

Twentieth-Century Literary Theory

70
VKM

A READER

EDITED AND INTRODUCED

BY K. M. NEWTON

M
MACMILLAN
EDUCATION

Twentieth-Century Literary Theory

70
VKM

A READER

EDITED AND INTRODUCED

BY K. M. NEWTON

1984
1983
1982
1981
1980
1979
1978
1977

M
MACMILLAN
EDUCATION

© Introduction and Notes 1988
K. M. Newton

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No paragraph of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright Act 1956 (as amended), or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, 33-4 Alfred Place, London, WC1E 7DP.

Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

First published 1988

Published by
MACMILLAN EDUCATION LTD
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 2XS
and London
Companies and representatives
throughout the world

Typeset by
Wessex Typesetters
(Division of The Eastern Press Ltd)
Frome, Somerset

Printed in Hong Kong

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Twentieth-century literary theory: a reader.

1. Literature—Philosophy—History
—20th century

I. Newton, K.M.

801 PN45

ISBN 0-333-43463-3

ISBN 0-333-43464-1 Pbk

M
MACMILLAN
EDUCATION

1671CHA

*Twentieth-Century
Literary Theory*

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements 8

Introduction 11

SECTION I RUSSIAN FORMALISM TO FRENCH STRUCTURALISM

- 1 *Russian Formalism and Prague Structuralism* 21
 - Victor Shklovsky: 'Art as Technique' 23
 - Roman Jakobson: 'The Dominant' 26
 - P. N. Medvedev/M. M. Bakhtin: 'The Object, Tasks,
and Methods of Literary History' 30
 - Jan Mukařovský: 'Aesthetic Function, Norm, and
Value as Social Facts' 35
- 2 *The New Criticism* 39
 - I. A. Richards: 'Poetry and Beliefs' 40
 - Cleanth Brooks: 'The Formalist Critic' 45
 - Kenneth Burke: 'Formalist Criticism: Its Principles
and Limits' 49
 - John M. Ellis: 'The Relevant Context of a Literary
Text' 53
- 3 *Chicago Aristotelianism* 57
 - R. S. Crane: 'Criticism as Inquiry; or, The Perils of
the "High Priori Road"' 58
 - Wayne C. Booth: 'Emotions, Beliefs, and the Reader's
Objectivity' 61
- 4 *Leavisite Criticism* 65
 - F. R. Leavis: 'Literary Criticism and Philosophy' 66
 - John Casey: 'Object, Feeling and Judgement: F. R.
Leavis' 69
- 5 *Phenomenological Criticism* 74
 - Roman Ingarden: 'Some Epistemological Problems
in the Cognition of the Aesthetic Concretization
of the Literary Work of Art' 76

6 CONTENTS

	Georges Poulet: 'The Self and Other in Critical Consciousness'	80
6	<i>Marxist Criticism</i>	85
	Christopher Caudwell: 'English Poets: The Decline of Capitalism'	86
	Georg Lukács: 'Critical Realism and Socialist Realism'	89
	Walter Benjamin: 'The Author as Producer'	93
7	<i>Archetypal Criticism</i>	98
	Northrop Frye: 'Archetypal Criticism: Theory of Myths'	99
8	<i>Hermeneutics</i>	103
	Hans-Georg Gadamer: 'Language as Determination of the Hermeneutic Object'	105
	E. D. Hirsch, Jr: 'Three Dimensions of Hermeneutics'	109
	P. D. Juhl: 'The Appeal to the Text: What Are We Appealing to?'	114
9	<i>Linguistic Criticism</i>	118
	Roman Jakobson: 'Linguistics and Poetics'	119
	Roger Fowler: 'Literature as Discourse'	125
10	<i>French Structuralism</i>	131
	Tzvetan Todorov: 'Definition of Poetics'	132
	Gérard Genette: 'Structuralism and Literary Criticism'	135
	Roland Barthes: 'Science versus Literature'	140

SECTION II POST-STRUCTURALISM AND AFTER

11	<i>Post-Structuralism</i>	147
	Jacques Derrida: 'Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences'	149
	Roland Barthes: 'The Death of the Author'	154
	Paul de Man: 'The Resistance to Theory'	158
	Edward W. Said: 'The Problem of Textuality: Two Exemplary Positions'	165

12	<i>Semiotics</i>	171
	Jonathan Culler: 'Semiotics as a Theory of Reading'	172
	Yury M. Lotman: 'The Content and Structure of the Concept of "Literature"'	176
	Julia Kristeva: 'The System and the Speaking Subject'	180
	Morse Peckham: 'The Problem of Interpretation'	185
13	<i>Negative Hermeneutics</i>	192
	Paul Ricoeur: 'The Conflict of Interpretations'	193
	William V. Spanos: 'Breaking the Circle: Hermeneutics as Dis-closure'	196
14	<i>Psychoanalytic Criticism</i>	203
	Norman N. Holland: 'Reading and Identity: A Psychoanalytic Revolution'	204
	Harold Bloom: 'Poetry, Revisionism, and Repression'	209
	Shoshana Felman: 'The Madness of Interpretation: Literature and Psychoanalysis'	213
15	<i>Reception Theory and Reader-Response Criticism</i>	219
	Hans Robert Jauss: 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory'	221
	Wolfgang Iser: 'Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response'	226
	David Bleich: 'The Subjective Character of Critical Interpretation'	231
	Stanley Fish: 'Interpreting the <i>Variorum</i> '	235
16	<i>Post-Althusserian Marxism</i>	241
	Raymond Williams: 'Dominant, Residual, and Emergent'	242
	Terry Eagleton: 'Towards a Science of the Text'	247
	Rosalind Coward and John Ellis: ' <i>S/Z</i> '	252
	Fredric Jameson: 'On Interpretation: Literature as a Socially Symbolic Act'	257
17	<i>Feminist Criticism</i>	263
	Josephine Donovan: 'Beyond the Net: Feminist Criticism as a Moral Criticism'	264
	Elaine Showalter: 'Towards a Feminist Poetics'	268
	Elizabeth A. Meese: 'Sexual Politics and Critical Judgment'	272
	<i>Index</i>	278

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editor and publishers are grateful for permission to reproduce the following copyright material: Roland Barthes, extracts from *Image-Music-Text* (1977), by permission of Collins Publishers and Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc.; Roland Barthes, extracts from 'Science versus Literature', *The Times Literary Supplement*, 28 September 1967, by permission of Times Newspapers Ltd; Walter Benjamin, extracts from *Understanding Brecht* (1973), by permission of Verso/NLB; David Bleich, extracts from 'The Subjective Character of Critical Interpretation', *College English*, 36 (1975), by permission of the National Council of Teachers of English and the author; Harold Bloom, extracts from *Poetry and Repression* (1976), by permission of Yale University Press; Wayne C. Booth, extracts from *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961), by permission of University of Chicago Press and the author; Cleanth Brooks, extracts from 'The Formalist Critic', by permission of the *Kenyon Review* and the author; Kenneth Burke, extracts from *Language as Symbolic Action* (1973), by permission of University of California Press; John Casey, extracts from *The Language of Criticism* (1966) by permission of Associated Book Publishers (U.K.) Ltd (Methuen); Christopher Caudwell, extracts from *Illusion and Reality* (1946), by permission of Lawrence and Wishart Ltd; Rosalind Coward and John Ellis, extracts from *Language and Materialism* (1977), by permission of Associated Book Publishers (U.K.) Ltd (Routledge and Kegan Paul); R. S. Crane, extracts from *The Idea of the Humanities and Other Essays, Vol. 2* (1967) by permission of the University of Chicago Press; Jonathan Culler, extracts from *The Pursuit of Signs* (1981), by permission of Associated Book Publishers (U.K.) Ltd (Routledge and Kegan Paul) and Cornell University Press; Paul de Man, extracts from 'The Resistance to Theory', *Yale French Studies*, 63 (1982), by permission of the editor; Jacques Derrida, extracts from *The Structuralist Controversy* (1972), by permission of Johns Hopkins University Press; Josephine Donovan, extracts from 'Beyond the Net: Feminist Criticism as a Moral Criticism', *Denver Quarterly*, 17 (1983), by permission of the editor; Terry Eagleton, extracts from *Criticism and Ideology* (1976), by permission of Verso/NLB; John M. Ellis, extracts from *The Theory of Literary Criticism* (1974), by permission of University of California Press; Shoshana Felman, extracts from 'Turning the Screw of Interpretation', *Yale French*

Studies, 55/56 (1977), by permission of the editor and the author; Stanley Fish, extracts from 'Interpreting the *Variorum*', *Critical Inquiry*, 2 (1976), by permission of University of Chicago Press and the author; Roger Fowler, extracts from *Literature as Social Discourse* (1981), by permission of B. T. Batsford Ltd and Indiana University Press; Northrop Frye, extracts from *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957), by permission of Princeton University Press; Hans-Georg Gadamer, extracts from *Truth and Method*, trans. William Glen-Doepel; Gérard Genette, extracts from *Figures of Literary Discourse* (1982), by permission of Basil Blackwell and Columbia University Press; E. D. Hirsch, Jr, extracts from 'Three Dimensions of Hermeneutics', *New Literary History*, 3 (1971-2), by permission of Johns Hopkins University Press; Norman N. Holland, extracts from 'Reading and Identity: A Psychoanalytic Revolution', *Academy Forum (The American Academy of Psychoanalysis)*, 23 (1979), by permission of the author; Roman Ingarden, extracts from *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art* (1973), by permission of Northwestern University Press; Wolfgang Iser, extracts from *Aspects of Narrative* (1971), ed. J. H. Miller, by permission of Columbia University Press; Roman Jakobson, extracts from *Readings in Russian Poetics* (1978), eds L. Matejka and K. Pomorska, by permission of University of Michigan; Roman Jakobson, extracts from *Style in Language* (1960), ed. Thomas Sebeok, by permission of MIT Press; Fredric Jameson, extracts from *The Political Unconscious* (1981), by permission of Associated Book Publishers (U.K.) Ltd (Methuen) and Cornell University Press; Hans Robert Jauss, extracts from *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception* (1982), by permission of The Harvester Press Ltd and University of Minnesota Press; P. D. Juhl, extracts from *Interpretation* (1980), by permission of Princeton University Press; Julia Kristeva, extracts from 'The System and the Speaking Subject', *The Times Literary Supplement*, 12 October 1973, by permission of Times Newspapers Ltd; F. R. Leavis, extracts from *The Common Pursuit* (1962), by permission of Chatto and Windus; Georg Lukács, extracts from *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism* (1963), by permission of The Merlin Press Ltd and Humanities Press International, Inc.; Yury M. Lotman, extracts from 'The Context and Structure of the Concept of "Literature"', *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*, 1 (1976); P. N. Medvedev/M. M. Bakhtin, extracts from *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship* (1978), by permission of Johns Hopkins University Press; Elizabeth A. Meese, extracts from *After Strange Texts* (1985), eds Gregory S. Jay and David L. Miller, by permission of University of Alabama Press; Jan Mukařovský,

extracts from *Aesthetic Function, Norm, and Value as Social Facts* (1979), by permission of University of Michigan; Morse Peckham, extracts from 'The Problem of Interpretation', *College Literature*, 6 (1979), by permission of West Chester University and the author; Georges Poulet, extracts from 'The Self and Other in Critical Consciousness', *Diacritics*, 2 (1972), by permission of Johns Hopkins University Press; I. A. Richards, extracts from *Poetries and Sciences* (1970), by permission of Associated Book Publishers (U.K.) Ltd (Routledge and Kegan Paul); Paul Ricoeur, extracts from *Freud and Philosophy* (1970), by permission of Yale University Press; Edward W. Said, extracts from 'The Problem of Textuality: Two Exemplary Positions', *Critical Inquiry*, 4 (1978), by permission of University of Chicago Press and the author; Victor Shklovsky, extracts from *Russian Formalist Criticism* (1965), eds Lee Y. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, by permission of University of Nebraska Press; Elaine Showalter, extracts from *Women Writing and Women Writing about Women* (1979), ed. Mary Jacobus, by permission of Croom Helm Ltd and Barnes and Noble Books; William V. Spanos, extracts from 'Breaking the Circle: Hermeneutics as Disclosure', *Boundary 2*, 5 (1977), by permission of the author; Tzvetan Todorov, extracts from *Introduction to Poetics* (1981), by permission of The Harvester Press Ltd and University of Minnesota Press; Raymond Williams, extracts from *Marxism and Literature* (1977), by permission of Oxford University Press.

Every effort has been made to trace all the copyright-holders but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity.

The editor would also like to thank Mrs Moira Anthony for her help with typing, Stan Smith for some suggestions and Beverley Tarquini for her support of the project.

INTRODUCTION

No one concerned with recent developments in literary criticism can ignore the fact that there has been a great revival of interest in questions of theory. Probably the main reason for this has been the impact on literary criticism of structuralism and post-structuralism, which have presented a serious challenge both to conventional historically based criticism and to the Anglo-American New Critical tradition. Theoretical issues, apparently dormant for several decades, have been revitalised and new forms of critical approach in which practice and theory are intermingled, such as deconstruction, reception theory, reader-response criticism, feminism, various types of Marxist and psychoanalytic criticism, have emerged. There has been much talk of a 'crisis' in literary studies. At present there seems little likelihood of a new consensus developing out of division and conflict.

Clearly this situation presents those who are beginning to study literature with serious difficulties, and in order to make things easier for them a number of introductory studies, especially relating to more recent theory, have been published in an attempt to make theoretical issues more accessible to a general literary audience. Though several of these studies are extremely useful,¹ there is no substitute for reading the primary sources in which theorists make their own case. There have, however, been few collections of primary theoretical texts easily available to a general literary readership and those which exist have tended to focus on a particular area. This book attempts to cover a wide range of twentieth-century literary theory by reprinting texts which provide theoretical support for the various critical positions which have tended to dominate in this century, from Russian Formalism, which has a strong claim to be the basis of a more theoretical approach to literature, up to developments of the present day.

Theory is an area of constant debate and confrontation and to have an adequate understanding of it it is necessary to have knowledge not merely of the arguments central to one or two particular standpoints but also of alternative positions explicitly or implicitly in conflict with them. It is also not enough to represent the major theories with only one example for there is conflict and debate not only between different theories but within them. Thus as well as representing a considerable range of theoretical positions,

this book tries to show different aspects of or emphases within particular theories. Furthermore, I have tried to strike a balance between authors or particular texts that must be included in any representative collection of twentieth-century literary theory and work which will be less familiar and not easily available to a general literary audience but which is arguably equally important and interesting.

Though it has been necessary for me to edit all of the texts that I have selected in order to keep this book to a reasonable length, I have tried to approach this editorial task positively by attempting to preserve the structure of the argument of each text, albeit in an abbreviated form, and to present it as sharply and coherently as possible. My aim has been to reprint enough material to allow the reader to be persuaded by a particular argument or to find grounds for rejecting it. I hope, of course, that users of this volume will find certain of the selections of sufficient interest that they will take the trouble to read the complete essay, article, chapter or book from which the selections are drawn.

The book is divided into two sections: the major approaches from Russian Formalism up to and including French Structuralism, and post-structuralism and beyond. Having some knowledge of the wider context of twentieth-century theory is at the very least a considerable help and in some cases a necessity in understanding current theory. I have tried not only to provide representative examples of particular theoretical perspectives but also to choose texts which highlight the debate between perspectives and which show some of the differences within them. It is easy to ignore theories or critical approaches which may at the present time be unfashionable and I have tried to resist this temptation by including, for example, Chicago Aristotelianism and Leavisite criticism. An important difference between the two sections is that in the first section there are fairly clear-cut distinctions between different approaches, but in more recent theory represented in the second section such distinctions are less easy to draw. Theories have begun to fuse or to interact with each other. Thus certain theorists who have been placed on one category might easily have been placed in one or more other categories. The categories in the second section, therefore, should not be interpreted too rigidly.

It may be objected that a book such as this, which is primarily designed to introduce the range of twentieth-century theory to students of literature in higher education and to a non-specialist literary readership, could do more harm than good. Why does one need to burden the mind of students or readers of literature in

general with theoretical questions? Can it not be objected that theory merely confuses such readers and has little positive effect on reading? Indeed it has been argued that only mature critics should concern themselves with the theoretical implications of their activity and that readers at a less advanced stage should not be exposed to theory.² These objections need to be answered.

The first point to make is that theory is intrinsic to *any* form of reading, even the most naive, of a literary text. To be unconscious of or uninterested in theory does not mean that it is not present. With virtually all forms of non-literary discourse certain norms and constraints must govern how they are read if such discourses are to serve the interests and purposes that direct our reading. Thus though theoretical questions may be raised in relation to such discourses, theory must take second place to these interests and purposes. This is the case whether one is reading a cooking recipe, a newspaper article, a work of history or philosophy, or a scientific paper. But with literary discourse, there are no practical or logical necessities external to the discourse that determine how it must be read. Theory is therefore always primary in reading literary discourse, since whatever norms and constraints that govern how literary texts are read cannot be seen as an integral part of the discourse itself but are chosen from among various possibilities by the reader.

In discussions of different forms of discourse, terms such as 'historical' or 'philosophical' or 'scientific' suggest a range of attributes or characteristics associated with the particular discourse, but the term 'literary' – despite numerous efforts at definition which claim that all texts that have been categorised as 'literary' have at least one common attribute – is empty. It does not refer to qualities that texts have in common but to what appears to be a human need to have a body of texts that exists beyond the pragmatic boundaries within which our reading of other forms of discourse must take place. There is no practical necessity or intrinsic constraint that can stop one using a text that has been categorised as 'literary' for any purpose whatsoever. The category 'literature', therefore, in the narrower, evaluative sense refers to certain of the texts that have been placed in the category of the non-pragmatic which readers and critics over several generations have judged to be particularly effective in serving their various interests.

It follows from what I have said that there could be as many theories of literature as there are readers. Obviously this is not the case. Indeed literary critical discourse exhibits a high degree of

order and coherence, and it is perhaps only recently that this has been partially undermined, and many would lay the blame for this on the current situation which has appeared to encourage a proliferation of theories. But even in the present situation there is no sign of complete relativism. Those who utter warnings of 'chaos' or 'anarchy' are employing rhetoric designed either to publicise their dislike of changes that are taking place within the literary community or to destabilise literary study for certain political purposes. A more interesting consideration is why there is so much order within literary study when literary discourse does not demand that there be any.

Since there are no pragmatic considerations that demand that certain norms and constraints must govern our reading of literary texts, the norms and constraints that do in fact govern our reading of them must have been chosen by us, even if we may not be aware of having made a choice. The reason, then, that literary criticism is comparatively ordered when there would appear to be no intrinsic need for it to be so is that most readers make the same kind of choice from the various options which they perceive to be available. Why so many different theoretical approaches to literature should have emerged in the twentieth century and why readers choose to support one rather than another are interesting questions. This is not the place to try to answer these questions in detail but clearly literary theory cannot be seen in isolation from the political and ideological conflicts which have been such a prominent feature of the twentieth century. Choices about reading, especially in relation to texts which exist beyond the pragmatic limits which govern our reading of other forms of discourse, cannot be ideologically neutral, and the reader may care to bear that in mind in reading the work of the various theorists included in this book.

Before twentieth-century developments in literary criticism the great majority of readers chose to relate literary texts to their historical context and to the intentions of their authors, and this approach still commands great support. But many twentieth-century readers, in contrast, choose to pay little or no attention to historical context or authorial intention and allow modern modes of thought, such as psychoanalytic or feminist theory, to govern how they read literary texts. Such readers would argue that the most important consideration in literary study is the text's relation to the concerns of a modern audience. There is also no limit to the number of interests that readers can choose to bring to bear on their reading of literary texts, the most common being aesthetic,

historical, linguistic, sociological, biographical, philosophical, psychological, political or combinations of these.

It is important to stress, however, that one cannot do anything other than make a choice. Though there are no intrinsic norms and constraints that determine how we must read literary texts, as soon as we begin to read the text norms and constraints of some sort will come into operation since the very activity of reading cannot take place without them. It is inevitable that readers will make the same kind of choices so that one finds readers and critics forming into groups or, as Stanley Fish calls them, 'interpretive communities'. It is conceivable that an individual may develop an entirely idiosyncratic way of reading literary texts that does not conform to any community of readers that exists or has existed. Markers of certain student essays might find this idea persuasive. But, of course, it is inevitable that the vast majority of readers will adopt the norms and constraints that govern the theories which are dominant in the culture at any particular time.

One of the most important arguments in favour of literary theory, therefore, is that since the norms and constraints are not intrinsic but chosen for particular reasons there is no justification for ignoring their existence as there might be in reading non-literary forms of discourse, even if this may result, as René Wellek has warned,³ in the minds of young students being unsettled. It would be bad faith to conceal the fact, even from young students, that no norms or constraints are integral to literary discourse and therefore privileged. Certain norms will, of course, be dominant and there may be justification for stressing their advantages and the dangers of discarding them but there can be no justification for claiming that these norms are intrinsic to the very existence of literary discourse.

An obvious implication of this is that once one knows that the norms and constraints that govern one's reading of literary texts have been chosen, then one may choose to change them. Though some may see such a possibility as a recipe for total relativism, the fact that any change cannot lead to norms being discarded altogether but only to the adoption of a different set of norms suggests that such fears are groundless. Indeed, it may have a positive benefit in that certain readers who have been operating with norms which are alien to their temperament or ideology or world-view may be able to choose a set of norms that they find much more congenial. This book thus has a double purpose: to make readers more aware of the norms and constraints which

govern their existing critical approach and to be able to defend it against alternative approaches, and by comparing their present set of norms and interpretative strategies against alternatives to be in a position to adopt a different approach should they find one that is more persuasive.

It would be inaccurate, however, to assert that the current situation of a 'proliferation of theories' has had no fundamental impact on literary criticism. One of the drawbacks of Stanley Fish's notion of 'interpretive communities' is that it implies that once readers of literary texts have chosen, consciously or not, their community there is little point in arguing with those who belong to different communities since it is not as if one community is right and all the others wrong. The very word 'community' suggests that one is part of a self-supporting group and that one need bother little with other communities. Yet one cannot but be struck by the constant debate and controversy that takes place in literary studies. Readers of literary texts do not seem content to adopt 'a live and let live' philosophy. This suggests that the 'communities' analogy needs to be discarded for a more adequate one.

The reason that there is so much controversy and debate in literary studies, I would argue, is that critics and readers feel they belong to a single community, even though they may have made quite different choices as to how they read literary texts. The very fact that they have had to make such a choice links them together with other readers and interpreters of texts. But since they could have chosen differently this will inevitably create the need to justify the choice they have made and encourage the desire to persuade others both that this choice is the right one and that other choices are mistaken. Literary criticism is in consequence an area of perpetual debate. Even though it is impossible for this debate ever to be resolved finally, the attempt to justify the position one has chosen and to defend it with rational argument against alternative positions is necessary if literary study is to remain vital. Controversy and debate are not, therefore, signs of crisis or destabilisation but signs of health and vigour. Ultimately literary criticism is about politics and power, and a sign of crisis is more likely to be a situation in which debate and rational argument are stifled than one in which they are conducted vigorously.

Perhaps the analogy, therefore, that best describes the current situation of literary criticism is not that it is made up of a number of separate 'communities' but, rather, that it is like a parliament. Before the recent explosion in literary theory, that parliament in the English-speaking world resembled one in which two parties