


THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO



# BRITISH ROMANTICISM

---

*Edited by Stuart Curran*




*The Cambridge Companion to  
British Romanticism*

---

*Edited by* STUART CURRAN

*Department of English, University of Pennsylvania*



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Victoria 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1993

First published 1993

Printed in Great Britain at the University Press, Cambridge

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data*

The Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism / edited by Stuart Curran.  
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 33355 5 (hardback). – ISBN 0 521 42193 4 (paperback)

1. English literature – 19th century – History and criticism.

2. English literature – 18th century – History and criticism.

3. Romanticism – Great Britain. I. Curran, Stuart.

PR457.C33 1993

820.9'145 – dc20

92-8861

CIP

ISBN 0 521 33355 5 hardback

ISBN 0 521 42193 4 paperback

## Contributors

MARSHALL BROWN, University of Washington  
MARILYN BUTLER, University of Cambridge  
STUART CURRAN, University of Pennsylvania  
P.M.S. DAWSON, University of Manchester  
MORRIS EAVES, University of Rochester  
WILLIAM KEACH, Brown University  
GARY KELLY, University of Alberta  
DAVID SIMPSON, University of Colorado, Boulder  
PETER THORSLEV, University of California, Los Angeles  
TIMOTHY WEBB, University of Bristol

## Preface

The forty years in Great Britain from 1785 to 1825, the period generally construed as the age of Romanticism, saw a crucial transition between an Enlightenment world view and the values of modern, industrial society. So different to a contemporary apprehension are those two cultures that we might resort to Shelley's claims for Dante, as a "bridge thrown over the stream of time, which unites the modern and ancient world," to characterize this age that spanned them. It was a turbulent period at whose center lies the longest experience of warfare – twenty-two years – in modern history, warfare conducted on a world scale. Although the counterrevolutionary and Napoleonic wars were all too real, leaving Europe exhausted and (except for Great Britain) bankrupt, they might stand as well as a metaphor for an age of conflict, stress, and tumult.

There was a day when scholars of the literature of this period sought for safe categories to resolve its instabilities, even when, like Arthur Lovejoy, they had to resort to a patent stretching of terms that would allow for conjoining "Romanticisms" rather than rely on a singular definition for the age. But as the currents of traditional literary criticism and scholarship in recent years have drawn increasing sophistication from new philosophical and historical inquiries, the problem of contemporary definition has been exacerbated – or perhaps rendered obsolete. The convenient labels by which critics sought to untrouble the roiling waters of actuality have grown more and more irrelevant to the true historical situation, or (which is to say much the same thing) they have seemed rather a falsification than explanation of the nature of the age.

The present volume affords an opportunity not for a consolidation of outmoded categories but a reassessment, a rethinking, of essential terms. If the aesthetics and history of the time reveal a similar preoccupation with process rather than completion, of skeptical explorations over dogmatic assurances, of multivalent instead of unitary modes of thought, then it follows that a criticism representing the main concerns of the age needs to be

conducted along dialectical lines that honor rather than resolve into simple formula the tensions responsible for its dynamic energies. This volume is a collaborative effort of an international panel of distinguished scholars who have sought to give English-speaking students, whatever their culture or level of training, a coherent access to the historical roots, the intellectual ferment, and the cultural range of the Romantic age without sacrificing its diversity and even its salutary contradictions. At the intersection of competing philosophical traditions, of political and class divisions, of emergent gender distinctions, of high and low and sacred and profane cultures, of battles of the books (prose and poetry, fiction and history), and contested claims among the arts, the literature of this age – the incomparable literature of Romanticism – reflects the tensions that attend and often empower its creation. The authors recognize that this book will most often be turned to by students of the six great poets who dominate the modern canon (Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, and Keats); but they are also well aware that newer voices, novelists and women authors particularly, are increasingly resonant in our classrooms as in our historical perspective. By giving space to those relatively unregarded now the volume at once testifies to the literary riches of the age and encourages readers to explore them further on their own.

# Contents

|    |                                                            |                |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
|    | <i>List of illustrations</i>                               | <i>page ix</i> |
|    | <i>List of contributors</i>                                | <i>xi</i>      |
|    | <i>Preface</i>                                             | <i>xiii</i>    |
| 1  | Romanticism, criticism and theory<br>DAVID SIMPSON         | I              |
| 2  | Romanticism and Enlightenment<br>MARSHALL BROWN            | 25             |
| 3  | Poetry in an age of revolution<br>P. M. S. DAWSON          | 48             |
| 4  | German Romantic Idealism<br>PETER THORSLEV                 | 74             |
| 5  | Romanticism and language<br>WILLIAM KEACH                  | 95             |
| 6  | Culture's medium: the role of the review<br>MARILYN BUTLER | 120            |
| 7  | Romantic Hellenism<br>TIMOTHY WEBB                         | 148            |
| 8  | Women readers, women writers<br>STUART CURRAN              | 177            |
| 9  | Romantic fiction<br>GARY KELLY                             | 196            |
| 10 | Romantic poetry: why and wherefore?<br>STUART CURRAN       | 216            |

viii      *Contents*

|    |                                        |     |
|----|----------------------------------------|-----|
| II | The sister arts in British Romanticism |     |
|    | MORRIS EAVES                           | 236 |
|    | <i>Chronology</i>                      | 271 |
|    | <i>Bibliography</i>                    | 285 |
|    | <i>Index</i>                           | 297 |



## Illustrations

|               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |            |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 3.1           | "The Beast as described in the Revelations Resembling Napoleon Buonaparte," engraving, 1808 by Sauley and Rowlandson. By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.                                                                                     | page<br>61 |
| 3.2           | "Boney's meditations on the Island of St Helena, or The Devil addressing the Sun," engraving, 1815 by George Cruikshank. By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.                                                                                  | 62         |
| 6.1           | Summary of the <i>Edinburgh Review</i> contents pages.                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 134-5      |
| 11.1          | William Blake, <i>Jerusalem</i> , plate 81 (copy D), relief etching, c. 1804-20. The Houghton Library, Harvard University.                                                                                                                                     | 241        |
| 11.2 a and b. | William Blake, <i>Jerusalem</i> , plate 81 (copy D), and corresponding text from David V. Erdman, ed., <i>The Complete Poetry and Prose of William Blake</i> , newly revised edn. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), pp. 238-9. | 244-5      |
| 11.3          | Pietro Martini after J.H. Ramberg, <i>The Exhibition of the Royal Academy, 1787</i> , engraving, 1787. By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.                                                                                                    | 250        |
| 11.4          | Francesco Bartolozzi, engraved ticket of admission to the 1791 exhibition of Copley's <i>Siege of Gibraltar</i> (facsimile of ticket by unidentified artist). By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.                                             | 252        |
| 11.5          | William Blake, <i>The Portland Vase</i> , engraving for Erasmus Darwin's <i>The Botanic Garden</i> part 1, <i>The Economy of Vegetation</i> , 1791. Collection of Robert N. Essick.                                                                            | 255        |
| 11.6          | S. Rawle, <i>View of the Shakespeare Gallery</i> , etched frontispiece to the <i>European Magazine</i> vol. 46, 1804. By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.                                                                                     | 258        |
| 11.7          | William Woollett after Benjamin West, <i>The Death of General</i>                                                                                                                                                                                              |            |

|      |                                                                                                                         |     |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| x    | <i>List of illustrations</i>                                                                                            |     |
|      | <i>Wolfe</i> , engraving, 1776. By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.                                    | 260 |
| 11.8 | James Gillray, <i>Design for the Naval Pillar</i> , etching, 1800. By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum. | 263 |

## I Romanticism, criticism and theory

THE terms of my title will probably seem to some readers rather bland, to others inevitably contentious. *Romanticism* has functioned as a period term, with somewhat different limits in different countries, and its use has led to a tradition of attempts at defining what it is, or what is most central to it. *Criticism* tends to pass us by as an unassuming description of what we do if we teach or study literature in universities, while *theory* is one of those terms that has caused arguments in seminars and tantrums at dinner parties. But criticism is by no means an innocent term, nor need theory always bite in the way that its bark has seemed to promise, if indeed it bite at all.

So it may be as well to begin with some working definitions – not trenchant specifications of exclusive or exact definitions of these terms, but loose explanations of what I mean by them, and of how they will function in the following pages. By *Romanticism* I mean, very roughly, the writings of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, sharing a general historical situation but not necessarily held together by any essential or prescriptive characteristics. Literary critics and historians have traditionally posited such characteristics in a manner allowing them to distinguish between what is more or less “romantic,” early and late romantic, pre- and postromantic, highly or antiromantic. Such usages are seldom consistent, and have mostly been employed to justify one set of preferences over others according to some standard or other of exemplary historicity.

By *criticism* I mean the practice of writing about literature, which became gradually professionalized, and professionalized in different ways, between the publication of *The Spectator* and that of *PMLA*. Eighteenth-century critics like Addison and Johnson were commonly men of letters or journalists. Their modern successors tend to hold jobs as university and college teachers. But “criticism” has never lost its associations of gifted amateurism and spontaneity, so that its exponents have largely not adhered to explicit or self-imposed standards of logical and philosophical coherence or methodological self-consciousness. Some criticism does indeed do this, and

when it does, it takes on some of the characteristics commonly associated with *theory*. Hence we get literary or critical theory, which attempts either to do or to discuss criticism or literature according to a clear set of principles or general categories. The theorist will usually and reasonably make the claim that all criticism functions by way of some theory or other, some set of principles, whether or not it recognizes or admits them. The critics, reciprocally, may espouse or disavow the claims and aspirations of theory. And theory may also claim to be an activity unto itself, a form of argument and inquiry that need not be referred “back” to literature or to criticism, because it maintains its own rules and its own particular ambitions, whether formal or referential.

The coexistence within modern English departments of criticism and theory, and of their various subdivisions – criticism against theory, literary theory, theories of criticism and of literature, and so on – helps to explain some of the powerful passions that arise around questions of theory in relation to the teaching of literature. And the role of the various constructions of Romanticism in the articulation of these relations has been significant. Generally speaking, until relatively recently, Romanticism has served literary criticism as an ally in its disciplinary habit of downplaying or denying the usefulness of theory. This tradition has been stronger in Britain than in America, as we shall see. But it has a lively existence throughout the anglophone cultures, where the Romantic poets (along with Shakespeare) have done yeoman’s service as recycled opponents of rational thought, analytical precision, and systematic speculation – all those habits we think of as described by “theory.” Alternatively, they have been proffered as exponents of the opposite virtues of passionate sensibility, human and humanitarian warmth, and lifelike confusion; of nature over culture, country over city, and spontaneity over premeditation.

It is easy to argue that this is merely an uninformed understanding of Romantic writing, a reductive “Romanticism,” but it is one which has been powerfully legitimated by some of the most influential twentieth-century literary critics, and it continues to play its part in the hostilities that commence at regular intervals over the place of theory in the humanities. And there were indeed important emphases within Romantic writing itself arguing against the aspirations of systematic or speculative thought, and thus against theory. Even before the French Revolution, the British tradition had for a century and a half been belligerently *empiricist*. The Restoration of 1660 brought with it a visible increase in the rhetoric of national identity, wherein being properly British involved a commitment to common sense, to an ethic of compromise, and to a respect for special circumstances rather

than an adherence to general rules. France was the historic enemy throughout the eighteenth century, in both military and cultural terms, so that the French were commonly demonized as the bearers of an adverse national character, one typified by a schizophrenic and unpredictable oscillation between extremes of passionate sensibility and cold-hearted logicity. Frenchmen were either inhumane philosophers or all-too-human libertines. They lacked the British disposition to sail comfortably with the winds of change, making up rules only as they were needed and discarding them as soon as they got in the way.

The events of 1789 and after only emphasized the already dominant ideology of the British national character in its happy contradiction of the French. Descartes had not sent people to the guillotine; he was, in the standard British mythology, merely a misguided intellectual with an obsessive respect for simplicity. Robespierre and his kind were much more dangerous; backed by a falsely propositional series of constitutions, they used theory for tyranny and murder and invented a logic for sheer cruelty. In perceived contrast, the glory of the British constitution came to consist in its having no theory, in its being the gradual and patient accumulation of practice and precedent, in its being, above all, unwritten. This is the "constitution" that Edmund Burke championed as peculiarly and fortunately British. To most undecided observers Tom Paine and the radicals, with their liking for propositions and for written laws, must have looked all too French. Arthur Young, in remarkably prescient phrasing, was quite typical of the British mainstream in his condemnation of "French theory" and his reliance "merely on experience."<sup>1</sup>

It is within this context of nationalist rhetoric, wherein those associated with a belief in the powers of theory (the radicals and the democrats) were unable to compete successfully for recognition as "patriots," that we must understand the profile that students and historians of literature have taken to be typically Romantic. For those involved in the profession of literature generally chose not to align themselves with theory, even when they sought alliances with radical politics. That is, if they placed themselves in opposition to the ruling interests, as many of them did, they yet tended to stay away from the kinds of affirmations of theory that would have marked them as in some obvious way "unEnglish." Even a visibly radical poet like Blake had little time for what we would now recognize as theory. In the largely negative figure of Urizen he critiques the overestimation of system and stability as

<sup>1</sup> Arthur Young, *The Example of France a Warning to Britain* (Dublin, 1793), pp. 79, 3. For an extended account of the British disposition against theory, see my *Romanticism, Nationalism, and the Revolt Against Theory* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992).

inhibitions on the free expression of bodily and spiritual energy. Regularity, symmetry and predictability are not virtues in Blake's bible, but the tools of tyrants and oppressors. Shelley, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Keats and their contemporaries take quite complicated positions on the status and implications of systematic thought, but the general drift of their respective evaluations of theory, in the sense here intended, is negative. So, just as Blake tells us that exuberance and not formality is beauty, so Wordsworth tells us that we murder to dissect, and Keats that philosophy will clip an angel's wings. Cobbett, who did successfully identify himself as a patriotic radical, began his career as a violent francophobe; and John Clare, who certainly felt the value of the rights of man, had no faith in grand theory or French constitutions. Byron and the mature Shelley, who did not hate the French, were not rationalists. Only Coleridge, among those writers who remain familiar to us today, dabbled much in what we now call theory. But he did so with explicitly conservative intentions, and the complexity of his attempt to establish a theory for the existing conventions of church and state and for a Christian rather than a rationalist culture results not a little from its going against the grain of a tradition whereby the theoretical mode had been generally recognized as the dialect of a radical-democratic philosophy.

The resulting myth of theory in nineteenth-century Britain was, then, that it was either pernicious, in the manner of Paine, or incomprehensible, in the manner of Coleridge. The other major example of visibly theoretical work, that instanced by Bentham and the Utilitarians, was variously felt by its opponents to be *both* pernicious and incomprehensible. Moreover the liberal reformers who did find in Benthamism a critical articulation of their ideals and concerns were social scientists and civil servants rather than men or women of letters. The Benthamites were generally hostile to the language of fiction and fantasy, which they saw (as had some of the French philosophers) as the rhetoric of a mystified social discipline; thus they were not kind to the claims of literature.

For these reasons, among others, the most authentically "English" literature (and this was the preferred term, rather than "British") came to be more and more defined as that which was most resistant to theoretical epitome and to the language of theory in general. Shakespeare was, as he has often remained, the titan of the national literature, and his qualities were felt most of all to consist in particularity of characterization and faithfulness to human variety – precisely the things that "theory" must fail to acknowledge in its search for common principles and general truths. Even Milton, a doctrinally saturated and even occasionally dogmatic genius, had been reconstructed by a tradition of eighteenth-century criticism as the exponent

of a very British<sup>1</sup> sublime. *Paradise Lost* was denarrativized, doctrinally deprogrammed, and depoliticized, and made provocative simply of a heightened reader response. According to Addison and others like him, we tremble but do not think too hard as we read or hear the poem's great passages; they overpower us emotionally but do not exercise us intellectually.

This consensus about the national literary character was already in place before the French had their revolution and the Romantics wrote their poems. Those professing to write literature thus found themselves with a readership already predisposed against the French and against any positive estimation of systematic analysis. This readership, furthermore, was less and less dominated by university-trained men of letters, and more and more tenanted by women and by men of the middle ranks. Correspondingly, more and more women writers were appearing in the literary marketplace. The demographic feminization of that marketplace only served to reinforce the discursive feminization already represented by literature's refusal of logicity and system, traditionally masculinized attributes though disputed as such by Mary Wollstonecraft among others. The familiar and traditional view of Romanticism as privileging emotion, intuition and spontaneity should be understood as a gendered as well as a literary-political construction. Reciprocally, the attempts made by Wordsworth and others to restrain the power of spontaneity (always, remember, best recollected in *tranquillity*), must also be read as attempts at the partial remasculinization of literature.

But not, of course, to the point of *theory*. The identification of literature the Romantics inherited and in which they themselves participated was both extended and further simplified by their successors, the critics and commentators who looked to literature for inspiration and, more and more, for solace, for an emotionally gratifying respite from the rigors of a mechanized world. John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography* provides a classic statement of the revolt (stimulated indeed by a reading of Wordsworth) against utilitarian mental discipline and the ethic of use-value. Mill, writing in 1869–70, recalls his reading of Wordsworth (in 1828) as commencing casually, with no expectation of "mental relief." He had found nothing appealing in Byron, whose cynical and worldly temperament seemed too close to the very side of himself he was trying to escape, and indeed nothing in Wordsworth's own *Excursion* (a judgment shared by most subsequent readers). But in the lyric and miscellaneous poems of Wordsworth, Mill felt himself aroused by "the power of rural beauty" and by a synthesis of "thought coloured by feeling." He found here a literature which, he thought, had "no connexion with struggle or imperfection" and demonstrated a "permanent happiness in

tranquil contemplation," a happiness sufficiently powerful to affect even those trained in "the most confirmed habit of analysis."<sup>2</sup>

Mill professed to admire Wordsworth's synthesis of thought and feeling, rather than any displacement of the one by the other. But Matthew Arnold's rewriting of this relation was to prove much more typical of the critical tradition that grew up around Romanticism. Arnold wanted to encourage the reading of poetry as "in itself it really is," without the contamination of either a "historic" or a "personal estimate." For him, it is a mistake to value a poem because of its historically informative qualities and merely because of its place in some sequence of writers and writings, as it is also a mistake to derive critical estimations from what we each happen to like. A test of quality must be applied, but it cannot be a theoretically deduced or formulated standard: we must rely, instead, on "tact," which is an intuitive faculty developed by the habitual contemplation of the best passages in the best writings.<sup>3</sup> This is Arnold's famous "touchstone" method, which is never explained in terms other than those of self-evidence: if we are properly trained and attuned, we know quality when we see it.

The passages offered for the cultivation of this tact are always short, often just a line or two. Unsurprisingly, then, the preface to his edition of Wordsworth declares a clear preference for the "shorter pieces" over the longer poems, which are often "flat and dull." Arnold finds that the "philosophy" in Wordsworth is mostly an "illusion"; Wordsworth is not the poet of the intellect but, once again, of nature and of the feelings (*Essays*, pp. 96, 105). Where Mill admired thought *and* feeling, Arnold places feeling over thought. In distinguishing the good in Wordsworth from the bad and the boring, Arnold rewrites the poet's own editorial categories. His three categories of "Lyrical Poems," "Sonnets," and "Reflective and Elegiac Poems" include all but thirty-one of the one hundred and sixty-eight poems in the 1879 edition. Wordsworth, who declared himself (in the preface to the 1807 *Poems*) ashamed to have no substantial long poem to publish, thus became for Arnold the genius of the short lyric.

But Arnold may here have been responding to as much as creating the popular taste. F. T. Palgrave's *Golden Treasury* had been immensely popular, going through twenty-three printings and editions (four printings in the first year) between 1861 and 1888. Palgrave offered the Romantics as the summation of English poetry, and the lyrics as the essence of Romanticism. He

<sup>2</sup> John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, ed. John M. Robson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989), pp. 120–2.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew Arnold, "The Study of Poetry," in *Essays in Criticism, Second Series* (1888; reprinted, London: Macmillan, 1935), pp. 5, 14; hereafter cited as *Essays*.



gave the Romantics half his volume, as much as the rest of English poetry put together. Among the Romantics Wordsworth again dominated, half the poems selected being his.<sup>4</sup> Arnold and Palgrave together thus seem to instance a profile in popular taste (or its creation) characterized by the predominance of Wordsworth among the Romantics, and of the lyric in Wordsworth's writings. The lyric has always been associated with the easeful, the spontaneous, and the occasional. In other words, it is as far as it is possible to be from the narrativized coherence or expository ambition that might verge on "theory." Walter Pater also rendered Wordsworth as a natural rather than an intellectual being. He saw in him the "true forerunner of the deepest and most passionate poetry of our day," discovering a life-affirming spontaneity quite at odds with the "sickly thought" and "excess of seriousness" he found in Coleridge. The true humanist, for Pater, could never "weep" over the failure of a "theory" or a "philosophical formula" or attempt, as Coleridge misguidedly did, to "reclaim the world of art as a world of fixed laws."<sup>5</sup>

The discipline of literary criticism evolving in the universities at the turn of the twentieth century did not refer to Palgrave for any serious inspiration: the *Golden Treasury* was, after all, a symptom of exactly the kind of popular taste that the university study of literature set out consciously to displace in its hostility to belle-lettrism and to the "stock response" (as I. A. Richards called it). In his preface Palgrave invoked as his standard of judgment the "general verdict of popular fame." This could never do for an intellectual subculture anxious to establish its own specialist credentials as well as its potential for the cleaning up of contemporary culture. But a number of Palgrave's priorities found their analogues in the more sophisticated formulations of the professional critics and their respectably intellectual predecessors. Palgrave admired those poems that turned "on some single thought, feeling, or situation" and sought his standard of excellence "rather in the Whole than in the Parts" (*Golden Treasury*, preface). These are neo-Coleridgean values, or rather simplifications of Coleridge's interest in a poetry that could recompose difference *into* unity and exercise the adverting mind with the process of composition itself. Both Palgrave and Coleridge were concerned with the elaboration of a distinctly British or "English" national consciousness, though at quite different levels of subtlety and complexity.

<sup>4</sup> The proportions are interesting. Forty-two of Wordsworth's poems are included, as against thirty-three of Shakespeare's, twenty-two of Shelley's, eleven each of Keats and Milton, eight by Byron, two by Coleridge, and only one by Blake (and this not in the first edition). The preface to *The Golden Treasury* (1888), hereafter cited, is unpaginated.

<sup>5</sup> Walter Pater, *Appreciations: With an Essay on Style* (London and New York: Macmillan, 1895), pp. 63, 68, 74.