduce elements of ideological disjunction and disorganization among Leningrad writers. Works began to appear in the magazine which cultivated a spirit of obsequiousness to modern bourgeois culture of the West, a spirit which is not characteristic of Soviet people. The magazine began to publish works saturated with nostalgia, pessimism and disillusionment in life (the poems of Sadofev and Komissarova in No. 1 of 1946, etc.). In publishing these works the editors aggravated their errors and still further lowered the intellectual level of the magazine . . .

The Central Committee notes that the magazine *Leningrad* is operating particularly badly. It has constantly opened its pages to the vulgar and slanderous writings of Zoshchenko, and to the inane and apolitical poems of Akhmatova. Just as the editors of *Zvezda*, the editors of the magazine *Leningrad* have permitted grave errors in publishing a number of works saturated with a spirit of obsequiousness to everything foreign . . .

How could it happen that *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, published in the hero-city, known for its advanced revolutionary traditions, a city which was always a nursery of advanced ideas and advanced culture, permitted apolitical works without idea content, and alien to Soviet literature, to creep into its magazines. What is the significance of the errors made by the editors of *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*?

The leading employees of the magazines, in the first place their editors, Comrades Sayanov and Likharev, forgot the thesis of Leninism that our magazines, be they scientific or artistic, cannot be politically indifferent. They forgot that our magazines are a powerful means whereby the Soviet State brings up the Soviet people and, in particular, the youth, and for this reason must be guided by the phenomenon which comprises the vital foundation of the Soviet structure—its politics. The Soviet system cannot suffer its youth to be educated in a spirit of apathy towards Soviet politics, in a spirit of disrespect and lack of ideas.

The strength of Soviet literature, the most advanced literature in the world, is that it is a literature in which there are not and cannot be any interests other than those of the people and the State. The task of Soviet literature is to help the State properly to bring up the youth, answer its needs, educate the new generation to be brave, to believe in its cause, to be fearless before obstacles and ready to overcome all barriers.

B

For this reason any preaching of lack of ideas, indifference to politics, 'art for art's sake', is alien to Soviet literature, pernicious to the interests of the Soviet people and the State and can have no place in our magazines.

The lack of ideals on the part of the leading employees of *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* also had the effect of their setting, as the cardinal point in their relations with literary figures, not the interests of the proper education of the Soviet people and of the political direction of the activity of the *littérateurs*, but personal interests of friendship. Criticism was dulled in order to avoid spoiling relations with friends. Clearly worthless works were permitted in the Press out of fear of offending friends. This sort of liberalism in which the interests of the people and the State, the interests of the proper education of our youth, are sacrificed to friendly relations and in which criticism is stifled, results in writers ceasing to perfect themselves and in losing awareness of their responsibility to the people, the State and the Party, and of ceasing to go forward.

All the above proves that the editors of *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* have not measured up to the duty with which they were charged, and have permitted serious political errors in directing their magazines.

The Central Committee decrees that the leadership of the Union of Soviet Writers and, in particular, its Chairman Comrade Tikhonov, have taken no steps to improve *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* and have not only not fought against the pernicious influences of Zoshchenko, Akhmatova and other non-Soviet writers like them on Soviet literature, but have even tolerated the penetration of tendencies and habits alien to Soviet literature into the magazines . . .

The propaganda administration of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union did not assure the necessary control over the work of Leningrad magazines.

III. EXPELLED!

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union decrees:

1. The editors of *Zvezda*, the board of directors of the Union of Soviet Writers, and the propaganda administration of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are to take steps for the unconditional elimination of the errors and weaknesses of the magazine indicated in our decree, are to correct the line of the magazine and guarantee a high idealistic and artistic level while forbidding access to the magazine for the works of Zoshchenko, Akhmatova and others like them.

2. In view of the fact that at the present moment there are no suitable conditions for publishing two literary artistic magazines in Leningrad, the magazine *Leningrad* is to cease publication and all literary forces in Leningrad are to be concentrated around *Zvezda*.

3. In an effort to introduce the necessary system in the work of the editors of *Zvezda* and a serious improvement in the magazine's content, the magazine is to have an Editor-in-Chief and an editorial board under him. It is decreed that the Editor-in-Chief bears full responsibility for the ideological and political direction of the magazine and the quality of the works published in it.

4. Comrade A. M. Egorin is appointed Editor-in-Chief of *Zvezda* while

retaining his functions as Acting Chief of the Propaganda Administration of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

IV. ALL WE LIKE SHEEP . . .

[SEVERAL PAPERS]

A few days ago in Leningrad there was a meeting of the 'Aktiv' of Leningrad Party Organization at which the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Zhdanov, made a statement with regard to the decree of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of 14 August of this year 'with regard to the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*'. The meeting discussed the statement made by Zhdanov, and in accordance with it passed the following resolution:

Resolution passed at the meeting of the 'Aktiv' of Leningrad Party Organization on the statement of Zhdanov on the Decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party 'On the journals Zvezda and Leningrad'.

Having heard and discussed the statement of the Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party, Zhdanov, on the decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party with regard to the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* which are published in Leningrad, the meeting of the Aktiv of the Leningrad Party organization unanimously acknowledges this decree to be just, entirely approves it, and undertakes to be guided by it and to carry it out precisely.

The meeting of the Party Aktiv considers that the City Committee of the Communist Party, being occupied with the decision of practical economic questions, has neglected questions of ideological work, has not concerned itself with the direction of the journals, has overlooked very big mistakes in the work of the editorial staffs, thus giving an opportunity to people who are alien to Soviet literature, such as Zoshchenko and Akhmatova, to take a leading position in the journals. Having forgotten that the journal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party *Bolshevik* strongly condemned the non-ideological, worthless writings of Zoshchenko, the Bureau of the City Committee of the Communist Party and its Secretaries, Kapustin and Shirokov, made a gross political mistake in admitting Zoshchenko as a member of the editorial staff of the journal *Zvezda*.

The City Committee of the Party, and first and foremost its Propaganda and Agitation Section, have forgotten the instructions of Lenin and Stalin to the effect that literature is a most important Party and State matter, that its task is to strengthen the Soviet system, to assist the Party and the State in the Communist education of the workers, to inculcate in the young generation the best qualities of Soviet peoples—courage, faith in their cause, love and devotion to the Socialist Motherland, the capacity and knowledge for overcoming any difficulties. The absence of daily guidance on the part of the City Committee of the Communist Party led to the result that the Leningrad journals instead of being a powerful weapon in the education of Soviet peoples and especially of youth, by profoundly ideological, contemporary productions, correctly reflecting Soviet life, opened their pages wide to such trivial and worthless writers as Zoshchenko, whose writings are full of a rotten lack of ideology, triviality and

ignorance of politics, which libellously portray Soviet people and mock their Soviet readers. The journals widely popularized the productions of a typical representative of empty poetry which is alien to our people, Akhmatova. The journals also printed the formally pretentious and false productions of Yagdfeld, the verses of Sadofev, which are decadent and permeated with melancholy, the similar verses of Komissarova, and other productions which are weak from an ideological and artistic standpoint.

The meeting of the Party Aktiv notes that although Leningrad writers have composed a number of good, ideologically valuable productions, the general level of their work lags behind the growing tasks of Soviet literature. Many Communist writers have lost the feeling of responsibility and of Bolshevik regard for the high calling of Soviet literature. More than this, some of them have joined the tag-end of writers—the vulgarians and merchants of literature. In the Leningrad section of the Union of Soviet Writers a situation was created in which the interests of the State and the Party were subordinated to private interests, and to personal friendships, a situation of clannishness and mutual admiration.

All this led to the result that in the productions of Leningrad writers there was no portrayal of the heroic deeds of Soviet people, of its inspired creative work in the post-war restoration of works and factories, collective farms, cities and scientific and cultural institutions. Artistic productions did not portray the laborious exploits and life of the workers of Leningrad who had been strengthened in the flame of the Great Patriotic War, and who are now working to restore their city, a hero city, to consolidate further the strength and might of their country . . .

Noting that the governing body of the Union of Soviet Writers and in particular its President, Tikhonov, did not effectively direct the work of the Leningrad section of the Union, did not engage in struggle with the harmful influences of non-Soviet writers, did not take any measures to improve the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* and permitted the infiltration into these journals of tendencies and habits foreign to Soviet literature, the Party Aktiv considers it necessary to ask the Central Committee of the Communist Party to strengthen the governing body of the Union of Soviet Writers, and to put at its head a stronger leader, capable of directing the work of the Union.

The meeting of the Party Aktiv calls upon all writers of the city of Leningrad to resolute improvement of their work as is demanded by the decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, to deep study of Marxism-Leninism, and heightening of their ideological understanding, to intensive creative labour aiming at a new development and flowering of Soviet literature, which is called upon to reflect the interests of the people and the State, and to inculcate the noble qualities of Soviet patriotism amongst the workers and amongst youth.

VI. ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL MAYBE

The meeting of Writers regards the decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party with regard to the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* as a document of immense significance both as regards principle and programme, determining the direction and the path of development of Soviet literature.

By its decree the Central Committee of the Communist Party points out to us that the strength of Soviet literature, the most progressive literature in the world, lies in the fact that it is a literature which has not and cannot have any other interests except the interests of the people, the interests of the State. The function of Soviet literature is to help the State in the correct education of youth, to answer its demands, to educate a young generation to be bold, confident in its cause, without fear of obstacles, ready to surmount all difficulties.

The meeting demands of every Leningrad writer that he should devote all his creative powers to the matter of producing ideologically valuable productions of high artistic merit, portraying the greatness of our victory, the fervour for re-establishment and socialist reconstruction, the heroic deeds of Soviet people for the fulfilling and over-fulfilling of the new Stalin Five-Year Plan. In our productions there must be found a worthy and clear portrayal of the Soviet citizen, educated by the Communist Party, steeled in the fire of the Great Patriotic War, devoting all his powers and talents to the great cause of Socialist construction, capable of surmounting any obstacles.

The governing body of the Union must take all steps for strengthening the contacts between writers and the broad masses of the workers, whose demands and just criticism must guide every writer in his work.

It is a matter of honour for Leningrad writers to carry out the decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and to rally the best forces of Soviet writers around the journal, to make the journal *Zvezda* the foremost literary journal in the country . . .

The meeting unanimously assures the Central Committee of the Communist Party and Comrade Stalin that the writers of Leningrad will within a short space of time overcome the grievous defects in their work, and under the leadership of the Leningrad Party organization will find within themselves the powers and the possibilities for the creation of works worthy of the great Stalin era.

What is this verdict in Western terms? It is as if the magazines *HORIZON* and *New Writing* (whose present editorial deals with another aspect of the same problem: Soviet attacks, encouraged by *The Times* correspondent, Mr. Parker, on 'escapist' English literature and periodicals) were suspended; one suppressed, the other given a new editor, and our composite writers, Waugh-Gubbins, and Woolf-Sitwell publicly censured, with all those who have written favourably of them, and forbidden to publish another line (i.e., condemned to starve). Pasternak-Eliot is also involved and elsewhere reprimanded and Spender-Tikhonov retired from his high function.

It is not to be expected that *HORIZON*, which exports about twenty copies to Russia, can be of the slightest help to Messrs. Zoshchenko and Akhmatova whose books at this moment are probably being withdrawn from all circulation, as if they were Celine's or Giono's, and for us even to hint that Western culture

approves of them is the worst thing we can do. But we can deduce one or two conclusions for our Western readers.

(1) Better a 'State' which can't read or write than one which begins to take a positive interest in literature.

(2) There is only one judge of books whom we *dare* trust—with all its faults—the Reading Public. A Buy-more-books Campaign with writers and publishers touring the country in a ballyhoo travelling circus is safer than the best-intentioned crumb of State patronage.

(3) Yet the State is ourselves, *l'état c'est toi*, and after enjoying the beginnings of the Third Programme (so admirably free from such doctrinaire rantings) we can envisage a State which does not necessarily adopt social realism but encourages art for its own sake. The Russian attitude betrays a complete ignorance of what art is about and why people like it, and we must be constantly on the look-out against its implications.

(4) The artist who cares truly for individual freedom, æsthetic merit or intellectual truth must be prepared to go once more into the breach against the Soviet view with all the patience, fervour and lucidity with which, ten years ago, he went into action against the nascent totalitarianism of the Nazis. This is a terrible and tragic conclusion, but the situation is no less tragic. The Soviet conception of art, with the intolerable bullying of artists to which it leads, is a challenge to every writer with liberal opinions—it is the extreme of illiberality.

(5) We must accept the probability that literature will die out in Russia, because the State is trying to force it artificially. All we can do is to see that does not happen here, and proclaim at once to our well-meaning and as yet inoffensive little Hercules the truth that Art is not a product of patriotism or policy or mass-demand, or the yells of a political commissar with a youth movement, but of internal conflict in the subconscious. The artist is a self-cured neurotic—the origins of Art are not in the State but in the family, and the one golden recipe for Art is the ferment of an unhappy childhood working through a noble imagination.

SAYING OF THE MONTH

La justice humaine est d'ailleurs pour moi ce qu'il y a de plus bouffon au monde; un homme en jugeant un autre est un spectacle qui me ferait crever de rire s'il ne me faisait pitié, et si je n'étais forcé d'étudier maintenant la série d'absurdités en vertu de quoi il juge. FLAUBERT, *Letters*.

RENÉ DUMESNIL

THE INEVITABILITY OF FLAUBERT

FLAUBERT, states Mr. Aldous Huxley in his essay, *Vulgarity in Literature*, wished his work to have no ornament other than its own essential beauty, without exterior decoration, however beautiful this might be in itself. And he adds that the saint's asceticism was duly rewarded, since there is nothing even remotely resembling a vulgarity in any of Flaubert's writings. Neither is there any pandering to the taste of the day, nor sacrifice to mere fashion. It is, of course, unquestionable that *Madame Bovary*—and probably still more *An Education in Love*—have given rise to a great number of novels whose authors have done their best to follow the precepts of the master of Croisset; but it is equally true that his ideas, his aesthetic theory, and his method of composition, were entirely his own. Flaubert created a literary school, he did not follow one.

The strict self-discipline which has gained Flaubert the title of ascetic is probably the reason why the young writers of today have turned away from so austere a master—and one, moreover, who had already scolded Zola for pandering to the taste of a public greedy for the frivolous and the morbid. When J.-K. Huysmans sent him *Les Sœurs Vatar*, Flaubert acknowledged it in a letter which could be read with advantage by many novelists of today: 'The basis of your style is firm enough, but you seem to me too modest to rely on it. Why try to bolster it up with violent and vulgar phrasology? When it is you who is speaking, why express yourself like your characters? Don't you see that this is the best way of weakening their idiom? That I should not understand some slang expression used by a Parisian footpad makes no matter. If you consider that expression characteristic and therefore indispensable, I bow to your judgement and deplore only my own ignorance of these things. But when a writer, in expressing his own views, employs a mass of words unknown to any dictionary, then I have a right to object. For what you are doing offends me and spoils my pleasure . . . A whole