THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF

LITERARY CRITICISM

VOLUME V Romanticism


EDITED BY
MARSHALL BROWN

The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism

VOLUME 5 Romanticism

Edited by

Marshall Brown





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521317214

© Cambridge University Press 2000

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2000 First paperback edition 2007

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN-13 978-0-521-30010-0 hardback ISBN-10 0-521-30010-X hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-31721-4 paperback ISBN-10 0-521-31721-5 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websides is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contributors

Jonathan Arac is Professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh and a member of the Boundary 2 editorial collective. He is author of Commissioned spirits (1979), Critical genealogies (1987) and 'Huckleberry Finn' as idol and target (1997), and he has edited five volumes of original essays, including Postmodernism and politics (1986). His contribution to this volume relates closely to his book in progress, to be published by Duke University Press, entitled Impure worlds.

Joel Black is Associate Professor of Comparative Literature at the University of Georgia. He is the author of *The aesthetics of murder: a study in Romantic literature and contemporary culture* (1991) and essays on De Quincey, Foucault, Pynchon and Gaddis. He is currently working on studies of contemporary film, Wilde's aesthetics and Freudian science.

Marshall Brown is Professor of English and Comparative Literature and Adjunct Professor of Music and German at the University of Washington, where he edits Modern language quarterly: a journal of literary history. He has written The shape of German Romanticism (1979), Preromanticism (1991) and Turning points: essays in the history of cultural expressions (1997), and edited La via al sublime (1987, with Giovanna Franci and Vita Fortunati), The uses of literary history (1996) and Eighteenthcentury literary history: an MLQ reader (1999). His next book will be The gothic text.

Alfredo De Paz is Professor of the Methodology of Art Criticism at the University of Bologna (Italy). He has written many essays and theoretical and historical books on the art and culture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For many years he has been engaged in interpreting European Romanticism in a contemporary and postmodern perspective. His publications include Sociologia e critica delle arti (1980), La rivoluzione romantica (1984), Goya: arte e condizione umana (1990), Il romanticismo e la pittura: natura, simbolo, storia (1992), Europa romantica: fondamenti e paradigmi della sensibilità moderna (1994), Géricault: la febbre dell'arte e della vita (1997).

Paul H. Fry is William Lampson Professor of English and Master of Ezra Stiles College at Yale University. He is the author of The poet's calling in the English ode (1980), The reach of criticism (1984), William Empson: prophet against sacrifice (1990) and A defense of poetry (1994), and editor of The rime of the Ancient Mariner: case studies in contemporary criticism (1998), together with numerous articles on Romanticism, the history of criticism (including an article on I. A. Richards for the present series) and literary theory. He is writing a book on Wordsworth.

Gary Handwerk is Professor of English and Comparative Literature and chairman of the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Washington. He is the author of *Irony and ethics in narrative: from Schlegel to Lacan* and translator of *Human, all too human* for *The complete works of Nietzsche*. He has published articles on nineteenth- and twentieth-century narrative and, most recently, articles on several of William Godwin's novels and on Romantic conceptions of history. He is currently at work on new editions of *Caleb Williams* and *Fleetwood*.

Theresa M. Kelley is Marjorie and Lorin Tiefenthaler Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin. She has published essays on eighteenth-century aesthetics, the sister arts, Romantic poets, rhetoric and art, and participates in an exchange on Romanticism and Philosophy for *Praxis*, the on-line journal of Romantic Circles on the Web. She is the author of Wordsworth's revisionary aesthetics (1988) and Reinventing allegory (1995) and co-editor with Paula Feldman of Romantic women writers: voices and counter-voices (1995). Her current projects include a study of the role of botany and botanical illustration in Romantic culture and an investigation of Staël's writing on passion and reason.

Jon Klancher, Professor of English at Carnegie Mellon University, is the author of *The making of English reading audiences*, 1791–1832 (1987) and articles on Coleridge, Godwin, Bakhtin, Romantic criticism and the French Revolution and other topics. He is currently writing a study of disciplinary formation and the institutional contexts of cultural criticism, political debate and literary theory in the Romantic age.

Herbert Lindenberger is Avalon Foundation Professor of Humanities in Comparative Literature and English at Stanford University, where he also founded and chaired Comparative Literature. His books include On Wordsworth's 'Prelude' (1963), Georg Büchner (1964), Georg Trakl (1971), Historical drama: the relation of literature and reality (1975), Saul's fall: a critical fiction (1979), Opera: the extravagant art (1984), The history in literature (1990) and, most recently, Opera in history: from Monteverdi to Cage (1998). He has held Fulbright, Guggenheim and

National Endowment for the Humanities fellowships. During 1997 he served as president of the Modern Language Association. He is currently working on a larger study of the interrelationship of the arts that will expand the essay in the present volume.

Kurt Mueller-Vollmer is Professor of German Studies and Humanities, emeritus, at Stanford University and guest associate with the Center for Advanced Study in the Internationality of National Literatures at the University of Göttingen (Germany). He has published widely in the areas of Romanticism, German-American cultural relations, hermeneutics and literary theory, language theory, and translation studies and on the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt. His book publications include Toward a phenomenological theory of literature (1963), Poesie und Einbildungskraft: zur Dichtungstheorie Wilhelm von Humboldts (1967), The hermeneutics reader (1985, 1988, 1991, 1994) and Wilhelm von Humboldts Sprachwissenschaft (1991). He has edited (with M. Irmscher) Translating literatures, translating cultures: new vistas and approaches in literary studies (1998) and is editor in chief of the critical edition of Wilhelm von Humboldt's Writings on linguistics.

David Perkins is Marquand Professor of English and American Literature, emeritus, at Harvard University, where he served in the departments of English, Literature and Comparative Literature. He is the author of numerous books and articles on English Romanticism, modern poetry and problems and theories of literary history.

Tilottama Rajan is Professor of English, director of the Centre for Theory at the University of Western Ontario, and founder of the North American Society for the Study of Romanticism. She is the author of Dark interpreter: the discourse of Romanticism (1980) and The supplement of reading: figures of understanding in Romantic literature (1990) and coeditor of Intersections: nineteenth-century philosophy and contemporary theory (1995) and Romanticism, history, and the possibilities of genre: reforming literature 1789–1837 (1998). Her current project is a study of relationships between phenomenology, deconstruction and poststructuralism.

Albert Sbragia is Associate Professor of Italian at the University of Washington and director of the Cinema Studies Program. Publications include Carlo Emilio Gadda and the modern macaronic (1996) and essays on Gadda, Calvino, Svevo and the nineteenth-century Italian novel. He is the translator of Franco Moretti's The way of the world: the Bildungsroman in European civilization (1987).

Helmut J. Schneider is Professor and chairman of the department of German at the University of Bonn (Germany). He formerly taught German

and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, and the University of California, Davis. He has worked extensively on the history of pastoral poetry, the German idyll and landscape and utopia. He is the author of Bürgerliche Idylle: Studien zu einer literarischen Gattung des 18. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel von Johann Heinrich Voss (1975) as well as articles on landscape aesthetics, Lessing, Kleist and modern authors, and has edited three anthologies: Idyllen der Deutschen (1978), Deutsche Landschaften (1981), and Deutsche Idyllentheorien im 18. Jahrhundert (1988).

E. S. Shaffer, F. B. A., is Senior Research Fellow and Director of the Research Project on the Reception of British Authors in Europe at the School of Advanced Study, University of London. She was visiting Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, in 1996. She is the author of 'Kubla Khan' and The Fall of Jerusalem: the mythological school in Biblical criticism and secular literature 1770–1880 (1975), and has published widely on English and German Romantic thought, including 'The hermeneutic community: Coleridge and Schleiermacher' in The Coleridge connection (1990) and 'Romantic philosophy and the organization of the disciplines' in Romanticism and the sciences (1990). Other books include Erewhons of the eye: Samuel Butler as painter, photographer and art critic (1988); she edited and introduced George Eliot, Middlemarch (1991), and Literature and science: the third culture (1998). She is editor of Comparative criticism, an annual journal of which volume 20 is 'Philosophical dialogues' (1998). She is working on a book on Coleridge's literary theory.

David Simpson is Professor and G. B. Needham Fellow in English at the University of California, Davis. He has written many books on Romanticism and other fields, of which the most recent are *The academic post-modern and the rule of literature: a report on half-knowledge* (1995) and Romanticism, nationalism and the revolt against theory (1993). He edited German aesthetic and literary criticism: Kant to Hegel (1984) and The origins of modern critical thought: Lessing to Hegel (1988), both published by Cambridge University Press. He is currently at work on a book titled Situatedness: or, why we keep saying where we're coming from.

David Wellbery is William Kurrelmeyer Professor of German at Johns Hopkins University. He is the author of Lessing's 'Laocoön': semiotics and aesthetics in the age of reason (1984), The specular moment: Goethe's early lyric and the beginnings of Romanticism (1996) and Neo-retorica e deconstrução (1998). He has edited several books and published numerous essays on literary theory and on German literature from the eighteenth century to the present. He is currently writing a book on Schopenhauer and modernism.

Contents

Notes on contributors ix

Introduction 1

Classical standards in the period PAUL H. FRY	7
Innovation and modernity ALFREDO DE PAZ (trans. Albert Sbragia)	29
The French Revolution DAVID SIMPSON	49
Transcendental philosophy and Romantic criticism DAVID SIMPSON	72
Nature Helmut J. Schneider	92
Scientific models JOEL BLACK	115
Religion and literature E. S. Shaffer	138
Language theory and the art of understanding Kurt Mueller-Vollmer	162
The transformation of rhetoric DAVID WELLBERY	185
Romantic irony GARY HANDWERK	203
Theories of genre TILOTTAMA RAJAN	226
Theory of the novel MARSHALL BROWN	250
	PAUL H. FRY Innovation and modernity ALFREDO DE PAZ (trans. Albert Sbragia) The French Revolution DAVID SIMPSON Transcendental philosophy and Romantic criticism DAVID SIMPSON Nature HELMUT J. SCHNEIDER Scientific models JOEL BLACK Religion and literature E. S. SHAFFER Language theory and the art of understanding KURT MUELLER-VOLLMER The transformation of rhetoric DAVID WELLBERY Romantic irony GARY HANDWERK Theories of genre TILOTTAMA RAJAN Theory of the novel

13	The impact of Shakespeare JONATHAN ARAC	272
14	The vocation of criticism and the crisis of the republic of letters JON KLANCHER	296
15	Women, gender and literary criticism THERESA M. KELLEY	321
16	Literary history and historicism DAVID PERKINS	338
17	Literature and the other arts HERBERT LINDENBERGER	362
	Bibliography 387 Index 448	

Introduction

MARSHALL BROWN

Many of the presuppositions and practices that prevail in contemporary aesthetics and literary criticism originate in writings from the Romantic decades.' So do several positions to which the contemporary climate is hostile. Hence Romanticism is often regarded as the root of contemporary attitudes – the beginning of Modernism which, conversely, is viewed as late Romanticism – and likewise, not infrequently, as the source of the troubles from which we are now at last freeing ourselves. Obviously, no period of the past has a monopolistic claim to be the origin of the modern (or the postmodern); nor do Modernism and postmodernism begin in and as anything other than themselves, whatever elements in the past may have inspired them. Still, it is generally agreed that the writing about literature from the period between 1780 and 1830 has a special bearing on the present.

Increasingly since the Romantic era literary criticism has been concerned not just with works but with writers and readers. When Wordsworth's Preface to Lyrical ballads defines the poet as 'a man speaking to men', he is, to be sure, making a point about the democratization of letters ('man'=common man) and missing one about the situation of women and women writers; both of these issues are discussed in this volume. But he is also making a novel statement about the communicative value of literature. The writer does not just provide moral exempla and frame a golden world; literature is there to be read and understood. One important new strand of Romantic criticism thus turns its attention to hermeneutics and interpretation: how do readers grasp what authors are saying? Criticism

Our volume, entitled Romanticism, aims to represent the range of writing remaining of interest and influence from the years between about 1780 and 1830. In the German arena it remains common to label some of the writings Romantic and others (particularly in connection with Goethe, Schiller and Humboldt) Classic. In the Latin countries and in the United States the label Romantic often gets applied to writers contemporary with the British Victorians and the German Biedermeier; their Romanticisms will be covered chiefly in volume 6 of this series, while some early figures, especially Rousseau, primarily appear in volume 4. In Romanticism and gender, New York: Routledge, 1993, Anne Mellor has argued cogently against lumping all the writings of these decades under a single label. Names remain useful hooks, but our aim has been to represent in their variety the writings of a period, not a movement.

grows at once (though not always in the same writers) more psychological and more technical, two functions often joined in Romantic rhetorical theory and in its deconstructive avatars. And criticism also grows more sociological, as the need to define a readership is increasingly felt. Earlier genre criticism concerned the laws of composition of different types of writing; now it also considers their different purposes and audiences.

Wordsworth's poet, however, speaks to men, not with them. Alongside the reader's part, the situation of the poet is at issue in much Romantic criticism. No longer the inspired representatives of divine order, and not yet Arnoldian pedagogues, Romantic authors have their own, multiple versions of authority. One might glance back to the threshold of Romanticism, where ancient erudition had breathed a newly personal spirit in Laurence Sterne's whimsical invocation, 'Read, read, read, my unlearned reader! read' (Tristram Shandy 111.36). At the same moment Samuel Johnson's Imlac had called the poet 'the interpreter of nature, and the legislator of mankind, and . . . a being superiour to time and place' (Rasselas, ch. 10). Imlac, of course, is a little loony, until brought down to earth by confronting the seriously disordered imagination of an astronomer who madly thinks he rules the heavens. Such are the figures who serve as equivocal models for Percy Shelley's paean to poets as 'hierophants' and 'legislators of the world' (conclusion of 'Defence of poetry'). But if Shelley's 'world' Romantically ups the ante from Imlac's social pretensions to the astronomer's universal ones, he simultaneously deflates them with the pathos of his negations: his poets are 'hierophants of an unapprehended vision' and 'unacknowledged legislators' (my italics).2 Ever since Plato, poetry was constitutionally on the defensive; in the Romantic period it became - to use what was then still a new sense of the word – nervous.

The last epigone of the platonic poet with his divine frenzy was the preromantic figure of the genius. In early Herder and other writers of the German Sturm-und-Drang movement we frequently find poets credited

² Earl Wasserman's unashamedly high-toned, neoplatonic reading of Shelley's 'Defence' bypasses the 'unacknowledged' and even contrives to neutralize it, claiming that 'the poetic transaction involves only the poet and his poem, not an audience' (Shelley: a critical reading, Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, p. 220). Yet earlier, in a paragraph buttressed by a hefty quotation from the 'Defence', Wasserman says that the 'end' of The Cenci' is a creative moral insight by the audience, an insight to which the play can only provoke and guide the audience by a true representation of human nature' (p. 102). For a more cautious, more explicitly proto-Arnoldian reading along similar lines, arguing that the 'actual and constantly operative power of poetry . . . is unacknowledged because it is unnoticed by everyone, including the poets themselves', see Paul H. Fry, The reach of criticism: method and perception in literary theory, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983, p. 161. Of course, the stature of 'the poets themselves', on this account, remains in question.

with liberated genius, sometimes even in the untranslatable compound form of the Kraftgenie. Kant codified Imlac-like yearnings and proto-Shelleyan nostalgia when he influentially defined genius as 'the talent (gift of nature) which gives the rule to art' (Critique of judgment, § 46). But he balanced praise with disparagement of Sturm-und-Drang excesses by insisting on taste and craft as other essentials; when out of place or out of line, genius is 'totally laughable' ('vollends lächerlich', § 47). As poets started going mad for real, the evidence began to come in, and the reports on Collins, Cowper and Clare, Sade, Hölderlin and even Blake were far from encouraging. Nor did the suicidal fraud of Chatterton or the obstinate one of Macpherson help the neoplatonic cause. In 'Resolution and independence' Wordsworth moralizes 'Chatterton, the marvellous Boy', and the tipsy Robert Burns with the famous lines, 'We Poets in our youth begin in gladness; / But thereof come in the end despondency and madness'. And while Keats dedicated Endymion to Chatterton's memory, the mood is far from exalted when his Epistle 'To George Felton Mathew' sequentially evokes Chatterton, 'that warm-hearted Shakespeare', 'Milton's blindness', and 'those who strove with the bright golden wing / Of genius, to flap away each sting / Thrown by the pitiless world'. Increasingly, it was the psychology of poetic genius and not its authority that came up for discussion. Generally, of course, if not in Keats's list, Shakespeare stood out from all competitors; the Romantic encounters with Shakespeare therefore became a crucial final reckoning with doctrines of legitimizing inspiration, preceding the Icarian swoops and swoons of Baudelaire and Tennyson and the obsessive ivory-tower perfectionism of the symbolists.

Often in Romantic criticism the struggles of readers to understand and of writers to be understood and the anxiety of creators to measure up were counterbalanced by an increasing emancipation and exaltation of art. The old moral imperatives had faded into the social graces of eighteenth-century taste and had been degraded even further in attacks such as Rousseau's on the frivolousness of aesthetic spectacle. The latest defence of poesy, particularly associated with Kant and Schiller, was to value play itself as a humanizing and elevating moral value. Art becomes not the representative of religion but its propaedeutic (Hegel) or even its substitute (Schelling and his followers). High and low come together in the more dizzying tributes to Romantic irony. From the varieties of Romantic-era criticism can be derived both the elitist formalism of the modernists and the anti-elitist high jinx of postmodernists, though both tend to strip Romantic motifs of their sublime, metaphysical or transcendental dimensions.

Finally, critics in the Romantic era became self-conscious about their position in time and space. Even in its turn to antiquity, the Renaissance

had present ends in mind.3 With Herder's historicism as both symptom and cause, Romantics worried about their historical role and studied poetry in its historical unfolding. They also used poetics to project destinies: utopia becomes an aesthetic realm lodged in the distant future. Nor though the connections are often overlooked - was Romantic situational thinking limited to temporality. It becomes geographical in the increasing nationalism of European culture of the period, leading to a growing divergence among the various European literary traditions. It becomes sociological in the burgeoning interest in folksong and, more generally, in writing for and by the lower classes (in verse chiefly) and the middle classes (in the novel). Situational thinking likewise motivates the growing, if still incipient and uneven attention to women as writers and readers of literature. It renders discussions of literature and the other arts richer and less judgemental than in earlier periods. And, finally, it regulates the complex use of nature as model, goal and nostalgic absence in so much Romantic criticism.

Such, in a quick conspectus, are the motifs that the following chapters pursue. We chose to request substantial essays investigating large areas of Romantic period writing. Other surveys focus more than ours does on digesting facts including, particularly, the tenets of individual authors. We preferred to let our chapters model how Romantics thought through and debated larger issues. The chapters are real essays, informational in their base, but ultimately more concerned with showing how Romantic ideas work and how contemporary critics may investigate and use them. A particular challenge for all our authors was to pursue their topics on an international basis and to show the coherence remaining as national traditions diverge. German abstraction can seem airless to British Romanticists, British empiricism can seem pedestrian to philosophical minds, and the French, in this period, can seem parochial or insubstantial to both; one aim of our volume has been to show how each tradition can animate and illuminate the others.

Because we wanted a volume that would be useful today and to an Anglophone readership, we have not tried to represent all facets of literary criticism from our period equally. Survivals from earlier eras are vital to a balanced view of our decades. It should be remembered that Hugh Blair's Lectures on rhetoric and belles lettres were far more often printed and more widely read than the Preface to Lyrical ballads. But choices had to be made, and in a book designed for contemporary readers we preferred

³ See Daniel Javitch's fine recent demonstration that even the Aristotle revival envisioned using Ancient means for Modern ends: 'The emergence of poetic genre theory in the sixteenth century', Modern language quarterly 59 (1998), pp. 139-69.

Wordsworth.⁴ Similarly, topics that seemed of more local importance have been left for specialized works, where discussions can readily be found. Thus, in connection with stylistics, the extensive German discussions about the proper use of classical metres, Kleist's fascinating hints about prose, and even Wordsworth's dissection of poetic diction and metre were set aside in favour of less technical, more overtly conceptual and ideological issues of rhetoric that have been much debated in criticism of recent decades. A number of issues and figures straddle the eighteenth-century and Romantic volumes: more systematic synopses of Kant and Schiller and of the sublime, the beautiful and the picturesque will be found in volume 4, where they synthesize earlier lines of thinking, whereas in our volume they appear in connection with distinctive sallies of innovation. Conversely, Fielding's theory of the novel was, in its day, eccentric in both form and substance, and it is treated more fully here in connection with the German theories of the novel that take up where Fielding leaves off.

*

The 'we' I have used in this introduction is a real but not a happy one. The original plan for the volume was Ernst Behler's, to which I contributed only a few refinements, and it was to have been his and my responsibility jointly. As editor, essayist, teacher, administrator, colleague and human being, Ernst was a force of nature. He died, suddenly and at the pinnacle of his career, before he could write his chapter or introduction, let alone see the volume through. It is in sadness, not joy, that I have dedicated it to his memory.

After Ernst, my largest gratitude is to the contributors. Those who finished early and waited patiently and those who persisted long with tough assignments are equally in the debt of all of us. Special thanks are due to two who coped splendidly with speedy fulfilments of late commissions: Theresa Kelley for her chapter on women in Romantic criticism, and David Simpson for the chapter on philosophy, replacing the one it was not given to Ernst to write. Eric Schaad laboured countless hours checking quotes and citations and supplementing bibliographies; one could not wish for a more meticulous and responsive co-worker. A Cambridge University Press sandwich, Josie Dixon between two slices of Kevin Taylor, waited when waiting was necessary, responded immediately when

⁴ For an impressively thorough and informative study of a slice of what was actually written and read in the Romantic period, see Friedrich Sengle, Biedermeierzeit: deutsche Literatur im Spannungsfeld zwischen Restauration und Revolution 1815-48, 3 vols., Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971-80, vol. I. I am not aware of comparable studies for other decades and countries.

questions arose and generally kept me in line. A sabbatical from the University of Washington and a fellowship from the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, while targeted for another project, helped a lot with this one. For once, Jane did not help much, but she was always there when wanted and constantly in my thoughts.

Classical standards in the period

PAUL H. FRY

If this topic should seem either too piecemeal or too self-evident to include in a general volume on romantic criticism, it may help to recall that for René Wellek the status of neoclassical criticism among the Romantics is the crucial issue that makes the second volume of his *History of modern criticism* possible: 'I think we must recognize that we can speak of a general European Romantic movement only if we take a wide over-all view and consider simply the general rejection of the neoclassical creed as a common denominator.' But possibly this claim only deepens suspicion. Arthur Lovejoy had famously argued that no criterion of any kind was common to all Romanticisms, and Wellek, who wrote his equally famous rebuttal of Lovejoy while at work on volume two, would have been especially eager at that time to uphold the legitimacy of broad period definitions.² Can the exceptions, we may ask – Byron and Chateaubriand, for example – ever be acceptably rationalized from any standpoint, not just Lovejoy's?

Nevertheless, whatever one might feel moved to say on other occasions, this is clearly not the place for the postmodern insistence that only an atomism vastly exceeding even Lovejoy's can do justice to the complexity of literary history (and in any case, Musset had already said that about 'Romanticism' in 1824!³). One must do what one can, aided in this case by the easily overlooked precision of Wellek's claim: we can try at first to agree, tentatively, that what the spirit of the Romantic age rejects is the neoclassical, not necessarily the Classical or the texts of antiquity, and proceed from there. It may finally be possible to show, however, that there is something even more telling, more truly characteristic and self-defining, albeit more varied, about the Romantic reception of Classical antiquity itself.

René Wellek, A history of modern criticism: 1750-1950, vol. II: The Romantic age, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955, p. 2.

² See Arthur Lovejoy, 'On the discrimination of Romanticisms' (1924), and René Wellek, 'The concept of "Romanticism" in literary history: the term "Romantic" and its derivatives', 1949, conveniently anthologized in *Romanticism: points of view*, Robert F. Gleckner and Gerald E. Enscoe (eds.), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

³ Lovejoy approvingly cites Alfred de Musset's Lettres de Dupuis et Cotonet as the 'reductio ad absurdum of efforts to define romanticism' (Romanticism, Gleckner and Enscoe (eds.), p. 66n.).

By 'Neoclassical' in this contrastive context we conventionally understand the domination of taste by Opitz and Gottsched in Germany, Boileau in France and Pope together with other verse essayists on criticism like Roscommon in England (it has been wittily observed that the neoclassical is the moment when poetry and criticism are one). The difference between the neoclassical and the Classical is for the most part selfexplanatory (as between Pope and Homer, or even between Pope and Virgil), but much harder to maintain, as we shall see, when one considers the reception of the Classical texts of criticism - Horace obviously, but also Longinus, who was popularized by Boileau, and Aristotle most problematically of all. When Wordsworth so disturbingly says, 'Aristotle, I have been told ...', then misunderstands what he has been 'told'4 while purporting to agree with it, even though the Preface to Lyrical ballads taken as a whole is the most radically anti-Aristotelian piece of critical speculation one could imagine, our perplexity is not just focussed on the sociohistorical interest that attaches to Wordsworth's alleged ignorance (and cheerful willingness to confess it) against the backdrop of earlier literary institutions, but also on the simple question what is meant by 'Aristotle': is this the neoclassical Stagyrite or is it the ancient sage who upholds the honour of poetry against the attack of Plato? And how significant can it be that Wordsworth seems in this place to have the latter figure in mind. since elsewhere he seems certainly to anticipate the modern consensus that Plato is proto-romantic while Aristotle is proto-neoclassical?5

Taking it as given, however, that in most cases we know what is meant by the Neoclassical, all will agree that the clearest instance of the 'Romantic' rejection of this 'creed', uttered in the name of the classical Apollo, can be found in Keats's 'Sleep and poetry' (1817), where a diatribe against poets who 'sway'd about upon a rocking horse, / And thought it Pegasus' concludes as follows:

A thousand handicraftsmen wore the mask Of Poesy. Ill-fated, impious race! That blasphemed the bright Lyrist to his face, And did not know it, – no, they went about, Holding a poor, decrepid standard out

⁴ William Wordsworth, 'Preface to Lyrical ballads', in Wordsworth: poetical works, Thomas Hutchinson (ed.), Ernest de Selincourt (rev. edn.), London: Oxford University Press, 1974, p. 737.

⁵ 'The English', Wordsworth is said to have remarked in conversation, 'with their devotion to Aristotle, have but half the truth; a sound philosophy must contain both Plato and Aristotle.' Cited from Old friends: memories of old friends, being extracts from the journals and letters of Caroline Fox, Horace N. Pym (ed.) (1884) in The critical opinions of William Wordsworth, Markham L. Peacock, Jr (ed.), Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1950, p. 76.