

 Blackwell
Publishing

LITERARY THEORY

A Reintroduction

DAVID AYERS



Literary Theory: A Reintroduction

David Ayers



© 2008 by David Ayers

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

The right of David Ayers to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks, or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

First published 2008 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

1 2008

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ayers, David, 1960–

Literary theory : a reintroduction / David Ayers.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 978-1-4051-3601-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)—ISBN 978-1-4051-3602-0 (hardcover : alk. paper) 1. English literature—History and criticism—Theory, etc. 2. Literature—History and criticism—Theory, etc. 3. American literature—History and criticism—Theory, etc. 4. Politics and literature—English-speaking countries. 5. Criticism—English-speaking countries. I. Title.

PR21.A94 2008
820.9—dc22

2007015776

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10/12.5pt Galliard
by Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong
Printed and bound in Singapore
by Markono Print Media Pte Ltd

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website at
www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: English as a University Subject	4
Chapter 2: The New Criticism and Beyond	28
Chapter 3: Reconfiguring English Studies	55
Chapter 4: The Politics of Theory	80
Chapter 5: From Work to Text	104
Chapter 6: Enlightenment and Modernity	139
Chapter 7: PC Wars	163
Chapter 8: Ethics	183
Notes	210
Selected Bibliography	225
Index	238

Introduction

This study is a reintroduction to literary theory which has the aim of setting the arrival of ‘theory’ in the 1970s in a social and historical context. There is a lot of society and history that could have been brought in and I have been necessarily selective! Above all events, it is the Russian Revolution which stands over the creation of modern English studies, and developments in theory have always been defined in relation, however mediated, to the major events of decolonization, civil rights, women’s liberation, strikes and wars, cold or otherwise. I interpret ‘literary theory’ very broadly, to include theories affecting the institutionalization of literary studies, and occasionally to allude to theoretical developments which lie outside the frame of the official university altogether. By way of reintroducing literary theory, I have gone back to Leavis (and to Arnold), and come up through I. A. Richards, John Crowe Ransom, Raymond Williams and others to the arrival of theory proper in the 1960s. These earlier phases of literary theory were often treated dismissively by the ‘theory’ of the 1970s, and are sometimes excluded from anthologies of theory, although they have all been the subject of important though mostly hostile critical study. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 effect this reintroduction, and I have given this period a relatively full exposition. Chapters 4 and 5 deal with the arrival of ‘high theory’ in what I have called the ‘moment of theory’ of the 1960s and 1970s. The usual names are here, mostly French – Louis Althusser, Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida – but I shift focus from these theorists to the process of their reception and adaptation to British and American contexts. Chapter 6 charts the growing interest in anti-Enlightenment thought which culminates in the dominance of Foucault in the 1980s and the florescence of postmodernism. Chapter 7 is an interlude which examines the PC Wars in the United

States, a moment of intense interest for the unprecedented attack, orchestrated at the highest level, on university culture. Under the rubric of 'Ethics' in Chapter 8 I suggest that in a complicated fashion the ethical priority in literary theory has shifted to the United States, via a positionally ambiguous 'postcolonial' detour, which I discuss in relation to queer theory and ethnic studies. These developments of the 1990s are not so vulnerable that they cannot handle a little critique, and, while asserting the ethical centrality of these branches of theory, I have taken the opportunity to identify a few distortions. Finally, I present a short discussion of the nature of literature as seen by Alain Badiou, and ask whether the functionalist mode of literary theory from Arnold to Vizenor requires correction or supplementation by a return to literature 'as such', as some have started now openly to wonder.

One consequence of my approach is that elements of theory not originating in the United States or Britain are discussed in terms of the moment and context of their adoption. This means, for example, that Ferdinand de Saussure, whose influential *Course in General Linguistics* was published in 1916, is discussed not in Chapter 1, as simple chronology would appear to demand, but in Chapter 4, in the context of a discussion of the Anglo-American reception of French structuralist poetics in the 1970s. Although this structure may seem counter-intuitive, I have been keen to stress the moment of adoption of Saussure's work over its meaning for and in its original context, not least since it is evident that the later reception of Saussure's work, outside and even inside the context of linguistic study, has involved significant misprisions. These have been unpacked at length by Saussure scholars keen to rescue the original Saussure from what they consider to be the tainted contexts of anthropology and semiology which I describe here.¹

I am very aware of gaps in this study and have resisted the temptation to pile in too many names and references for the sake of completeness. I have discussed theory in both Britain and the United States, even though it would have been difficult in one volume to present either nation comprehensively. However, I feel that the difference between Britain and the United States is important for theory, although it is only occasionally acknowledged. Finally, I am aware that important figures are presented through selected key works, with the effect that changes in their thinking are not reflected in my accounts. This is because I am trying to give an account of certain moments in the development of theory, not of the whole careers of theorists.

Part of Chapter 1 condenses arguments and material which I have presented at length in 'Literary Criticism and Cultural Politics', in Laura

Marcus and Peter Nicholls, eds., *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century English Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 379–95), and is reprinted with permission. A short section in Chapter 3 is drawn from a longer exposition in ‘Materialism and the Book’ published in *Poetics Today* 24: 4 (2004).

I would like to thank the School of English at the University of Kent for understanding treatment in respect of study leave. My present and former colleagues at Kent have always provided an environment of the highest calibre, and I have had many useful conversations in corridors and seminar rooms which have contributed to this study. For their particular help, I would like to thank David Stirrup for his guidance on Native American matters; Henry Claridge for help in tracking down 1930s texts; my former colleague Thomas Docherty for sharing his extensive knowledge of all matters French; Rod Edmond for innumerable useful exchanges. Thanks to my editors and readers at Blackwell for their impressive efficiency. Special thanks for all her support to Margaret. Finally I would like to recall a memorable conversation about beauty and form which I had with our late, talented and much missed colleague, Sasha Roberts.

Chapter 1

English as a University Subject

Literature has always been an object of study. It is necessary to study literature and reflect on its processes in order to create it in the first place. The process of reflection on literature might be silently incorporated into the practice of creating it, or it might be formed into an explicit, extra-literary discourse designed to accompany literature, be set alongside it, in order to clarify and explain, or perhaps mask and appropriate literature or literary objects. Indeed, as an art of words, literature can include explicit verbalized theory within itself, modifying if not entirely upsetting the apparent opposition of literature as a concrete actuality and theory as the discourse which comments on that actuality – Hamlet’s remarks to the Player are among the most famous examples, and the tradition goes back to Homer. These simple facts are worth keeping before us as we review the recent history of theory, since they remind us that any human practice is always implicitly theoretical, and that any theory is unavoidably involved in some kind of practice. Some commentators will proceed from this simple insight to question the ability of theory (discourse, language, the idea) to transcend physical and social realities, and will stress that all forms of organized language which make theoretical claims are reflective of social interests, ‘discourses’ which silently embody coercive institutional imperatives. Since this position is one of the common stances of contemporary theory, it cannot be the stance of a study, even a survey such as this, which aims to bring into view recent practices of theory on terms other than their own. However, for the purpose of this study it is desirable to qualify the use of the notion of ‘literary theory’ by specifying that ‘theory’ is not exclusively located in the key theoretical documents of official literary theory, but is found too in practices of literary criticism and commentary, and may

be silently embodied in literary works, in the practice of their creation, distribution and reception, and – if we are to assume any relationship between ‘literature’ and ‘life’ at all – theory as discourse and as practice will reveal itself to belong in large part to the cultural, social and political discourses, institutions and practices of which it is part.

This study will focus on the last 100 years or so, and will predominantly examine theory as an element of the University study of English. That said, the notion of theory should not be limited to the University, not only because the study or reading of literature at a high level is not exclusively the domain of the University, but also because ‘theory’ is a key term in the University’s appropriation of literature for and as literary studies. In this respect, literary studies themselves form part of a complex system of cultural capital in which the legitimacy of literature and of the various modalities of its pedagogic propagation are intimately tied to the labour market: a degree in English is a qualification with the potential to confer status and economic opportunity. The theory of literary studies is part of this system of legitimation, although literary study itself has mostly attempted to suppress this connection, and the present study is no exception. What this study does stress is the *immanence* of theory, its perpetual involvement with something which is *not* the University, and in a key respect the use of the term theory made here contradicts the form in which the term appeared. For there was certainly a moment, located broadly in the 1970s, in which a challenge to the established study of literature in English Departments in England and America was laid down by socialists and feminists who had become apprised of developments in French and German thought, particularly Marxism and linguistics, which seemed set to shatter the assumptions and methods of the discipline as it then stood. The term ‘theory’ was used as the catch-all phrase under which linguistic, psychoanalytic, feminist and Marxist criticism announced a war on established literary studies, which for the sake of convenience were labelled ‘Leavisism’ in Britain, due to the perceived influence of the Cambridge academic F. R. Leavis in the formation of the method and curriculum of literary studies. Leavisism came to be perceived as the root of an ideological blindness and almost willed ignorance within English studies which it was the job of ‘theory’ to sweep away. The need to ‘theorize’ a particular text or topic was announced on all hands by critics who called themselves ‘theorists’, and the markers were laid down in a war between ‘theorists’ and ‘Leavisites’ which was often bitter and resulted, in some British universities, in a divided English Department with the two sides barely on speaking terms. Those were interesting times indeed, which this study in part documents, but the

term 'theory' cannot be taken on its own terms, even though those terms must be explained, and while it is certainly the case that the adoption by Anglo-American literary studies of numerous ideas new to the discipline marked a period of great change (mediated and disseminated by a succession of primers in, and anthologies of, 'literary theory'), it is also the case that the tendency of 'theory' to cast itself as the Renaissance and the Enlightenment combined and animated by a Romantic hatred for tyranny requires, with hindsight, a little modification.

The teaching of English, though sometimes thought of as a twentieth-century novelty building on precarious nineteenth-century origins, can be traced back to the ancient practice of teaching rhetoric, which survived through the Middle Ages and was a central element in education until the eighteenth century. The pre-eminence of rhetoric was threatened by rationalist criticisms, and the educational centrality of Greek and Latin literature began to give way to vernacular literature as early as the mid-seventeenth century. The growing importance of English studies was confirmed by the landmark appointment in 1828 of a Chair of English Language and Literature at University College, London. Shortly afterwards, the appointment of F. D. Maurice at the newly opened King's College, London, confirmed the beginnings of English literary studies in something like their modern form. Maurice's approach tended towards textual close reading, based on his own classical background. He believed that English literature and English history were linked in a consciousness of nationality and national destiny, and emphasized the importance of the function of English among the middle class. The middle class were to be targets of English literary education because he saw them as bearers of the national project and as a politically stabilizing force in a time of Chartist unrest. Maurice considered English to be an appropriate subject for women, and was able to implement his ideas on female education when he became the first principal of Queen's College in 1848.¹ Oxford and Cambridge developed English studies only later. The first Chair in English at Oxford came in 1904 and the Cambridge English Tripos originated in 1917.

It is usual to date the origins of modern English studies from its foundation at Cambridge, because it was at Cambridge that a version of the subject in which the reading of texts would be elevated above their history or philology was first heavily promoted. This form of English studies was plainly anticipated in the nineteenth century, as we have noted, but the version of English established at Cambridge by F. R. Leavis, Q. D. Leavis and I. A. Richards is generally considered to have provided the dominant model in Britain for at least three decades. The

approach of the Leavises was fundamentally centred on the conditioning of the reader, and its keyword was 'sensibility', a term which subsequent theory has tended to dismiss as an anti-rational, ideological mask. Although the Leavises harked back to a lost condition of England in which class stratification was unalienated because each knew his or her place and all were linked by common linguistic intelligence, the Leavisite project was fundamentally futuristic, and in its way no less radical than the socialist and feminist projects which came bitterly to oppose it under the banner of theory.

It is customary to compare the project of the Leavises, in particular, to that of the poet and educationalist Matthew Arnold (1822–88). The validity of the comparison does not lie primarily in any detailed similarity of theoretical articulation. Indeed, the mapping of history in terms of dominant ideas ('Arnoldian' or 'Leavisite') can easily be pushed into a false idealism which finds something like an evil power (albeit a discursive power) at work behind history, moving it on in a sinister way. The usefulness of establishing the connection between nineteenth- and twentieth-century versions of English studies lies in the comparison of contexts, and in the insight that modern literary studies have tended to be shaped as a response to social antagonism, whether as an attempt to meliorate or offset the conflict of social classes, or further to articulate and provoke such conflict in order to accelerate social change. It is certainly possible to view Arnold and Leavis as opponents of social change and defenders of the status quo,² and a Marxist reading of history which views communism as a teleological inevitability will tend to see them as little more than obstacles to change. The apparent conservatism of Arnold and Leavis can be given a different gloss, however, albeit one that a Marxist view of history might find hard to sustain. Both Arnold and Leavis are operating in the context of what they perceive to be rapid social change, and are interested in two ideals: the avoidance of unbridled social conflict and the preservation of the best values of existing society, even though the elements in society which created or sustained those values are now losing power. Arnold's lessons concern peace, the maintenance of difference in unity, and the modernization of cultural identities in a process of historical change. This will seem like a contentious claim, but I suggest that Arnold's vision of the essential universality of culture is not worse than any contemporary claims about hybridization of the arts and of identity itself. The need for dominant powers to adopt subordinate cultures is an issue as much of our own time as Arnold's, and Arnold's very nineteenth-century assumptions about the identity of a people and its culture are not very different from those of liberal pluralists in our own

times who share Arnold's agenda of diminishing the potential for social conflict through cultural convergence and enlightenment.

Arnold states that he wrote the lectures which appeared as *On the Study of Celtic Literature* (1867) in response to a piece in *The Times* which was itself a response to his own support for a Welsh Eisteddfod – a festival of Welsh-language literature and Welsh music and dance. Arnold had made measured comments in support of the Eisteddfod, in terms which endorsed cultural Welshness, but insisted on the need for people in Wales to embrace English. He compared what he took to be the people's culture as manifested at the Eisteddfod to the lack of culture among the commercial middle class of England – whom he termed 'Philistines':

When I see the enthusiasm these Eisteddfods can awaken in your whole people, and then think of the tastes, the literature, the amusements, of our own lower and middle class, I am filled with admiration for you. It is a consoling thought, and one which history allows us to entertain, that nations disinherited of political success may yet leave their mark on the world's progress, and contribute powerfully to the civilisation of mankind. We in England [. . .] are imperilled by what I call the 'philistinism' of our middle class. On the side of beauty and taste, vulgarity; on the side of morals and feeling, coarseness; on the side of mind and spirit, unintelligence – this is Philistinism. Now, then, is the moment for the greater delicacy and spirituality of the Celtic peoples who are blended with us, if it be but wisely directed, to make itself prized and honoured. In a certain measure the children of Taliesin and Ossian have now an opportunity for renewing the famous feat of the Greeks, and conquering their conquerors.³

The Times' response to Arnold tackled the issue of the assimilation of Wales to England in a strident modernizing fashion, insisting that the Welsh look to their future with England and forget their cultural past. We should bear in mind when looking at this text that Wales was not a recent imperial addition but a long-standing and integral part of the English throne. Arnold quotes from *The Times*:

The Welsh language is the curse of Wales. Its prevalence, and the ignorance of English have excluded, and even now exclude the Welsh people from the civilization of their English neighbours. An Eisteddfod is one of the most mischievous and selfish pieces of sentimentalism which could possibly be perpetrated. It is simply a foolish interference with the natural progress of civilization and prosperity. If it is desirable that the Welsh should talk English, it is a monstrous folly to encourage them in a loving

fondness for their old language. Not only the energy and power, but the intelligence and music of Europe, have come mainly from Teutonic sources, and this glorification of everything Celtic, if it were not pedantry, would be sheer ignorance. The sooner all Welsh specialities disappear from the face of the earth the better.⁴

Arnold opposes culture to progress. 'Improvement' and 'progress' had been bywords of the Industrial Revolution. As far as proponents of economic development were concerned, progress was to be led by changes in economic methods of production, and the past was to be unsentimentally discarded in the interest of whatever practices would increase the general wealth (and the particular wealth of property owners). Readers of Jane Austen will recall that one of the key moments of moral self-definition given to Fanny Price in *Mansfield Park* occurs when, with her customary reserve, she signals her dislike of the 'improvement' of the Sotherton estate by its modernizing owner, Rushworth. Modernization is driven by the capital surpluses generated by changes in the technology and organization of production, the process which Karl Marx had attempted to account for in *Capital* (1867). The very process of rapid change generated in some quarters an unsentimental attitude towards the past but, equally, rapid change made the historical nature of humanity far more visible than ever.

The growing awareness of history as a process of change, and not merely as a random selection of events dictated by destiny or chance, was accompanied by a rising tendency to equate culture, as an ensemble of objects and practices across arts and daily life, with the very stuff that defined a 'people' as a historical agent or entity. Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) argued in a series of publications that history was best grasped in terms of the culture of peoples rather than as the history of battles and conquest, and advanced a relativistic account of human cultures in which cultural difference came into view through analysis of the literature and other arts of a people. Herder's approach suggested that the contemporary shape of existence within one's own national culture might also be grasped as the product of a historical process that could in turn be understood through the analysis of the nation's past cultural products. In a similar vein, Giambattista Vico's *Principles of New Science* (1725) attempted to demonstrate the importance of poetic understanding for the development of modern society. Vico claimed that the history of a nation resembled the development from infancy to maturity. Knowledge in the earliest society was the domain of poet-theologians. This insight gives Vico the means to interpret the literary texts of

ancient societies as the symbolic encoding of the totality of their knowledge. The *New Science* was an early example of the growing tendency to view human society as historical, not natural, and was original in its attempt to grasp social evolution through the analysis of culture. Whether presenting narratives of degeneration (Rousseau) or of progress (Vico, Herder and Condorcet), eighteenth-century historicists took man's historical progress from ancient to modern times as their subject.

Arnold's response to the article in *The Times* is an attempt to offset the modernizing attitude to the past. This is not done from antiquarian interest, but from the point of view of the dominant and, on Arnold's terms, progressive state power as it stands in relation to subordinate peoples. It is an early examination of the cultural problems attendant on imperialism and on what is now called 'globalization', and of the potential consequences both for the dominant power and for the subaltern in that process. Arnold does not map this in terms of the Western 'subject' versus the colonized 'Other' – terms which would be given wide currency in this context only after 1945, in the tradition of de Beauvoir and Sartre – but instead thinks in terms of race, following the assumptions of that time that the English were basically Germanic and the Irish basically Celtic. This racial categorization seems to creak more than a little from our own contemporary point of view: the underlying assumption that people are shaped by collective cultural unities has proved one that modern commentators have attempted to leave behind. The unity of a culture is now seen more in terms of its formative social conflicts than in terms of any prior, idealized unity of 'spirit'. Yet the problem is fundamentally modern, and Arnold's intervention indicates the scope of claims that will be made about literature in particular as a bearer of cultural identities which have ever since haunted the theory of literature.

'Behold England's difficulty in governing Ireland!'⁵ Arnold views *The Times'* attack on Welsh-language culture as a problem of imperialism.

There is nothing like love and admiration for bringing people to a likeness with what they love and admire; but the Englishman seems never to dream of employing these influences upon a race he wants to fuse with himself. [. . .] His Welsh and Irish fellow citizens are hardly more amalgamated with him now than they were when Wales and Ireland were first conquered.⁶

Arnold's program is one of remarkable realism, even if the terms of his study, which depends on the notion of racial 'genius', now seem superseded. The realism, of course, might not be to all tastes. Political

subordination is accepted as a given and even a good; subaltern culture is encouraged in flattering terms. Celts are 'airy', 'quick', 'noble', 'indomitable', 'sensuous' and so on, while their poetry gains in style precisely because of their lack of technological domination of nature: 'Celtic poetry seems to make up to itself for being unable to master the world and give an adequate interpretation of it, by throwing all its force into style, by bending language at any rate to its will, and expressing the ideas it has with an unsurpassable intensity, elevation, and effect.'⁷ Celtic poetry is closer to nature, because it does not share in the process of modernization which has made nature the object of language, and its very substance constitutes a kind of repressed element to which its opposite – in Arnold's account the 'Germanic spirit' – has limited access. Although Arnold's account is cast in racial terms, it is also plain that the opposition between the Celtic and the Germanic constitutes a kind of allegory of the trajectory of human spirit, from the pre-rational to the rational state, with Celtic literature coming to stand in some ways for the whole of literature, having the function of carrying the beauty of the magical and pre-scientific view of nature into the world of scientific rationalism which has made nature its object. Arnold does not explicitly express the matter in these terms but, as we review the vocabulary with which he refers to the Celts and laments the loss of their culture, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that for him literature is the expression not only of this or that people or culture, but also of the lost, pre-scientific world as such.

Arnold reflects other eighteenth- and nineteenth-century thinkers in seeing literature as what we might now call a collective cultural imaginary, finding whole attitudes and ways of being encoded or sedimented in a particular rhetorical flourish or stylistic preference. The teaching of literature, and of poetry in particular, must also ameliorate present conflict, a function examined by Arnold in *Culture and Anarchy* (1869). *Culture and Anarchy* classifies the aristocratic, established church, Conservative interests as 'Barbarian', the commercial, nonconformist, Liberal interests as 'Philistine', and the workers and socialists as 'the Populace'. As the Barbarians lose power with the rise of the Philistines, Arnold asserts that culture will offset the tendency to anarchy created by the one-sided 'Hebraism' of the individualist Philistines, and by the mass demonstrations and social unruliness of the Populace. Culture is 'the study of perfection' and 'goes beyond religion'.⁸ Culture is identified with poetry. Arnold later wrote: 'The future of poetry is immense, because in poetry, where it is worthy of its highest destinies, our race, as time goes on, will find an ever surer and surer stay'.⁹ The middle class will learn not to *produce* cultural artefacts but to *know* them. Hence

the emphasis on *criticism* rather than *creativity*. Culture embodies a universality, a 'harmonious expansion of *all* the powers which make the beauty and worth of human nature', which 'goes beyond religion' and 'consists in becoming something rather than in having something', defending an 'idea of perfection as an *inward* condition of the mind and spirit' which 'is at variance with the mechanical and material civilisation' of England. Culture therefore stands for the greatest possible degree of universality and is not merely the vehicle of human progress but also its substance.

The influence of Arnold in the early twentieth century is found far more in the field of criticism than in that of poetic practice, and especially in the development of English as a university subject. On the one hand, Arnold situates literature in a key position as the expression of the identity of a nation or people, as the repository of a lost or eclipsed way of being, as a way to moderate what he perceives to be the materialism of the rising commercial class (and also of their upcoming socialist rivals), and as the bearer of the values of conquered or colonized peoples which can be preserved in the conquering imperial culture in a dialectical process which modifies the dominant power, thereby ensuring a secret triumph for the defeated, and at the same time pacifies the colonized and establishes the legitimacy of the conqueror. On the other hand, Arnold brings all of these grand narratives of cultural identity and change back down to the text as an object of criticism, in the idea that nuances of observation and judgement, rather than broad content, are at the very heart of the culture-bearing modality of texts, not peripheral questions of refinement of an effete 'taste'. Arnold's vision builds on views of race and culture developed during the previous hundred years, and is a synthesis of historicist views of culture. It is developed with a keen awareness that existing society is in a process of change, and with the intention of developing a strategy to manage that change. Criticism and pedagogy are the cornerstones of this complex social program, of such potential scope that Arnold's work can only partially suggest its future course. It is above all an administrative venture. It proceeds in the name of all that is true and beautiful, but there is a tension between the aesthetic refinement it advocates and the grand narrative of culture and change which it identifies as the metanarrative governing all human culture. It seeks to account for and manage what it terms 'culture' as part of a process of government (and therefore national and particular), but also to situate culture as the site in which an as yet unexpressed future of changed relations of class and race are being anticipated and negotiated (and therefore supranational and universal). Literary reading and scholarship are granted

a massive legitimacy in this set of claims, and even though Marxist and postcolonial commentary of recent decades has tended to dismiss Arnold as authoritarian and imperialist, the kind of models he employs are not too far from those implicitly favoured by cultural administration today – certainly at the level of arts management, and especially in the framing assumptions of literary studies in the University.

In Arnold's work, literature can be seen in the process of coming to occupy a grand role, in part transcendent, in large part administrative, mediated by schools and universities, and by the official organs of criticism and taste. Literature at that time had not, however, subordinated itself to these grand institutional imperatives and grand narratives. *Culture and Anarchy* is certainly a seminal text for us, but was written against a background of hostility to culture, and literature in the later nineteenth century – to the extent it identified with art (poetry) and not with entertainment (fiction) – was a marginal activity in search of legitimation and a proper domain. That is not to say that practitioners of literature as art were socially marginal subjects – not exactly – although they were frequently at odds with the dominant elements in the privileged classes of which they formed a part. Arnold's own account, which proposes a connection between literature's domain of interiority and the outside world of practicality (commerce and science), articulates a distinction between the private and public worlds which is of growing structural importance for literature throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth – not least in the literary activities of modernism, which has a key role in the formation of literary studies, especially in the figure of T. S. Eliot.

The theoretical and philosophical material which has produced and analysed this splitting of a private, inner domain and a public and objective domain is a vast one and beyond the scope of this chapter. One dimension of this separation is produced by science, which reveals the objective world to be a mechanism, and indeed seems to imply that subjectivity too may be a mechanism. A key text on this topic is Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), which proposes a rigorous separation of the mechanical world of nature and the subjective realm of moral freedom. Another dimension of the separation is brought about by the development of capitalism and the evolution of the 'interior' as a living space which increasingly replaces nature. This phenomenon – which includes such effects as the bourgeois living room, the arcade, and the closed illusionistic theatre of Wagner – is given theoretical substance in the work of Walter Benjamin and Theodor Adorno.¹⁰ There are other possible routes to considering the separation of inner and outer worlds,