

EMINENT VICTORIANS AND
R. E. LEE: A CASE STUDY
IN CONTRASTS

ROBERT PARTIN

Since the end of the First World War, biography has flourished as never before in history. During this period almost twenty-five thousand biographies were published in America.¹ The influence of this boom has been twofold: On the one hand, it has immeasurably enriched biography--made it "indeed a house of many mansions"; for these works were of every conceivable type: biographies long and short, interpretative and narrative, eulogistic and defamatory, pure and impure, scholarly and superficial, and about "heroes and villains of every hue." On the other hand, the boom has made of "Biographical literature... a maze, without a plan."² This literary maze has often been covered by a fog of confusion. Literary cults and biographical schools--by dogmatically proclaiming and aggressively defending their pet theories and practices--have distorted truth, destroyed values, and confounded the confusion which inevitably accompanied so large and so varied a literature.³

When such confusion beclouds any branch of literature, it is proper for the students of that literature to concern themselves with the problem; and it is the purpose of this paper to examine the biography of this period and to suggest possible ways of lessening the confusion. For this study, all biographies are divided into two classes: the "new" revolutionary, interpretative, debunking "sketches" which flourished from 1918 to 1932, and the "post-new" counter-revolutionary, full character-portrayal, long biography which has dominated the field since 1932.⁴ For careful study, only two biographies have been selected: from the "new" biography, Lytton Strachey's Eminent Victorians, and from the "post-new," Douglas Southall Freeman's R. E. Lee.⁵

The selection of two from thousands of biographies is justified on the ground that these works are not only the most characteristic biographies of their respective schools, but also two of the most important biographies of the twentieth century. At any rate, these two works--poles apart in all important respects--furnish an interesting case study in contrast of all the factors and influences which have made biography of the last forty years so rich yet so confusing.

The most obvious difference in the two works is that of size. Eminent Victorians, the biography of four prominent individuals, is one slim volume,

containing only 351 pages; R. E. Lee, the life of a single individual, runs to four fat volumes, containing 2421 pages. "Cardinal Manning," the longest of Strachey's four sketches, contains only 131 pages; and "Dr. Arnold," the shortest, contains only 36 pages. That is, Freeman's work is almost seven times as long as Strachey's; and the life of Lee is more than eighteen times the length of Strachey's longest sketch and almost seventy times the length of the shortest.

These differences in length are indicative of the fundamental differences in the works. Strachey's work is short because his concept of biography was narrow and his method highly selective; Freeman's work is long because his concept of biography was broad and his method exhaustive.

For Strachey biography was first of all an art. But not only was biography an art, it was to him "the most delicate and humane of all the branches of the art of writing," an art which he proposed to rescue from the Victorian panegyrists and scrupulous narrators. He aimed to replace "those two fat volumes. . . of tedious panegyric" with his own artistic sketch.⁶ And because Strachey was first of all an artist, his masterpiece is first of all a work of art and not a scientific history.

Strachey's conception of the biographer as a historian and the historical methods which he employed in writing Eminent Victorians are made clear in his famous preface:

For ignorance is the first requisite of the historian. . . .

It is not by direct method of a scrupulous narration that the explorer of the past can hope to depict that singular epoch. If he is wise, he will adopt a subtler strategy. . . . He will row out over that great ocean of material and lower down into it, here and there a little bucket, which will bring up to the light of day some characteristic specimen, from those far depths, to be examined with a careful curiosity.

In the passage above, the author of Eminent Victorians makes it plain that he will not tire himself with research or overwhelm the reader with historical facts. He also makes plain his method of appraising historical items. He is going to use, he tells us, "certain fragments of truth which took my fancy and lay to my hand." For Strachey, the first duty of a biographer was "To preserve. . . a becoming brevity. . . ."⁸

Strachey openly displayed his scorn of research and the trappings of the historian's craft: there is not a footnote in the book, and the bibliographies are short indeed. Perhaps Strachey was, as his ardent admirers claimed, a profound scholar; but any rapidly reading graduate student should be able to read his references on Manning in less than a month and those on Arnold in less than a week.

As implied in the preface and made clear in the body of the work, Strachey's method was highly selective. Actually, before beginning Eminent Victorians (this too is implied in the preface and made clear in the body of

the work) Strachey drew a "straight-jacket design" and then selected subjects and "specimens" of their lives to fit his "Procrustean" plan, rejecting everything which did not take his fancy. And that which most often caught his fancy was "the colorful, the exotic, the eccentric."⁹

If Strachey did not employ the historical method, what method did he use? The answer is the psychological. Through psychological interpretation the biographer revealed what was not in the record. He did this by putting words into the mouth, thoughts into the mind, and hidden motives into the actions of his subject. Strachey was wiser and more restrained in the use of psychology than many of his disciples, but he is responsible for its wide use and misuse. His psychological method, like so much else in his art, suffered from narrowness; for, as one critic put it, "His psychology is a psychology of humors, all of character types etched with deepening bite around a few strongly defined traits."¹⁰

Within these narrow limits which Strachey deliberately set for himself, he was a master. He was a master of design, selection, arrangement, and above all, a master of style. His style has been described as one containing "mingled elegance and vitality" and "made exhilarating by the continuous sparkle of an impish and adroit irony." It has also been credited with possessing "the virtues of classicism: clarity, balance, concision."¹¹ Strachey's place as an artistic biographer has been cogently summarized by Andre Maurois: "Mr. Strachey... has the power of presenting his material in a perfect art form, and it is this form which is for him the first essential." Maurois also referred to Strachey's artistic creations as "exquisitely ironic terra-cottas."¹²

On the contrary, Freeman was first of all a historian. His biographical philosophy and method was in every way the opposite of Strachey's "ignorance is the first requisite of the historian" concept and his "little bucket" dipping techniques.¹³ In his research, he employed the "industry of a Ranke"; and, in his writing, he employed "the direct method of scrupulous narration," filling the work with "the rich abundance of his items" and all but overwhelming the reader with footnotes, appendixes and bibliographies. He spent twenty years in the preparation of his R. E. Lee.¹⁴ Certainly for Douglas Southall Freeman "brevity" was not "the first duty of the biographer."

Freeman too was a great artist. But his art he employed only after he had, with a scientist's skill and patience, uncovered the facts, all the facts to be found. His art pattern was in a broad sense an outgrowth of his historical methods; and it was not rigid but elastic--elastic enough to allow the original plan of R. E. Lee to grow from one to four volumes. Because Freeman's four volumes are nearly twenty-five hundred pages in length, many readers have overlooked "the moving beauty" of the work.¹⁵

Freeman's artistry consists of strong, beautiful, appropriate words; long resonant sentences; a richness of details; smooth flowing transitional

passages; excellent descriptions of moving and dramatic scenes; the selection and arrangement of materials; and in beautiful interpretative writing as, for example, "The Pattern of Life" at the end of Volume IV. The practice of keeping the reader always at Lee's side during the war serves to give the work an artistic unity.¹⁶ But it was Freeman's style that made R. E. Lee an artistic masterpiece. Not only did his admirers describe it in glowing terms, but even his bitterest critic, Professor T. Harry Williams, twenty years after its publication, wrote: "First in any listing of Freeman's virtues must be his literary style. Here was a historian who knew how to write. His pages are marked by grace, clarity, and eloquence."¹⁷

If Strachey's sketches in Eminent Victorians are best described as exquisite ironic terra-cottas, Freeman's R. E. Lee is best described as a magnificent Gothic cathedral. Both works are masterpieces of artistic biography and, as such, deserve to be placed among the great biographies of all time. But there was also a deep moral purpose behind Strachey's brilliant but bitter sketches and Freeman's stately monumental narrative.

Although Strachey denied, in his famous preface, that he had any "ulterior intentions" in writing the book, his spiritual aims are obvious to any one who studies the man and his work.¹⁸

Strachey not only hated the Victorians because they produced fat tedious volumes of biography; he hated them because, he believed, their hypocrisy, self-seeking, and muddled-headed emotionalism were responsible for bringing on the First World War.¹⁹ He also believed that if he did not destroy them and their whole way of life they would destroy him and his own "lofty ideals." Therefore, his major moral aim in writing Eminent Victorians was the complete destruction of the Victorian way of life and its replacement by his own "idealistic world"--a world of "Voltairianism."²⁰

Freeman's moral purpose was, if we may judge his purpose by what he did, to prove the truth of the Robert E. Lee legend and by proving it true to glorify the whole Victorian way of life. At least, his aim was to prove the moral superiority of those Victorian traits of character of which Lee was the noblest symbol. Certainly among the major moral purposes of Freeman's efforts was the attempt to show in Lee's life "a triumph of character over catastrophe."²¹

In a word, Eminent Victorians was a work of disillusionment and hate, in which Strachey was out to destroy his four subjects;²² R. E. Lee was a work of admiration and love in which Freeman's ultimate purpose, if not his preconceived one, was to show the actual Lee greater than the heroic legendary Lee.²³

How could these contemporary writers use biography--the historical facts of the lives of Victorians--for the accomplishment of antithetical moral purposes? Strachey and Freeman achieved their purposes through selection.

In order to achieve his devastating purpose, Strachey had to choose suitable characters, characters with both heroic and ridiculous elements in their lives. He chose four eminent Victorians, each of whom, like General Gordon, was "a contradictory person--even a little off his head, perhaps, though a hero."²⁴ He gave all four the ice and acid treatment. He employed his famous ironic method with "an adroit mingling of contempt and comedy," and throughout the work he assumed a false air of scientific objectivity.²⁵

Having marked the Victorian Age for destruction and having selected the method and the human "specimen" to be used in its accomplishment, Strachey proceeded to dip out and use those "little buckets" of materials which fitted his narrow design; that is, material which revealed the ridiculous or evil side of his subjects. And Strachey, as one of his admirers recently wrote, "had a remarkable quickness in discovering the ridiculous and pouncing upon it."²⁶

There are many descriptions of what Strachey did in order to turn his readers against the Victorians. The following is one of the most recent and one of the most vivid:

From the moment we begin the preface, with its deadly pianissimo opening--"Ignorance is the first requisite of the historian"--Strachey's brilliant softening up method begins to work on us. Stunned by epigrams, punch-drunk with the dazzling lethal impudence of the four portraits, we stagger through round after round of the ironic imagination--depreciating, sarcastic, erudite, farcical, mock-sententious--until finally in the last sentence of the book comes that magnificent knock out foul blow.²⁷

Edgar Johnson had the feeling that Strachey's sketches "are not portrayal, but persecution" and that his facts were "not fabricated, but manipulated."²⁸

Strachey manipulated his facts to suggest the utter futility of the Christian, the philanthropic, the educational, and the patriotic efforts of the Victorians. The manipulation process is carried on throughout the book, but the most "instructive" examples of it are found in the concluding passages of "Cardinal Manning" and "The End of General Gordon."

Here are the final sentences of "Cardinal Manning":

The Cardinal's memory is a dim thing to-day. And he who descends into the crypt of the Cathedral which Manning never lived to see, will observe, in the quiet niche with the sepulchral monument, that the dust lies thick on the strange, the incongruous, the almost impossible object which, with its elaborations of dependent tassels, hangs down from the dim vault like some forlorn and forgotten trophy--the Hat.²⁹

The last glimpse of Gordon suggests the same futility as does his last reference to Manning, with the added element of horror. After Gordon had

been killed and his head taken to his mortal enemy, the Mahdi, Strachey gives the reader a last glimpse of the face of one of England's heroes. "The trophy was taken to the Mahdi: at last the two fanatics had indeed met face to face. The Mahdi ordered the head to be fixed between the branches of a tree in the public highway, and all who passed threw stones at it. The hawks of the desert swept and circled about it. . . ."30

Thus, as Strachey appraised their influence, manipulating his facts to suggest this to his readers, Manning left nothing for the inspiration and guidance of future generations except a dust-covered trophy, the Hat; and Gordon left nothing but a blood-covered trophy, his head.

Freeman was as skillful in defense of the Victorians as Strachey was in their prosecution, and he was more industrious. Since R. E. Lee was a biography of almost "unchallengeable completeness,"³¹ Freeman did not practice Strachey's method of rigid selection. Nevertheless, it is through selection and presentation that he too achieves his aims. To begin with, he selected Lee because he admired him. He employed selection of material to justify Lee's action as a soldier and he certainly employed selection to enhance his character.³²

Freeman did not ignore damaging evidence against the man he so much admired. He simply used the undamaging evidence which he discovered to bury the mole hill of Lee's faults under a mountain of his virtues. Dumas Malone suggests how Freeman created his desired effects:

From this carefully wrought and slowly-moving story Lee emerges in full glory. This is not to say that he was impeccable in judgment; Freeman describes his mistakes with complete candor at the time he made them and sums them up in a final critique--the chapter entitled "The Sword of Robert E. Lee." Also he underlines the General's chief temperamental flaw, his excessive amiability at times in dealing with his commanders. But the balance is heavily on the credit side. . . .³³

Freeman, like Strachey, used the last passage in the work to bring home a message. After giving, in the last chapter of Volume IV, "The Pattern of Life," the deeds and principles which had shaped the life of this great Christian soldier, Freeman closed his monumental biography with this:

And if one, only one of all the myriad incidents of his stirring life had to be selected to typify his message, as a man, to the young Americans who stood in hushed awe that rainy October morning as their parents wept at the passing of the Southern Arthur, who would hesitate in selecting that incident? It occurred in Northern Virginia, probably on his last visit there. A young mother brought her baby to him to be blessed. He took the infant in his arms and looked at it and

then at her and slowly said, "Teach him he must deny himself."

That is all. There is no mystery in the coffin there in front of the windows that look to the sunrise.³⁴

In contrast to the message of utter futility which Strachey has Manning and Gordon leave for future generations, Freeman has Lee leave for "young Americans" and "their parents" as guidance in this world, a pattern of life as pure and as noble as that of King Arthur. And also the lesson, at least the suggestion, that high aspirations and noble efforts did not end in the tomb; for after death, there is the resurrection.

Thus in brief is a review of the wholly different works which we, in the beginning, assumed were symbolic of the richness and the confusion of modern biography. Let us now examine the effects of the two works on modern biography and life, their standing today, and their possible influence on future biography.

Eminent Victorians was in 1918 a revolutionary work, and its publication precipitated a violent and prolonged literary war--a war which raged in violent form throughout the twenties and early thirties and has not yet altogether ended.³⁵ Admirers gave extravagant praise to the book, declaring among many other things that with its publication "Lytton Strachey... captured biography for art" and in so doing destroyed the superficial and pretentious Victorian morality.³⁶ But detractors violently attacked Strachey and his work. Strachey was condemned for his lack of patriotism, his lack of sympathy, his anti-Catholic point of view, his bitterness, his inaccuracies, and his narrowness. He was called among many other things "the Nietzsche among biographers," "an evil old Bloomsbury gossip," and "the subtilist beast in England." The influence of the book was declared by some to be wholly bad.³⁷

Actually, Strachey's influence has been both beneficial and pernicious. It has been beneficial because, with the publication of Eminent Victorians, he destroyed the sacchrine Victorian panegyric which was neither art nor history; he succeeded in making biography more interesting, more artistic, more popular, and, in the long run, more truthful.³⁸ For example, there is considerable circumstantial evidence to show that R. E. Lee is a greater work because of Eminent Victorians.³⁹ On the other hand, Strachey inspired a host of incompetent imitators, who within a decade turned the "new" movement into a "Freudian frolic" of general debunkery and over-emphasis on sex.⁴⁰

R. E. Lee, as already noted, was also a literary sensation; it too made the best-seller lists.⁴¹ It has been more lavishly and more universally praised than any other biography of modern times. Henry Steel Commager voiced the opinions of many others when he called it "one of the great biographies of our literature."⁴²

But Freeman too had his detractors. He was criticized for his over-zealous attention to detail, for his dullness, for his pro-Southern sentiments and worshipful attitude toward Lee, for his lack of interpretation, for his ignorance of war activities outside the Virginia theatre, and for his errors of judgment, especially regarding military affairs.⁴³

Although Freeman did not have a flock of week-end biographers rushing to the publishing houses will ill-concealed imitations, as Strachey did--R. E. Lee is not as easy to imitate as "Cardinal Manning"--the influence of the work was more profound and lasting. Freeman's work influenced not only the new scholarly biographers, but it profoundly influenced some of Strachey's erstwhile ardent admirers, the most famous of these being Andre Maurois.⁴⁴

The author of R. E. Lee restored respectability to biography and did much to stop the wholesale debunking of heroes. He achieved this by doing two things: First, in this work, Freeman demonstrated that a "monumental biography" of "scrupulous narration," though it ran to twice two "fat volumes," could also be art of the highest order. Second, in that difficult field of moral didacticism in biography, he demonstrated that all our heroes do not necessarily drop from their pedestals and break their feet of clay the moment the historian reveals the true facts of their lives. Freeman proved that Lee's feet were not made of clay and that the moral ground upon which he stood was firm. Indeed, he proved that the real flesh and blood Lee was greater than the legendary hero of the South.

As for the relative greatness of Eminent Victorians and R. E. Lee, if we may accept the opinion of a panel of literary judges, one is not greater than the other. They are different, representing different methods of revealing truth--truth as diverse as human nature, as varied as the hearts and minds of authors.

Today their positions still stand in bold contrast. What was said of Freeman a few years ago seems still to be true: "Long before his life ended, Douglas Freeman had become a name and a legend. He sat in Richmond surrounded by a vast admiration without parallel in modern historiography."⁴⁵ The admiration for Strachey is not vast; but among "discerning readers," who love "art and beauty" and the liberal humanistic tradition" it is strong, deep and lasting.⁴⁶ What will be the place of Strachey and Freeman in the future of biography?

As long as the art of biography shall endure--and John Garraty recently predicted that biography would outlast "the seven hills of Rome"⁴⁷--it will always stand in need of both Stracheys and Freemans. If biography continues its rhythmical course, its ebbing and flowing with changing times, the future roles of such men seem clear. Whenever the art of biography falls, as it did in the years around 1918, upon evil days--smothered by piousness, hypocrisy, sweetness, and large quantities of ill-digested materials--a Lytton Strachey will be needed to step into the biographical house, puncture

pomposity with the "hygiene of laughter," cast out those articles of "funereal barbarism," and fumigate the place with his acid wit. Likewise, when the ignorant, incompetent, lazy and dishonest disciples of a future Strachey fill the house with their own abnormal heroes and their own literary and moral rubbish, a Douglas Southall Freeman will again be needed to write "noble books about noble men" and to overwhelm the false biography with truth and a larger art.⁴⁸

Auburn University

Footnotes:

¹ There were published in America during the years 1920-39, 11,382 biographies. The Publishers' Weekly: The American Book Trade Journal, cxxxix (January 18, 1941), 232. Since 1939, there have been published approximately 13,000 biographies. This estimate was made from information in ibid., cxli (January 3, 1942), 66 ff., clxxvii (January 18, 1960), 74, passim.

² Allan Nevins, "How Shall One Write a Man's Life?" New York Times Book Review (July 15, 1951); Dumas Malone, "Biography and History," The Interpretation of History, Joseph R. Strayer, ed. (Princeton, 1943), 145-48; and Thomas Seccombe, "The Reading of Biography," The Living Age, ccc (February 19, 1919), 435. Seccombe made his statement about the maze of biography at the very beginning of the period, but almost forty years later John A. Garraty, still found biographers in a maze, at least, as to the theories and practices of writing it. Garraty, "How to Write a Biography," The South Atlantic Quarterly, lv (January, 1956), 73-86.

³ Garraty, "How to Write a Biography," 73-86; and The Nature of Biography (New York, 1957), 121-52. See also Dana Kinsman Merrill, American Biography: Its Theory and Practice (Portland, Maine: The Bowker Press, 1957), 205-47.

⁴ For an explanation of why these dates were selected as marking the beginning and ending of these eras, see Robert Partin, "Biography as an Instrument of Moral Instruction," American Quarterly, viii (Winter, 1956), 303-5, 309.

⁵ Eminent Victorians (New York, 1918); R. E. Lee: A Biography (4 vols.; New York, 1934-35).

⁶ Strachey, v-vii.

⁷ Ibid., v.

⁸ Ibid., vii.

⁹ Leonard Bacon, "An Eminent Post-Victorian," Yale Review, xxx (December, 1940), 321-22; George Dangerfield, "Lytton Strachey," The Saturday Review of Literature, xviii (July 23, 1938), 3; and Charles Rich-

ard Sanders, "Lytton Strachey's 'Point of View,'" PMLA, lxxviii (March, 1953), 84.

¹⁰ Edgar Johnson, A Treasury of Biography (New York, 1941), 452.

¹¹ The Dictionary of National Biography, 1931-1940 (London, 1949), 836; Johnson, 452.

¹² Andre Maurois, Aspects of Biography, tr. by Sidney Castle Roberts (New York, 1929), 18.

¹³ For a fuller expression of Strachey's attitude toward history and historians, see Strachey, Portraits in Miniature and Other Essays (New York, 1931), 139-214, passim.

¹⁴ Even a casual examination of R. E. Lee will reveal the exhaustive nature of Freeman's methods. For brief explanations of certain aspects of Freeman's historical methods, see the Foreword in volume one of R. E. Lee; the Introduction in volume one of George Washington; Dumas Malone, "The Pen of Douglas Southall Freeman," and Mary Wells Ashworth, "Prefatory Note" in volume six of George Washington.

¹⁵ Henry Steel Commager, "New Books in Review: The Life of Lee," Yale Review, xxiv (Spring, 1935), 597.

¹⁶ For Freeman's explanation of the use of the practice, see R. E. Lee, I, ix; for a criticism of its use, see T. Harry Williams, "Freeman, Historian of the Civil War: An Appraisal," The Journal of Southern History, xxi (February, 1955), 91-100; for a criticism of Williams' criticism, see Joseph H. Harrison, Jr., "Harry Williams, Critic of Freeman: A Demurrer," The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, lxiv, 1 (January, 1956), 70-7.

¹⁷ Williams, "Freeman, Historian of the Civil War," 92.

¹⁸ For a brief explanation of the inconsistencies between Strachey's avowed objectivity and his obvious subjectivity, see Partin, "Biography as an Instrument of Moral Instruction," 305-6.

¹⁹ Johnson, p. 451; Harold Nicolson, The Development of English Biography (London, 1928), 149-50.

²⁰ Sanders, "Lytton Strachey's 'Point of View,'" 94.

²¹ Freeman, George Washington, I, xv, xxvi.

²² For an explanation of how Strachey achieved his purpose, see John Raymond, "Books in General, Reassessments: Strachey's Eminent Victorians," The New Statesman and Nation, xlix (April 16, 1956), 545-46.

²³ For a criticism of Freeman's "too worshipful" attitude toward Lee, see Williams, "Freeman, Historian of the Civil War," 96-7.

²⁴ Strachey, 350.

²⁵ Johnson, 451-54.

²⁶ Sanders, "Lytton Strachey's 'Point of View,'" 91.

²⁷ Raymond, "Books in General, Reassessments: Strachey's Eminent Victorians," 545.

²⁸ Johnson, 453.

- 29 Strachey, 130.
- 30 Ibid., 347-8.
- 31 Malone, "The Pen of Douglas Southall Freeman," xx.
- 32 Freeman, I, ix.
- 33 Malone, "The Pen of Douglas Southall Freeman," xx.
- 34 Freeman, IV, 505.
- 35 For a discussion of biography since 1918, see Garraty, Nature of Biography, 121-52; and for a list of sources covering the same period, see ibid., 273-79.
- 36 Marston Balch, Modern Short Biographies (New York, 1936), 42; William York Tindall, Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1946 (New York, 1947), 129; Edmund Wilson, The Shores of Light: A Literary Chronicle of the Twenties and Thirties (New York, 1952), 551; and Nicholson, 149-50.
- 37 Editorial in Literature and Art Section, "Is there a Menace of Literary Prussianism? Further Protest Against the 'Spirit of Sheer Brutality' Exhibited by Lytton Strachey," Current Opinion, lxxv (October, 1918), 253; Bacon, "An Eminent Post-Victorian," 319; and F. L. Lucas, "Persons and Personages," Living Age, cccxlii (March, 1942), 38.
- 38 For a rather full but sympathetic treatment of Strachey's influence, see Sanders, Lytton Strachey, 337-54.
- 39 Freeman was evidently well acquainted with the "new" biography which, in his opinion, was "already becoming conventionalized." R. E. Lee, I, ix. To this writer, Chapter one of Volume I reads like "new" biography, especially the opening paragraphs; and, likewise, the closing paragraphs of Volume IV, in spite of the totally different message, suggest the closing paragraphs of "Cardinal Manning" and "The End of General Gordon."
- 40 For an excellent discussion of the extent of this degeneracy, see Ernest Boyd, "Sex in Biography," Harpers Magazine, clxv (November, 1932), 752-59.
- 41 Malone, "Biography and History," 140.
- 42 Commager, "New Books in Review: The Life of Lee," 594.
- 43 For an early criticism of Freeman, see Liddell Hart, "Why Lee Lost Gettysburg," The Saturday Review of Literature, xi (March 23, 1935), 561-70. For a recent criticism of Freeman, see Williams, "Freeman, Historian of the Civil War: An Appraisal," 91-100.
- 44 For Maurois' changed attitude, see Maurois, "To Make a Man Come Alive Again," New York Times Book Review, December 27, 1953, 1.
- 45 Williams, "Freeman, Historian of the Civil War: An Appraisal," 91.
- 46 Sanders, Lytton Strachey, 352-53.
- 47 Garraty, Nature of Biography, 259.
- 48 For suggestions of their places in the future, see Sanders, Lytton Strachey, 352-53; and Malone, "The Pen of Douglas Southall Freeman," xxxi.