Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism

TCLC 101

ISSN 0276-8178

Volume 101

Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism

Criticism of the Works of Novelists, Poets, Playwrights, Short Story Writers, and Other Creative Writers Who Lived between 1900 and 1999, from the First Published Critical Appraisals to Current Evaluations

Jennifer Baise, Linda Pavlovski
Editors

Thomas Ligotti
Associate Editor

GALE GROUP

Detroit
New York
San Francisco
London
Boston
Woodbridge, CT

STAFF

Lynn M. Spampinato, Janet Witalec, *Managing Editors, Literature Product*
Kathy D. Darrow, *Product Liaison*
Jennifer Baise, Linda Pavlovski, *Editors*
Mark W. Scott, *Publisher, Literature Product*

Ellen McGeagh, *Editor*
Jenny Cromie, Thomas Ligotti, *Associate Editors*
Vince Cousino, *Assistant Editor*
Mary Ruby, Patti A. Tippett, *Technical Training Specialists*
Deborah J. Morad, Kathleen Lopez Nolan, *Managing Editors*
Susan M. Trosky, *Director, Literature Content*

Maria L. Franklin, *Permissions Manager*
Debra Freitas, *Permissions Associate*

Victoria B. Cariappa, *Research Manager*
Tracie A. Richardson, *Project Coordinator*
Tamara C. Nott, *Research Associate*
Nicodemus Ford, Sarah Genik, Timothy Lehnerer, Ron Morelli, *Research Assistants*

Dorothy Maki, *Manufacturing Manager*
Stacy L. Melson, *Buyer*

Mary Beth Trimper, *Manager, Composition and Electronic Prepress*
Carolyn Roney, *Composition Specialist*

Michael Logusz, *Graphic Artist*
Randy Bassett, *Imaging Supervisor*
Robert Duncan, Dan Newell, *Imaging Specialists*
Pamela A. Reed, *Imaging Coordinator*
Kelly A. Quin, *Editor, Image and Multimedia Content*

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 76-46132
ISBN 0-7876-4561-3
ISSN 0276-8178
Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism

Guide to Gale Literary Criticism Series

For criticism on	Consult these Gale series
Authors now living or who died after December 31, 1999	*CONTEMPORARY LITERARY CRITICISM (CLC)*
Authors who died between 1900 and 1999	*TWENTIETH-CENTURY LITERARY CRITICISM (TCLC)*
Authors who died between 1800 and 1899	*NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERATURE CRITICISM (NCLC)*
Authors who died between 1400 and 1799	*LITERATURE CRITICISM FROM 1400 TO 1800 (LC)* *SHAKESPEAREAN CRITICISM (SC)*
Authors who died before 1400	*CLASSICAL AND MEDIEVAL LITERATURE CRITICISM (CMLC)*
Authors of books for children and young adults	*CHILDREN'S LITERATURE REVIEW (CLR)*
Dramatists	*DRAMA CRITICISM (DC)*
Poets	*POETRY CRITICISM (PC)*
Short story writers	*SHORT STORY CRITICISM (SSC)*
Black writers of the past two hundred years	*BLACK LITERATURE CRITICISM (BLC)* *BLACK LITERATURE CRITICISM SUPPLEMENT (BLCS)*
Hispanic writers of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries	*HISPANIC LITERATURE CRITICISM (HLC)* *HISPANIC LITERATURE CRITICISM SUPPLEMENT (HLCS)*
Native North American writers and orators of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries	*NATIVE NORTH AMERICAN LITERATURE (NNAL)*
Major authors from the Renaissance to the present	*WORLD LITERATURE CRITICISM, 1500 TO THE PRESENT (WLC)* *WORLD LITERATURE CRITICISM SUPPLEMENT (WLCS)*

Preface

Since its inception more than fifteen years ago, *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism* (*TCLC*) has been purchased and used by nearly 10,000 school, public, and college or university libraries. *TCLC* has covered more than 500 authors, representing 58 nationalities and over 25,000 titles. No other reference source has surveyed the critical response to twentieth-century authors and literature as thoroughly as *TCLC*. In the words of one reviewer, "there is nothing comparable available." *TCLC* "is a gold mine of information—dates, pseudonyms, biographical information, and criticism from books and periodicals—which many librarians would have difficulty assembling on their own."

Scope of the Series

TCLC is designed to serve as an introduction to authors who died between 1900 and 1999 and to the most significant interpretations of these author's works. Volumes published from 1978 through 1999 included authors who died between 1900 and 1960. The great poets, novelists, short story writers, playwrights, and philosophers of the period are frequently studied in high school and college literature courses. In organizing and reprinting the vast amount of critical material written on these authors, *TCLC* helps students develop valuable insight into literary history, promotes a better understanding of the texts, and sparks ideas for papers and assignments. Each entry in *TCLC* presents a comprehensive survey on an author's career or an individual work of literature and provides the user with a multiplicity of interpretations and assessments. Such variety allows students to pursue their own interests; furthermore, it fosters an awareness that literature is dynamic and responsive to many different opinions.

Every fourth volume of *TCLC* is devoted to literary topics. These topics widen the focus of the series from the individual authors to such broader subjects as literary movements, prominent themes in twentieth-century literature, literary reaction to political and historical events, significant eras in literary history, prominent literary anniversaries, and the literatures of cultures that are often overlooked by English-speaking readers.

TCLC is designed as a companion series to Gale's *Contemporary Literary Criticism,* (*CLC*) which reprints commentary on authors who died after 1999. Because of the different time periods under consideration, there is no duplication of material between *CLC* and *TCLC*.

Organization of the Book

A *TCLC* entry consists of the following elements:

- The **Author Heading** cites the name under which the author most commonly wrote, followed by birth and death dates. Also located here are any name variations under which an author wrote, including transliterated forms for authors whose native languages use nonroman alphabets. If the author wrote consistently under a pseudonym, the pseudonym will be listed in the author heading and the author's actual name given in parenthesis on the first line of the biographical and critical information. Uncertain birth or death dates are indicated by question marks. Single-work entries are preceded by a heading that consists of the most common form of the title in English translation (if applicable) and the original date of composition.

- A **Portrait of the Author** is included when available.

- The **Introduction** contains background information that introduces the reader to the author, work, or topic that is the subject of the entry.

- The list of **Principal Works** is ordered chronologically by date of first publication and lists the most important works by the author. The genre and publication date of each work is given. In the case of foreign authors whose

works have been translated into English, the English-language version of the title follows in brackets. Unless otherwise indicated, dramas are dated by first performance, not first publication.

- Reprinted **Criticism** is arranged chronologically in each entry to provide a useful perspective on changes in critical evaluation over time. The critic's name and the date of composition or publication of the critical work are given at the beginning of each piece of criticism. Unsigned criticism is preceded by the title of the source in which it appeared. All titles by the author featured in the text are printed in boldface type. Footnotes are reprinted at the end of each essay or excerpt. In the case of excerpted criticism, only those footnotes that pertain to the excerpted texts are included.

- A complete **Bibliographical Citation** of the original essay or book precedes each piece of criticism.

- Critical essays are prefaced by brief **Annotations** explicating each piece.

- An annotated bibliography of **Further Reading** appears at the end of each entry and suggests resources for additional study. In some cases, significant essays for which the editors could not obtain reprint rights are included here. Boxed material following the further reading list provides references to other biographical and critical sources on the author in series published by Gale.

Indexes

A **Cumulative Author Index** lists all of the authors that appear in a wide variety of reference sources published by the Gale Group, including *TCLC*. A complete list of these sources is found facing the first page of the Author Index. The index also includes birth and death dates and cross references between pseudonyms and actual names.

A **Cumulative Nationality Index** lists all authors featured in *TCLC* by nationality, followed by the number of the *TCLC* volume in which their entry appears.

A **Cumulative Topic Index** lists the literary themes and topics treated in the series as well as in *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism, Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800, Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism,* and the *Contemporary Literary Criticism* Yearbook, which was discontinued in 1998.

An alphabetical **Title Index** accompanies each volume of *TCLC*. Listings of titles by authors covered in the given volume are followed by the author's name and the corresponding page numbers where the titles are discussed. English translations of foreign titles and variations of titles are cross-referenced to the title under which a work was originally published. Titles of novels, dramas, nonfiction books, and poetry, short story, or essay collections are printed in italics, while individual poems, short stories, and essays are printed in roman type within quotation marks.

In response to numerous suggestions from librarians, Gale also produces an annual paperbound edition of the *TCLC* cumulative title index. This annual cumulation, which alphabetically lists all titles reviewed in the series, is available to all customers. Additional copies of this index are available upon request. Librarians and patrons will welcome this separate index; it saves shelf space, is easy to use, and is recyclable upon receipt of the next edition.

Citing *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism*

When writing papers, students who quote directly from any volume in the Literary Criticism Series may use the following general format to footnote reprinted criticism. The first example pertains to material drawn from periodicals, the second to material reprinted from books.

George Orwell, "Reflections on Gandhi," *Partisan Review* 6 (Winter 1949): 85-92; reprinted in *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism,* vol. 59, ed. Jennifer Gariepy (Detroit: The Gale Group, 1995), 40-3.

William H. Slavick, "Going to School to DuBose Heyward," *The Harlem Renaissance Re-examined,* ed. Victor A. Kramer (AMS, 1987), 65- 91; reprinted in *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism,* vol. 59, ed. Jennifer Gariepy (Detroit: The Gale Group, 1995), 94-105.

Suggestions are Welcome

Readers who wish to suggest new features, topics, or authors to appear in future volumes, or who have other suggestions or comments are cordially invited to call, write, or fax the Managing Editor:

Managing Editor, Literary Criticism Series
The Gale Group
27500 Drake Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535
1-800-347-4253 (GALE)
Fax: 248-699-8054

Acknowledgments

The editors wish to thank the copyright holders of the excerpted criticism included in this volume and the permissions managers of many book and magazine publishing companies for assisting us in securing reproduction rights. We are also grateful to the staffs of the Detroit Public Library, the Library of Congress, the University of Detroit Mercy Library, Wayne State University Purdy/Kresge Library Complex, and the University of Michigan Libraries for making their resources available to us. Following is a list of the copyright holders who have granted us permission to reproduce material in this volume of *TCLC*. Every effort has been made to trace copyright, but if omissions have been made, please let us know.

COPYRIGHTED EXCERPTS IN *TCLC*, VOLUME 101, WERE REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING PERIODICALS:

ATQ, v.12, December, 1998. Reproduced by permission.—***Commentary,*** v. 90, December, 1990. Copyright © 1990 by the American Jewish Committee; all rights reserved. Reproduced by permission of the publisher and the author.—***Criticism,*** v. XIII, Winter, 1971. Copyright © 1970, Wayne State University Press. Reproduced by permission.—***Dalhousie Review,*** v. 71, Winter 1991/92. Reproduced by permission of publisher and the author.—***FOLIO: THE MAGAZINE FOR MAGAZINE MANAGEMENT,*** v. 20, March 1, 1991. Reproduced by permission.—***Journal of Popular Culture,*** v. IX, Spring, 1976. Reproduced by permission.— ***Literature and Psychology,*** v. XXI, 1971. Copyright © by Editor 1971. Reproduced by permission.—***The Massachusetts Review,*** v. XXXIX, Summer, 1998. Copyright © 1998. Reproduced from *The Massachusetts Review,* The Massachusetts Review, Inc. by permission.—***Modern Fiction Studies,*** v.38, Spring, 1992. Copyright © by Purdue Research Foundation. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission.—***The New England Quarterly,*** v. LVII, March, 1984. Reproduced by permission of the publisher and the author.—***New Literary History,*** v. 26, Autumn, 1995. Copyright © 1993 by Twayne Publishers. Reproduced by permission.—***Novel A Forum on Fiction,*** v. 26, Winter, 1993. Copyright NOVEL Corp. © 1993. Reproduced by permission.—***Parnassus: Poetry in Review,*** v. 17 & 18, 1993. Copyright © 1993 by Poetry in Review Foundation. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission.—***Philological Quarterly,*** v. 75, Winter, 1996. Reproduced by permission.—***Studies in the Novel,*** v. XIII, Winter, 1981; v. XVI, Winter, 1984. Copyright 1981, 1984 by North Texas State University. Reproduced by permission.—***Style,*** v. 23, Spring 1989. Copyright © Style, 1989. Reproduced by permission.—***Twentieth Century Literature,*** v. 23, October, 1977; v. 31, Winter, 1985. Copyright 1977, 1985, Hofstra University Press. Both reproduced by permission.

COPYRIGHTED EXCERPTS IN *TCLC*, VOLUME 101, WERE REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING BOOKS:

Algren, Nelson. In an introduction to ***Erik Dorn*** by Ben Hecht. The University of Chicago Press, 1963. Introduction copyright © by The University of Chicago Press. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission.—Anderson, Wallace L. From "The Young Robinson as Critic and Self-Critic," in ***Edwin Arlington Robinson Centenary Essays***. Edited by Elsworth Barnard. University of Georgia Press, 1969. Copyright © 1969 by the University of Georgia Press. Reproduced by permission.—Cambon, Glauco. From "Edwin Arlington Robinson: Knights of the Grail," in ***The Inclusive Flame: Studies in American Poetry.*** Indiana University Press, 1963. Copyright © 1963 by Indiana University Press. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission.—Cowley, Malcolm. From "Edwin Arlington Robinson: Defeat and Triumph," in ***New England Writers and Writing.*** Edited by Donald W. Faulkner. Copyright © 1996 by University Press of New England and the Estate of Malcolm Cowley. Reprinted by permissions of University Press of New England.—Freidman, Norman. From "The Waters of Annihilation: Symbols and Double Vision in 'To The Lighthouse'," in ***Form and Meaning in Fiction.*** The University of Georgia Press, 1975. Copyright © 1975 by The University of Georgia Press. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission.—Gregor, Ian. From " 'Spaces: To The Lighthouse'," in ***The Author in His Work: Essays on a Problem in Criticism.*** Edited by Louis L. Martz and Aubrey Williams. Yale University Press, 1978. Copyright © 1978 by Yale University. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission.—Hall, Donald. From an introduction in ***The Essential Robinson.*** The Ecco Press, 1994. Introduction and selection copyright © 1994 by Donald Hall. Reproduced by permission.—Hardy, John Edward. From "Vision Without Promise," in ***Man in the Modern Novel.*** University of Washington Press, 1964. Copyright © 1964 by the University of Washington Press. Reproduced by permission.—Howe, Irving. From "A Grave and Solitary Voice: An Appreciation of Edwin Arlington Robinson," in ***Irving Howe: Selected Writings 1950-1990.*** Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1990. Copyright © 1990 by Irving Howe. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—Justice,

PHOTOGRAPHS AND ILLUSTRATIONS APPEARING IN *TCLC*, VOLUME 101 WERE RECEIVED FROM THE FOLLOWING SOURCES:

Contents

Edward W. Bok
1863–1930

Dutch-born American editor, essayist, and autobiographer.

INTRODUCTION

The influential editor in chief of the magazine *Ladies' Home Journal* between 1889 and 1919, Bok is remembered for his impact on American culture at the turn of the century and for his Pulitzer Prize-winning autobiography *The Americanization of Edward Bok* (1920). As editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal,* Bok instituted advice columns and a series of how-to articles, focusing his energies on improving the lives of Americans by moderately changing the attitudes of the middle-class. Among his reform and public-service efforts conducted in the pages of the *Journal* were his "Beautiful America" conservation campaign, an attack on patent-medicines, his advocacy of sex education for children, and plans for affordable housing. In his editorial columns and separately published works, Bok sought to project the virtues of common sense, hard work, and service, using himself as an example of how the dutiful application of these ideals would lead to success.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Bok was born in Den Helder, the Netherlands, in 1863. His family emigrated to the United States when he was six years old, settling in Brooklyn, New York. Bok attended public school until the age of twelve, at which time he took a job as an office boy for the Western Union Telegraph Company in order to help support his impoverished parents. During this period he began to write brief biographies of notable Americans and to sell them for ten dollars each. In 1882 Bok found work with the publisher Henry Holt and Company as a stenographer. Two years later he joined the prominent New York publishing company Charles Scribner's Sons. His efforts with the church-focused *Brooklyn Magazine* and his creation of the Bok Syndicate Press, a newspaper publishing organization, in 1886 earned him the attention of Cyrus H. K. Curtis, publisher of the *Ladies' Home Journal.* In 1889 Curtis offered him the editorship of the magazine. Bok accepted and moved to Philadelphia. With Bok as editor in chief the *Ladies' Home Journal* experienced considerable gains in readership, becoming by 1903 the first American magazine to reach a circulation of one million readers. By 1893 Bok was made vice-president of the Curtis Publishing Company. He married Curtis's daughter, Mary Louise, in 1896 and remained editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal* until 1919. After his retirement, Bok devoted himself to writing and philanthropy. His 1920 autobiography, *The Americanization of Edward Bok,* earned him a Pulitzer Prize for biography. He also established a series of public endowments, including the $100,000 American Peace Award. Bok went on to make more than two million dollars in charitable donations prior to his death in 1930 at his estate near Lake Wales, Florida.

MAJOR WORKS

Many of Bok's writings are autobiographical in nature, and nearly all reflect his belief in the importance of service, hard work, self-improvement, and public awareness. *Successward* (1895) is essentially a book of advice for young men drawn from Bok's own experiences as an immigrant. The same theme is treated somewhat differently in his *Why I Believe in Poverty as the Richest Experience*

That Can Come to a Boy (1915), which links his accomplishments with an unceasing effort to escape destitution and a desire to better himself. Told in the third-person, Bok's best-known work, *The Americanization of Edward Bok,* holds up these same middle-class virtues, detailing his application of assiduity and energy to the task of achieving his goals. Among Bok's journalistic writing, he conducted a series of editorial crusades in the columns of the *Ladies' Home Journal.* Calling for the improvement of parks and public roads and the limitation of certain forms of obtrusive advertising, he developed the "Beautiful America" campaign in print. Bok launched a critique of largely ineffective patent-medicines and a ban on their advertising in his periodical, which led to the passage of the 1906 Food and Drug Act. He also offered a sustained criticism of the women's suffrage movement.

CRITICAL RECEPTION

While Bok enjoyed considerable public success during his lifetime, he also incited a number of critics who decried his paternalistic attitude toward women, his sentimentality, and his oversimplification of complex problems. *Why I Believe in Poverty as the Richest Experience That Can Come to a Boy* was particularly singled out by commentators, who observed that Bok's universal application of his own experience failed to adequately confront the difficulties of entrenched poverty and the realities of helplessness and resignation that frequently accompany it. *The Americanization of Edward Bok* was extremely well-received upon its publication, but the work has since declined in esteem as modern scholars observe that Bok quite characteristically employed the American themes of opportunity and advancement—previously elevated to near-legendary status in the writings of Benjamin Franklin and Horatio Alger—to describe his own arc of success. Other modern assessments of Bok have tended to focus on his accomplishments as an editor of one of America's most popular monthly periodicals and to analyze the rather simplified image of benevolent middle-class virtue he presented in his writings.

PRINCIPAL WORKS

The Young Man in Business (nonfiction) 1894
Successward (nonfiction) 1895
A Story of Some Pictures (nonfiction) 1896
The Young Man and the Church (nonfiction) 1896
Explaining the Editor (nonfiction) 1901
Why I Believe in Poverty as the Richest Experience That Can Come to a Boy (nonfiction) 1915
How the Y.M.C.A. Made Good: The Actual Facts Stated (nonfiction) 1919
The Americanization of Edward Bok (autobiography) 1920
Two Persons (nonfiction) 1922
A Man from Maine (nonfiction) 1923
Twice Thirty (nonfiction) 1925
America, Give Me a Chance! (autobiography) 1926
Dollars Only (nonfiction) 1926
You: A Personal Message (nonfiction) 1926
Mary's Son, A Christmas Brochure (nonfiction) 1927
Perhaps I Am (nonfiction) 1928
America's Taj Mahal, the Singing Tower of Florida (nonfiction) 1929
The Man in the White House (nonfiction) 1929

CRITICISM

Salme Hanju Steinberg (essay date 1979)

SOURCE: "The Editor's Aims, Strategies, and Risks," in *Reformer in the Marketplace: Edward W. Bok and The Ladies' Home Journal,* Louisiana State University Press, 1979, pp. 50–74.

[*In the following essay, Steinberg details Bok's editorial policies, reform efforts, and influence over the readership of the* Ladies' Home Journal.]

Edward Bok's personal qualities, especially his dedication to the humanistic values of his generation, profoundly influenced his conduct as editor. Although he often preached from his own experiences, he liked to insist that he had to repress his own personality, which he called Edward William Bok, to allow his *persona,* Edward Bok, the middle-class model for his generation, to edit the *Journal.*[1] The pages of the *Journal* do not bear him out, however. The man underestimated the editor; indeed, he judged him too severely. The editor accomplished most of what the man endorsed. The man of sixty, conscious of his age, remembered the vain hours he had spent on the problems of knitting and embroidery when important ideas begged to be explored. In the 1890s Bok certainly had accepted the limitations of the *Journal*'s objectives. His was a woman's magazine, not a "free lance" eager to spar with the "combative questions."[2] The *Journal*'s record reveals, however, that Bok and his audience eventually outgrew these limited aims.

Bok's successful editorship was the result of his carefully attuning himself to his readers, sensing their fears, and giving them what they wanted to read and a little bit more.

This combination, more than any other factor, assured the *Journal*'s large circulation and its consequent choice by advertisers for spending their revenues. Just as Cyrus Curtis had gained the confidence of his advertisers, Edward Bok cultivated the trust and assurance of his readers.

Bok created this special quality between his audience and himself in several ways. First, his definition of his role as editor and his relationship with his staff contributed to the climate of trust and confidence. Second, he built up his readers' trust in products advertised in the *Journal.* And, third, he shrewdly measured the needs and wishes of his female audience and always tried, as far as his conscience permitted, to keep pace with their developing interests and expanding role.

The student of Edward Bok as editor can learn more about his achievements than his procedures. The records simply are too few to illuminate his methods of editorial negotiations with writers and contributors. He preferred to use personal interviews and was willing to travel to conduct business. Although Bok and his journalist contemporary, S. S. McClure, had many business connections, only occasional references and notes to McClure are extant in the Bok letterbooks. Peter Lyon, McClure's biographer, said he did not remember seeing a single Bok item or letter in the bulky McClure papers. As Bok told one of his contributors, "A half-hour's talk together would do more than all the letters we could write."[3]

To show the differences between the two Curtis publications—Bok's *Journal* and George Horace Lorimer's *Saturday Evening Post*—the contemporary business journal *Profitable Advertising* published a short essay. The editors of both magazines, the article said, were eager to satisfy the readers' interests; but Bok's magazine consistently mirrored his audience, while Lorimer's more often reflected Lorimer. In reality, Bok's influence was just as pervasive as Lorimer's, only more subtle. He often said, however, that an editor could only be a good listener and give readers a magazine that they, in effect, wrote themselves. To achieve his ends Bok stayed at home one or two days out of every week reading the thousands of letters that inundated the Curtis Company offices. His ideas for articles, deletions of material, everything, he said, came from his readers. He did qualify this statement by admitting that his successful editorship came from being a "huckleberry or two" ahead of his readers.[4]

From the start Bok hoped to do more than merely reflect the audience. He wanted to raise the aspirations of his readers by giving them what they wanted but in a more profound way. Believing that the *Journal* was a tool for educating large numbers of American women, he tried to guide their interests to areas he thought would benefit them. He noticed, for example, that many people were concerned about raising the ethical standards of their communities, and he was convinced that sooner or later such people would look to the Bible for answers. Because no religious newspaper provided such guidance at that time, Bok and the *Ladies' Home Journal* decided to step into the breach by hiring the Reverend Lyman Abbott to counsel questioning readers with biblical wisdom.[5]

Bok enjoyed being a didactic editor. He once told Bernard Shaw that the *Journal*'s editorial pages were the world's "largest possible pulpit." One of his main techniques in education was to use his editorial page as his witness on topics that concerned him. Because an occasional article on an important issue had the greatest potential impact when published in editorial form, Bok sometimes asked contributors if they would permit editorial adaptations of manuscripts they had submitted to the *Journal.*[6]

Part of the editor's strategy was to create a forceful public personality, often remonstrative, always personal. He wanted to know his audience and his audience to know him. Although his photograph was not printed in the *Journal,* it was available for a small fee from the publishers. The Bok correspondence also reveals his initial eagerness to accept lecture engagements. But by 1906 Bok was willing to lecture only in his home state and its close neighbors—Pennsylvania, Delaware, New York, and New Jersey. In addition, he asked higher fees if he was unable to spend the night in his own house. When he decided that the public attended his lectures only to stare, he permanently discontinued his engagements on the lecture circuit.[7] Bok did not like public display or fanfare after he had become a public figure, and he realized that lecturing did not build the *Journal* audience.

Bok's ideas prevailed, too, in the type of fiction acceptable to the *Journal.* Any criticism of life had to be balanced by a suggestion of hope, an offer of remedy. Similarly, sadness had to be offset by humor, because Bok believed the stories should entertain, amuse but not sadden. When lessons were to be taught through fiction, Bok often advised writers to come only to the threshold of disaster, sparing the reader from too great an emotional shock. Even if a manuscript was nearly in accord with Bok's ideas, he often requested changes in theme or handling before acceptance.[8] When too many changes were in order for a manuscript, it was rejected. Unhappily Bok returned Samuel Clemens' story "My Platonic Sweetheart" and wrote apologetically to the author, "It must be like bitter gall to a humorist to be told that the public always wants funny things from him, but it does from Mark Twain unquestionably."[9] The predictable, not the unusual, was standard for *Journal* fiction.

Although Bok solicited fiction from some first-rate writers, the authors could not transgress Bok's anti-realistic bent.

As a result, Bok published Rudyard Kipling's *Just So* stories and the work of writers like the "smiling" realist, William Dean Howells. A typical *Journal* novel was Jean Webster's *Daddy Long-Legs.*

Journal fiction, from the editor's viewpoint, should not narrate the way life was but rather the way life *should* be. In 1890, one essayist was eager to write an article on the character of contemporary fiction. Bok told her to avoid discussing the popularity of certain leading realist and naturalist writers: "I almost fear that the statistics . . . on the sale of such writers as Zola and Tolstoi would be so large that it is best not to acquaint the public with it."[10] Another writer submitted a short story using the theater as background. Bok wrote to the author, "Nothing could be more directly against our policy than a story the scenes of which are laid on the stage; and to make matters worse you give me a suicide at the end."[11]

Bok saw no need to excite his readers by presenting them with a barrage of controversial and disturbing material. It was much shrewder to court them in unimportant matters so that he could preach his big concerns more effectively. Moreover, because his own literary taste was uncultivated, he willingly gratified his readers' preferences for happy, sentimental writing. And he was sure to hear from them if he violated this formula.

The dominance of Bok's personal philosophy at the *Journal* offices was maintained through his careful selection and control of the staff. Although the editorial staff was filled with highly professional and talented associates, Bok retained a commanding view over his chosen experts. By 1890 he had an editorial board made up of writers from whom he could request short articles on subjects of his choosing. Other editors read manuscripts and selected articles to submit to him. After he set a price on the manuscripts, they were given to his editorial assistants. Bok also placed other assistants on editorial salary to keep eyes and ears open for material of *Journal* interest in various cities. By 1898, he had a staff of twenty-two members, who formed an important element in developing the readers' trust in the magazine.[12]

Cyrus Curtis guaranteed editorial freedom to the *Journal* and *Post* editors, but members of Bok's staff were hardly free from their editor's influence.[13] He closely supervised his writers' contributions and often wrote samples of the kind of copy he wanted. Because his interests and capabilities were so extensive, he did not hesitate to write a column for a new series on social usage or advice to the lovelorn. Whatever the topic, he tried to be on the frontier of change. He pointed out the impracticality of a dwarf lemon tree for a table centerpiece as deftly as he reminded an associate art editor of new developments in printing technology.[14]

After advice columns on various subjects such as home nursing and child feeding had appeared in the *Journal* every month for a year or so, Bok discontinued the heading and placed it in the *Journal* service directory. Readers could then write to the staff editor in charge of the subject and receive personal answers. Bok admitted that, after twelve published columns, the basic questions on a topic were answered and the department only took space away from new topics.[15]

Despite the appearance of well-coordinated staff work, Bok's editorial assistants often failed to meet his exacting standards. The editor complained that he could entrust painstaking research problems to few American writers because Americans were not sufficiently thorough in their research methods. Not until 1911, when Karl Harriman became Bok's managing editor, were many trivial editorial problems removed from his anxious surveillance.[16] Bok had to supervise his staff very closely, since the *Journal*'s mainstay in serving its readers was the personal reply promised to every inquiry; and the volume of reader correspondence grew quickly. (The *Journal* offices received 59,000 letters in the last four months of 1911 and 97,000 letters in the last four months of 1912.) Every six months Bok wrote a letter under an assumed name to each of his department editors. He disliked the spying character of this method, but it enabled him to learn how attentive, accurate, and neat his editors' replies were. He praised good responses to his fake inquiries as strongly as he censured slipshod replies. Bok and his staff tested their rival magazines' services in the same way and found them wanting in contrast to the *Journal*'s.

Biographers of Bok's journalist contemporaries sometimes used him as the tranquil foil to highlight the distraught lives of their hyperanxious subjects. Bok was wholly uncomplicated to some observers and to others a jolly mover of men who worked without strain.[17] His associates knew better, however; he was not an indulgent editor. Perhaps this characteristic gained more victories for him than it lost contributors and staff members. His first managing editor advised office visitors to come prepared with definite ideas to discuss with the editor in chief; Bok had no time for a "rambling talk."[18]

Journal editorial copy had to be in the office at least three months before publication. Bok often made layout decisions several months before this deadline. He also made last-minute changes in the magazine's makeup. When he left the office for business trips or vacations, the magazine was made up far enough in advance to cover the issues he would not be present to supervise.[19]

Although Karl Harriman's predecessor, William V. Alexander, enjoyed a long tenure as managing editor from 1899 to 1911, he had walked uneasily on a thin line be-

tween his own responsibilities and Bok's wishes. He was authorized to open all Bok's mail, including that marked personal, and knew the ins and outs of all office issues; but he avoided making independent managerial decisions, preferring instead to wait for Bok's judgment. His caution annoyed Bok.[20]

Alexander certainly did not believe that Bok was uncomplicated, and occasionally he complained about his chief's capricious editorial decisions. He did not, for example, understand the seemingly inconsistent criteria used by Bok in selecting illustrations for publication.[21] On one occasion, Alexander received an irate letter from a writer who complained that her manuscript had been unwisely edited. Apparently Bok had made inaccurate "corrections" in the manuscript, which was about Holland. Alexander admitted to her that *Journal* staff members would not dare to question any textual changes made by a Hollander about his native Netherlands.[22]

Perhaps Bok wanted Alexander's main job to be to instill fear of the editor's wrath into bothersome or delinquent *Journal* contributors. Alexander did write to contributors about his harrowing sessions with the editor after Bok had been informed that a writer might be unable to meet a scheduled deadline. Alexander also tried to squeeze concessions from contributors by threatening to direct Bok's attention to the matter at hand.[23]

Only the rare writer, like the rare managing editor, met Bok's standards. Esther Everett Lape remembered that once, close to the end of Bok's editorship, he complimented her: "I feel very stimulated. At last I have found a real writer."[24] Bok complained that, in addition to their generally poor quality of writing, too many writers wanted to break office rules. They fought unsuccessfully against his requirement that all manuscripts submitted to the *Journal* were on approval; that is, nothing was guaranteed publication before Bok himself read and accepted it.[25]

Bok's editorial standards were high but so were the fees paid to writers published in the *Journal*—one advantage of the magazine's large circulation.[26] Bok had no fixed scale of payment; he judged each manuscript on its merits alone. He argued that payment by word weakened literary craftsmanship, and thus he paid in lump sums only. Despite an occasional reference in his letters to a *Journal* policy of not soliciting manuscripts, Bok did solicit most articles and some fiction. Many of his editorial practices, such as lump-sum payment and manuscripts on approval, were still regarded as novelties by other publishers before World War I.[27]

Bok carefully nurtured contributors' trust in the *Journal* and its editors. He enjoyed Benjamin Harrison's confidence, for example, and he made all the book publishing arrangements for the collections of Harrison's articles on the presidency that had been originally published in the *Journal.*[28] In another instance, Finley Peter Dunne, the creator of "Mr. Dooley," could not finish a serial for the *Journal* because he was in poor health. Bok wrote to Dunne telling him to keep the advance the *Journal* had already paid him and, upon his recovery, repay in token by giving the *Journal* the first chance to examine any new work he finished.[29]

One indication of the editor's interest in maintaining confidence in his magazine was his care to avoid abetting plagiarism. The *Journal* staff had to guard constantly against the dishonesty and unreliability of some contributors. Problems of real and suspected literary piracy haunted the editorial offices throughout Bok's thirty years as editor. In most cases Bok demanded acknowledgment of error and confession by the guilty plagiarist, whereupon he dismissed the case. One literary thief begged the young editor for his mother's sake not to publish news of his wrongdoing. Bok agreed.[30] In cases of copyright infringement the *Journal* tried to settle out of court. One magazine reprinted an article published in a British magazine, which had bought the article from the *Journal.* William Alexander wrote many times to the offender and demanded restitution. When the culprit sent fifty dollars, Alexander returned the check with a letter stating, "From the beginning our stand in the matter has been one for principle alone, and as you have given us all the satisfaction that we felt it is our duty to demand we wish now to prove to you that we have nothing but the kindest and most neighborly regard for you."[31]

Bok's idea of the editor as steward demanded that he personally supervise the myriad details affecting the publication of his mass magazine. He complained about his editorial burdens but did little to lighten them. Everyone from reader to staff member knew it was Bok who stood behind the *Journal*; he would guard their trust and confidence in him. His job was his vocation, in the religious sense. He knew what middle-class Americans wanted and expected to hear, but he also gave them a pinch of what they should hear if they were to grow in compassion and understanding of themselves and others.

The personal approach Bok used in his editorship extended to the purely business side of the *Journal,* the province of advertising. Indeed, advertising had an integral place in his vision of the magazine's purpose. He wanted everything published in the *Journal* to be trustworthy and useful. At a time when suspicion of business was manifest among the middle classes, Bok tried to show that society accrued countless benefits from commercial and business undertakings. Because he also criticized some features of advertising, he contributed to the credibility of the Curtis Publishing Company.

Bok often said that he believed in the businessman's power for performing good works. Businessmen were not the sordid people so often pictured, he said, and they were the great patrons of the arts and medical research in the United States. In addition, just and efficient business methods could be successfully applied to all sectors of life, including home and the Church.[32] Although he lauded business, he knew that far more important values transcended the marketplace.

In the reorganized Curtis Company the president defined the jurisdiction of the business manager. In the president's absence, the manager would be responsible for general business, only if the vice-president was *not* an editor of one of the magazines. If the vice-president was an editor, he would manage business affairs in the president's absence. The manager would not, however, have jurisdiction over either *Journal* or *Post* editor.[33]

By 1892 Edward Bok was the vice-president of the company. Curtis therefore regarded him as his chief lieutenant in business matters. Bok filled this post somewhat reluctantly. Part of his responsibility involved occasionally soliciting advertising for the Curtis magazines or checking advertisements sent out by the *Journal* or *Post.* Usually, he wanted nothing to do with conducting the *Journal*'s business affairs.[34]

Although Bok had to solicit advertising in Curtis's absence, he quietly attempted to withdraw on Curtis's return. But agents and customers continued calling on him to finish their particular negotiations. Apparently he was reluctant to tell these clients to work with Curtis and stop taking his time. The publisher wrote to his western advertising agent: "I would prefer that Mr. Bok would fight his own battles and if his tact prevents him from expressing himself clearly, I have made up my mind to do so for him so as to prevent as much as possible his ruffling up my nervous system with complaints." Thus Curtis, in an effort to steer clients away from discussions with Bok, often advised them that Bok knew no more about advertising than an office boy.[35]

After he retired, Bok fondly remembered writing advertising copy about *Journal* articles. Certainly he might have written some advertisements, but it is unlikely that he wrote many. Curtis said, probably a bit more accurately, that *he* wrote the advertising copy. Company records reveal Curtis's references to writing some advertisements but no evidence to support Bok's statement.[36] In fact, records only testify to Bok's annoyance when he was in any way associated with the business of *Journal* advertising.

Bok was, however, consistently interested in the quality and craftsmanship of advertising. In 1923, four years after he had retired from the *Journal,* Bok endowed an advertising award to be administered by the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration. In announcing the endowment, Bok said that he wanted advertising to improve through the correct use of English, more economy in language, higher standards in art and typography, and a meaningful relationship between the advertisement and a company's plan for production and distribution. The billion-dollar-plus industry practiced "so little originality and advancement of standards" that something had to be done to fight the annihilation of quality by the sheer weight of quantity. Displays in the competition were judged on design and tastefulness. Because sales results from the publication of winning advertisements were not counted, advertising men criticized the award program for being irrelevant and not in the best interests of the advertising industry.[37]

Bok's most important innovation for advertising in mass journalism was the profitable practice of mixing advertisements among editorial pages. Formerly the advertising was relegated to pages in the front and back of the magazine, and feature articles and editorials were self-contained in the middle. With the new format, however, articles were continued in the back pages, where the reader could not avoid noticing the advertisements. Bok said that he invented the practice in 1896. His correspondence, however, shows the accidental nature of this invention and indicates that he was initially reluctant, on aesthetic grounds, to use this method. All misgivings aside, Bok quickly became aware of the commercial value of this practice.[38]

The editor's chief contribution to the *Journal*'s advertising fortunes was his frequent justification of the slick advertisements that the *Journal* carried in ever greater numbers. Not only did the advertisements make the magazine attractive, he wrote, they also enabled literary and artistic excellence to thrive by supplying funds otherwise unavailable.[39] And he urged *Journal* readers to patronize the advertised products. In 1898, Bok reinforced his views on the benefits of advertising to readers by assuring them that the *Journal* carefully maintained the proportion of advertising linage to the amount of reading matter in any issue. "The more advertising there is," he said, "the more reading matter there is, and twice over."[40]

In 1901 Bok bluntly told his readers that "a magazine is purely a business proposition. It is published to earn money for its owners. . . . As he [the editor] succeeds or fails in this [getting subscriptions], the magazine secures or fails of an advertising patronage." Ten years later he told readers that without advertisements no magazine could exist. He also undoubtedly helped the advertising income of the *Journal* by quoting letters from readers who reported how useful and reliable they had found the *Journal* advertising pages to be.[41]