The Relationship between Romantic Poetry Composition, New Reading Ethnics, and Publishing System

英国浪漫主义诗歌创作与新的阅读伦理和出版体制关系研究

张 鑫 /著

中国科学技术大学出版社

浙江省哲学社会科学规划课题成果

The Relationship between Romantic Poetry Composition, New Reading Ethnics, and Publishing System

英国浪漫主义诗歌创作与新的阅读伦理和出版体制关系研究

张 鑫 /著

中国科学技术大学出版社

内 容 简 介

本书分别从英国浪漫主义时期新的“阅读伦理”形成的社会角度，出版制度变更的政治角度，以及“写为后世”的创作心理角度出发，通过文史结合、定性与定量结合的方法，着力研究新的阅读伦理观和不同的出版体制对经典浪漫主义诗人诗歌创作的重大影响，分析他们的作品和理论中深受阅读伦理和出版制度影响的决定性显现，从而达到拓宽浪漫主义研究思路，提出新的创作成因之说的目的。

本书适合相关文学研究者和外国文学爱好者阅读，也可供文学专业研究生拓宽视野、获得新鲜文史材料与研究视点使用。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

英国浪漫主义诗歌创作与新的阅读伦理和出版体制关系研究：英文/张鑫著. —合肥：中国科学技术大学出版社，2014.11

ISBN 978-7-312-03633-0

Ⅰ. 英… Ⅱ. 张… Ⅲ. 浪漫主义—诗歌创作—研究—英国—英文 Ⅳ. I561.072

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2014)第 255179 号

出版 中国科学技术大学出版社
安徽省合肥市金寨路 96 号，230026
http://press.ustc.edu.cn
印刷 安徽省瑞隆印务有限公司
发行 中国科学技术大学出版社
经销 全国新华书店
开本 710 mm×1000 mm 1/16
印张 18.75
字数 357 千
版次 2014 年 11 月第 1 版
印次 2014 年 11 月第 1 次印刷
定价 36.00 元

前　言

在当今文学理论层出不穷、文本解读大量涌现的时代里，“浪漫主义研究”依然是一个极富挑战性但从不缺乏吸引力的课题。作为一种文学研究中的“显学”，国内外英国浪漫主义的研究一直呈现比较蓬勃壮观的局面。新世纪以来，国内的英国浪漫主义研究基本呈现以下几个宏观模式：第一个也是最主要的研究模式是个案研究，即对个体诗人或独立文本的研究。其中对六大浪漫主义诗人的研究呈现出极不均衡的现象。华兹华斯研究约占 40%，济慈研究约占 30%，剩余 4 位约占 30%。第二是比较研究模式，即对英国浪漫主义诗人之间的对比，以及对英国浪漫主义诗人与中国诗人之间的对比。前者的对比主要集中在华兹华斯与济慈、雪莱与拜伦上；后者的比较主要集中在华兹华斯与陶渊明、济慈与陆机和李贺、雪莱与郭沫若和徐志摩等方面上。第三是生态研究模式，主要是将浪漫主义诗人的诗歌和诗论与当前的生态理论相联系，解读他们的生态思想、主张和时代意义。第四是综合研究模式，即将英国浪漫主义作为一个整体或运动来进行综合评述。20 年来，国内英国浪漫主义研究势头未减、成果较丰，并有一定的长期性和持久性。但是将浪漫主义诗歌的发展与当前备受国外学者关注的阅读伦理、出版制度和创作外在化理论联系起来的研究依然寥寥无几，对英国浪漫主义研究的视阈和方法上亟待新的突破和发现。

国外对英国浪漫主义的研究不论是主题挖掘的深度和广度，还是研究方法的多样性方面均超过了国内。自从弗兰西斯·杰弗里(Francis Jeffrey)于 1802 年在《爱丁堡评论》(*Edinburgh Review*)上发表论骚塞的《毁灭者塔拉巴》(*Thalaba, the Destroyer*)算起，英语世界的英国浪漫主义研究迄今为止已经走过了 200 多年的历史。这期间，各种研究可谓汗牛充栋，不胜枚举。这也使得许多后来者背负沉重的“影响的焦虑”，并有望而生畏、无所适从之感。但是仔细分析 200 多年来的研究史可以发现，林林总总的研究背后依然存在清晰可辨的宏观模式。国外英国浪漫主义研究的基本脉络遵循了以下几大主导范式：政治—历史范式、内在性范式、解构主义的语言范式和新历史主义的话语权利范式。而且这几大主导范式研究基本与近现代西方文艺理论的发展是同步的。尽管对于浪漫主义研究中著名的“雅努斯”难题，这些范式并未能提供圆满的解答，但都在他们提出的理论与方法上做出了巨大贡献；在给后世带来“影响的焦虑”的同时，也带来了极大的参考与借鉴价值，同时为现代主义、后现代主义视野中英国浪漫主义研究的新范式留下了拓展空间。

随着对浪漫主义研究的加深和拓宽，近年来国外英国浪漫主义研究开始有了

新的转向。这些研究在参考前期相关成果的同时又独辟蹊径，力图走出自己的浪漫主义研究新路，其中比较引人注目的便是将英国在19世纪作为“阅读之邦”的事实、当时政府的出版制度和新兴的阅读大众所带来的阅读伦理引入对英国浪漫主义的研究视阈，并产生了许多新的研究成果。这些研究初步探讨了崭新的阅读伦理、变换的出版制度与英国浪漫主义诗人创作思维转变等方面纷呈复杂的关系。总的看来，国外相关研究具有以下特点：学术背景的国际化，学术视野的宽泛化，理论方法的糅合化和学术成果的后现代性。研究的问题涉及阅读的兴起及其后果、版权制度的发展与经典形成、阅读习惯与作品流行、盗版对诗歌发展的影响等。但是这些研究大都具有为论证某种观点和视角而先期形成的特点，带有较强的主观性和浓厚的相对主义色彩。诸多繁复的统计数字背后，充斥着对个体诗人在阅读伦理与出版制度影响下创作之维的简单描述，并未就鲜明时代背景下的整体发展做系统研究。

19世纪英国浪漫主义的众声喧哗基本是通过六大诗人的喉管发出的。但如果就此认定英国浪漫主义诗歌发展中“经典诗人”与“流行作品”之间可以画等号，那就犯了“手拿孤例，横扫天下”之嫌。传统诗歌研究将英国浪漫主义诗歌发展全部归结为诗人个体的“内在化”声音，也是没有考察时代背景和兼顾文化、历史因素的结果。英国浪漫主义时期的“经典”只是对文学价值的一种判断，而非畅销书名单，“名声”不代表读者认可，出版支出也不与销售数量成正比。不同诗人由于对当时正在兴起的阅读大众的“阅读伦理”和变化剧烈的出版制度认识的差异，将在很大程度上影响了他们作品的流行，从而对他们是否最终跻身经典诗人之列产生巨大影响。在当今呼唤个性、呼吁多元文化的学术领域，将客观历史文化背景与诗人主观意识相联系，从一个更高更新的视野来研究英国浪漫主义诗歌的发展，应该具有一定的理论意义和运用价值。

在这种宏观与微观学术背景和个人学术创作的意愿下，本书的作者在丰富的历史研究基础上，深度探讨了经典生成的影响因素，在对英国浪漫主义研究做整体分析的同时，试图把握史上这场最具影响力的文学文化运动嬗变和发展动态，以信服的史料和理论努力正本清源。在研究方法的选择上，作者利用交叉学科和跨学科综合研究的方法，扩大研究范围和视野，将“阅读之邦”的崛起、阅读大众读书习惯的变更以及出版制度的变化等历史、社会背景引入本书的讨论之中，希冀在当今“读图时代”或“经典代读时代”为人们划清“流行作家”与“经典作家”的区别提供些许理论依据，以利于澄清当前人们对经典形成的错误认识，并为推动真正意义上的“读典”活动做理论支持。

张鑫

2014年5月于金华

Contents

Introduction

This book is a long-awaited, time-consuming, but not labor-lost attempt contributing to the new findings in the field of the British Romanticism study with the relationship between romantic poetry compositions, new reading ethnics, and publishing system at the core. With the ongoing powerful academic study shifting to such buzz theories prefixing with "post-", "neo-", "anti-", or "super", any research on romanticism, ambitious or modesty, will become quite risky. As one of the greatest waves in the evolution of western literature, British Romanticism has no pressing worry to be forgotten or elbowed out both in the worldwide academic community and in any separate country. No matter what forthcoming theories will be employed in the study of British Romanticism, its time-honored quality and universally acknowledged influence will sustain and be appreciated for generations. The alternatives and disintegration in the study of British Romanticism do not bespeak the weakening of its momentum but reflect the booming development in the new millennium. Breaching the study of romanticism from epoch-making perspectives does not mean any academic offensive. One hundred schools' contending may result in a historical blossoming in this field. Academically and conventionally, a study of British Romanticism should be carried out in an unexhausted survey of its commencement and research history.

The study of romantic poetry does not necessarily mean to undertake a profound and extensive study of Romanticism. But it is indispensable to any definition of Romanticism under the circumstance of reader-friendly academic status quo. "Romanticism" is a notoriously difficult term to define. When scholars of the literature of this period sought for quite safe categories to resolve its instabilities, they all had no alternatives but "had to resort to a patent stretching of terms that would allow for conjoining 'Romanticism' rather than rely on a singular definition for the age". ① The term itself resists historical or social confinement every bit as much as it deflects assignment of its definitive

① Stuart Curran. *British Romanticism*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001, xiii.

qualities. The first rub to define Romanticism falls on the division of time or the definition of date. There have been no incontestable dates with which to delimit Romanticism as a period; neither is there any one controlling idea that informs Romanticism as concept. It is often defined in terms of its historical period but the exact dating if this period is a matter of some dispute. Integral to nearly every account of Romanticism, however, is the conviction that its poetry is somehow or another essential to its definition.

Some generally established treatises put forward to their own definitions of date on Romanticism, which may be taken as normative references. According to *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, "following a widespread practice of historians of English literature, we shall denote by the 'Romantic period' the span between the year 1795, the midpoint of the decade in which Samuel Johnson died and Blake and Burns published their first poems, and 1830, by which time the major writers of the earlier century were either dead or no longer productive."① *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* puts its definition of date as follows: "In Britain, a stark contrast appears between representative works of the preceding Augustan age and those of leading figures in what became know as the Romantic movement or 'Romantic Revival' in the period from about 1780 to about 1848 (the 'Romantic period')."② Chris Baldick's division of time is quite vague: "...that dominated much of European culture in the first half of the 19th century... as it emerged in the 1790s in Germany and Britain".③ Stuart Curran takes "the forty years in Great Britain from 1785 to 1825" as the "age of Romanticism".④ Jerome McGann personally regards the poetry from 1785 to 1832 as Romantic poetry.⑤

The difficulty in defining Romantic period does not hinder the universal acceptance of Romantic poetry as the privileged site for the entry of critical theory into literary studies. Although challenged in the second half of the 19th

① M. H. Abrams (ed.). *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 6th ed. New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993, 1.

② Margate Drabble. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005, 871.

③ Chris Baldick. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2000, 193.

④ Stuart Curran. *British Romanticism*. xiii.

⑤ See Carl Woodring and James Shapiro (eds.). *The Columbia History of British Poetry*. Columbia: Columbia UP, 2005, 353-379.

century by the rise of realism and naturalism, Romantic poetry has in some ways maintained a constant presence in Western literature, providing the basis for some schools and movements from the Pre-Raphaelites and Symbolists to expressionism and surrealism. Romantic poetry that Cleanth Brooks and the New Critics read as the finest expression of their privileged category of "ambiguity" exemplified for William Wimsatt the intimate and ennobling exchange between mind and nature that inherited in the Romantic image. For the great literary figures as M. H. Abrams, the same body of writing has once provided and will still provide classifications of the "greater Romantic lyric" and the "correspondent breeze", as well as the comprehensive understanding of Romantic poetry as a template of "natural supernaturalism".① The poetry in Romantic period that made possible Geoffrey Hartman's reading of the opposition between the Romantic imagination and nature, the *via naturaliter negative*, was for Paul de Man exemplary of the rhetorical indeterminacy that characterized the "literariness" of poetic language. The same work from the Romantic poetry that Harold Bloom pressured as manifesting his theory of literary "misreading" and the psychology of composition as "internalization" served in turn for Marjorie Levinson and Jerome McGann as the aesthetic elision of an ideological reality. The greatness of "The Gang of Four" in Yale University may have been obscured without the work of the Romantic poetry. Consequently, the New Critics and a certain scholars of cultural studies might have waited longer for their fame and position. Susan Wolfson has apprised the ostensibly naïve formalism of Romantic poetry and been aspired to probe the relation of literary form to ideology under the heading of a renovated and contextualized formalism. It is no exaggerated to confirm that there would be no such resounding names in literary studies without the commencement and recognition of Romantic poetry.

It has been settled to be a common sense rather than a rare case that Romantic poetry should be seriously taken as classics and studied as it is. It is a myth to hold British Romanticism after its birth as a progressive and welcoming literary movement for all generations of scholars. Critical opposition to the

① See M. H. Abrams. "Structure and Style in the Greater Romantic Lyric", 1965, reprinted in Ed. Harold Bloom. *Romanticism and Consciousness*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1970, 201-229; *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature*. New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1971; *The Correspondent Breeze: essays on English Romanticism*. New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1984.

Romantic inheritance, in the name of "classical" ideals, was once advanced by Matthew Arnold in the 1850s, and by some later critics under his influence, including the American scholar Irving Babbitt, whose book *Rousseau and Romanticism* condemned the Romantic movement as an irresponsible "pilgrimage in the void" that has licensed self-indulgent escapism and nationalist aggression.① His student T. S. Eliot pushed the supervisor's negative attitude toward Romantic poetry and continued the anti-Romantic campaign, although Eliot's own poetry, like Arnold's, was nonetheless inescapably 'romantic' in its nostalgia and sense of alienation. As a result, some damage was done by Eliot's disciples to the reputation of Shelley and other Romantic poets, from which they have since at least partially recovered. If the only anti-Romanticism of Eliot's circle was passed without any contextual consideration, the result would be biased. "It seems that Eliot's anti-Romanticism rose out of a strong dissatisfaction with the current state of literature and art." He also suggested, "the only cure for Romanticism is to analyze it."② Eliot's anti-Romanticism complex partly rose from his up-bringing and partly from his academic inheritance. The most influential of all the British critics on English teaching in the schools as well as in the universities, F. R. Leavis also made some causal comments or formal declaration on British Romantics with somewhat disadvantaged suggestions toward them. But Leavis was not an anti-Romantic in nature and in any declared sense. Therefore, any selective abstraction on Leavis would stand out irrationally and non-contextually. The fact that Leavis has made much of the best of Wordsworth could rectify some misunderstandings on Romanticism studies. To some extent, the advocate that Leavis has blackened British Romanticism rose from the assumption that Leavis's strenuous emphasis on a shared "experience" was to disregard any writing that questioned or undermined the image of consensus. Such an advocate has been proved an academic phantom because much British Romantic writing obviously did just this. For example, Leavis could find in Wordsworth a "human normality" and a "preoccupation with sanity and spontaneity".③ To what extent the fairness of Leavis's revaluation has been undermined British Romanticism is a serious

① See Irving Babbitt. *Rousseau and Romanticism*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1991.

② T. S. Eliot. *The Sacred Wood*. London: Faber & Faber, 1920, 31.

③ F. R. Leavis. *Revaluation: Tradition and Development in English Poetry*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967, 137.

question that needs to be answered. Then the less saying of Raymond Williams, the most important British socialist critic, needs more caution and effort to handle. In The Country and the City, where one might have expected a full engagement with the canonical Romanticism, Williams wrote against the grain. His preference laid on Goldsmith, Crabbe, Cobett and Clare rather than Wordsworth, Keats, or Shelley. This shift of attention has surely had the effect of making William's work more ignorable that it deserves to be for those engaged in the research of British Romanticism. Williams's selective narrative technique should not make his investigation of British Romanticism notoriously anti-Romantic. The shift and the revaluation were the natural consequences under the time context where the Romantics have tended to appear as at the center of the national interest.

Not all critics of British Romanticism shared the identical background with Eliot, Leavis, or with Williams and enjoyed their attitudes as well. This typical academic environment with Eliot at the core may be reasonably taken as a miniature in the field of British Romanticism studies. Apart from some sporadic negative comments on British Romanticism, the majority of the criticism in this field has long been positive and inspiring. Only the road to a dominating school remains time-consuming and result-controversial for the plurality of British Romanticism itself.

Dating back to the year of 1920, A. O. Lovejoy, the influential American philosopher, argued that the word Romanticism "offers one of the most complicated, fascinating, and instructive of all problems in semantics".① He continued that we should use the plural term "Romanticisms" rather than refer to a singular Romanticism:

> *The word 'Romantic' has come to mean so many things that, by itself, means nothing. It has ceased to perform the function of a verbal sign. When a man is asked [...] to discuss romanticism, it is impossible to know what tendencies he is to talk about, when they are supposed to have flourished, or in whom they are supposed to be chiefly exemplified.*②

① A. O. Lovejoy. "On the discrimination of Romanticisms". In Ed. M. H. Abrams. *English Romantic Poets: Modern Essays in Criticism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1970, 58.

② A. O. Lovejoy. "On the discrimination of Romanticisms". 66-67.

So many Romanticisms that are available to the modern readers can show the points at which Romantic poets come together and where they diverge. The studies on British Romanticism from the serial reviews of Francis Jeffery appeared from 1802 to 1816 ushered an epoch-making criticism movement on British Romanticism. For romantic scholars and critics, the essential aspect of any study on British Romanticism should lay on the coherence to be found among these writers. The study and reevaluation of British Romanticism does not necessarily mean that any attempt should be ground-breaking or precursor-toppling. But such a belief should be cherished when one takes up the study in this field: it is in their own belief that what they are doing is to explore the newness in the star-studded Romantic writers, "whether this is referring to their new sense of the need for equality and enfranchisement, a new understanding of the role of the poet, a belief in the limitless of science's potential achievements, a new interest in the forgotten and neglected people of society, a new fascination with the dark, unexpected regions of psychological, mysterious and supernatural". ① The seemingly stereotyped and newness-hard-to-find study of British Romanticism should be looked back with horror and hope.

British Romanticism has long been held as an important source for the twentieth-century critics and theories. But the study of British Romanticism has never been interrupted and dissociated. But the attempt to draw a linear and definite outline of the twentieth-century criticism of British Romanticism often proves to be a time-consuming work. In the eighteenth century, critics tended to value and over-value perspicuity and urbanity in poetry. But in the twentieth century, critics shifted to value and over-value concreteness of imaginary, attraction of sensationalism, semantic ambiguity, paradoxes and tensions in Romantic poetry, so Romantic poets' work has amply satisfied these Modernists. Although various paths have been followed and different sounds echoed, a universal recognition of an "integrated British Romanticism" is yet to be established.

Francis Jeffery assumed that British Romanticism was nothing but the consequence of the French Revolution. His romantic study thus followed and rolled this early-set assumption and exerted great impact on the study in this field in the later half of the 19th century. With the publication of Edward Dowden's *The French Revolution and the English Literature*, the first paradigm

① Sharon Ruston. *Romanticism*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2009, 6.

of the study of British Romanticism came into being and almost dominated this field to the end of WW Ⅱ. Irving Babbitt and Jacques Barzun also contributed a lot to this paradigm. ①

Apart from the pavement of the political paradigm, the New Criticism developed, popularized and elaborated by Cleanth Brooks and others ushered another paradigm of the study of British Romanticism. This paradigm shared many of the priorities of the practical criticism, but it operated more conventionally through the close reading of chosen text, which has been regarded as a self-evident and self-sufficient verbal unit. Such New Critics as Brooks has once stated that modern poetry has the every right to question the assumed importance of Romanticism in literary history and declared Shelley to be resistant to irony to function as a model for new poetics. But Brooks later put forward many good things to say of Keats and Coleridge, and never rejected British Romanticism in general. ② With the sweeping momentum of this paradigm in the classes of American universities, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, or Coleridge have become household names both for literary professionals and for common readers.

In the second half of the 20th century, the study of British Romanticism presented varied and rich productions. The consistency with the former study was not completely broken, but the approach was gradually shifted from the pure textual analysis to the internalization-oriented one. In the 1950s Kenneth Muir, Kenneth Allot, and Leonard Unger respectively explored deep into the psychological situations of British Romantic Poets and pointed out the close relation between their inner workings and the exterior surroundings. ③ Harold Bloom's influence study on Romanticism was a very projecting school in the 1960s. He insisted that the imagination and originality of British Romantic Poets come from their creative misreading and therefore self-discovering. ④ Bloom also sensed the origins of modernity in Romanticism: "Modern poetry,

---

① See Irving Babbitt. *Rousseau and Romanticism*. 1991; Edward Dowden, *The French and the English Literature*. London: Kegan Paul, 1897; Jacques Barzun, *Classic, Romantic and Modern*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1962.

② See Cleanth Brooks. *The Well Wrought Urn: Studies in the Structure of Poetry*. New York: Harcourt, 1947.

③ G. S. Frasher (ed.). *John Keats: Odes*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 1985.

④ Harold Bloom. *The Visionary Company: A Reading of English Romantic Poetry*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1961.

in English, is the invention of Blake and Wordsworth." For him, this means the obligation to a strenuous counter-cultural individuality, out of step with nature as well as with culture.① Comparative studies in the period were also fruitful. In order to "examine the literary relationship between Keats and Wordsworth, and to evaluate similarities and differences found in their poetry",② Thora Balslev published his *Keats and Wordsworth: A Comparative Study* in 1962, which was a worthy treatise.

M. H. Abrams and their peers progressively made the political and the New Criticism paradigm of the study of British Romanticism shift to the continuity and emphasis of internalization paradigm with the focus on such elements as aesthetics, religion, linguistics and psychology explored from Romantic poetry in the end of WW Ⅱ. With the booming of the Yale Deconstruction School in the 1970s, the internalization paradigm consequently expanded to the reading with the help of poetic semiotics and pragmatics. All the critics of this school share a sense of the importance of Romanticism and of a comparative method. The concept that Romanticism, especially British Romanticism, is prophetic of an abysmal modernity that leaves poetry operating "under a steady threat of extinction"③ even as it is the only available vehicle of a certain kind of hope could be shared by many scholars of this school. De Man summarized the guiding trope of British Romanticism as an irony built around "distance and difference" and allowing "for no end, for no totality".④ This notion is quite close to the reading principle of deconstruction. Geoffrey Hartman was notoriously known for his post-modern insight of British Romanticism, which brought out a definition and completely demonstrated break with the tradition of romantic poets as healers, and of poets as organic subjects. He argued for the understanding of "problematical self-consciousness" and a "division in the self" in British Romanticism.⑤ With regard to the study

① Harold Bloom. *The Ringers in the Tower: Studies in the Romance Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971, 337.

② Thora Balslev. *Keats and Wordsworth: A Comparative Study*. Copenhagen: Norwegian UP, 1962, 7.

③ Paul de Man. *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1984, 17.

④ Paul de Man. *Blindness and Insight: Essays on the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983, 222.

⑤ Geoffrey Hartman. *Beyond Formalism: Literary Essays, 1958-1970*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1970, 303.

of British Romanticism, the Yale School has created a Romanticism that can no longer be read as it has been interpreted for decades: sole exhortation to and emblem of wise passiveness, oneness with nature, natural supernaturalism, and the bringer of peace to an otherwise tortured modern individual.

Developments of the study of British Romanticism since the 1970s are harder to describe. But an intentionally scientific and acceptable generalization could be made. The 1980s and 1990s have seen the emergence of new approach to the study of British Romanticism powered by historical, political and theoretical concerns. Firstly, in the newly-invigorated historical criticism of Romantic poetry, Keats, Wordsworth, and Shelley have formed the important and rewarding focus. Jerome McGann is both a spokesman and the frontier of this criticism. He once claimed that Keats was a "poet for whom historical analysis—by the virtually unanimous decision of western literary critics—has no relevance whatsoever". ① His essay has encouraged a diversity of critical and theoretical approach to British Romantic poets. In his Romantic treatise *Romantics, Rebels, and Reactionaries* Marilyn Butler determinedly assumed that the important sense evasive of history in British Romantic poems. ② In *Keats's Life of Allegory: The Origins of a Style* and *Wordsworth's Great Period Poems: Four Essays*, Marjorie Levinson adopted a materialist approach to history to deconstruct and rewrite the critical narrative. Whiling taking readers back to the hostile responses Keats contemporary reviews, Levinson constructed Keats's stylistic project as "a social-ego project", an "aggressively literary" writing that is, "in effect, anti-Literature". ③ Some gender-based approaches were also introduced to the study of British Romanticism with Susan J. Wolfson and Margaret Homans as two influential figures. ④

At the turning point of the new century, feminist, cultural materialism, and literary sociology criticisms, with their attentions to hitherto ignored or excluded compositions of literature, construction of genius, and canonization of

---

① Jerome McGann. "Keats and the Historical Method in Literary Criticism". In *Modern Language Notes*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979, 26.

② Marilyn Butler. *Romantics, Rebels, and Reactionaries*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981, 151.

③ Marjorie Levinson. *Keats's Life of Allegory: The Origins of a Style*. Oxford and Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1988, 13.

④ See Susan Wolfson. "Feminizing Keats". In *Critical Essays on John Keats*. Ed. Hermione de Almeida. Oxford : Oxford UP, 1990. Margaret Homans, "Keats Reading Women, Women Reading Keats". In *Studies in Romanticism*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

works, reflect the shifts apparent in the study of the humanities as a whole, and are proving formative of a new British Romanticism. Among these new criticisms, feminist and literary sociology theories and their outputs on British Romanticism exerted great impact upon the revaluation of the paradigm of the study in this field. The feminist romantic study yielded many significant products with their focuses on the major female romantics. ① Another influential engagement with study of British Romanticism commencing at the dawn of the new century is the study of the relationship between Romantic composition and its sociology context, mainly the interwoven influence between the construction of Romantic canons and the great changes of publishing system and reading ethnics. Quite a few of thought-provoking books have been published. ②

Although a large number of papers or monographs on British Romanticism were published in the last decade, there are still no treatises from the perspective of literary sociology and textual research. The present study will advance from the perspectives of the commencement of new publishing system, the making of Great Britain as a reading nation, the configuration of mass reading ethnics, the shared knowledge of Romantics' anxieties, the attitude towards influence, the creative misreading of the precursors and the powerful self-rectification and tries to demonstrate that the shaping and recognition of the time-honored romantic poets, their self-regulations in poetic composition, and their poetic thoughts are not as mysterious as they had been imagined nor as simple as they looked with the hope of broadening the current understanding of British Romanticism, opening up new possibilities for Romanticism research, and making a moderate contribution to the building of theories of canonization as well as reevaluation of the Romantic myth of the inspired poet.

---

① See Meena Alexander. *Women in Romanticism*. Bashingstoke & London: Macmillan Education, 1989; Anne Mellor, *Romanticism and Gender*. New York: Routledge, 1993; Paula Feldman and Theresa Kelley, eds., *Romantic Women Writers: Voices and Countervoices*. Hanover & London: University Press of New England, 1995.

② See Andrew Franta. *Romanticism and the Rise of the Mass Public*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007; Pierre Woudenberg, *Networking Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007; William St. Clair, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004; Lucy Newlyn, *Reading, Writing and Romanticism: The Anxiety of Reception*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000; Andrew Bennett, *Romantic Poets and the Culture of Posterity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Chapter 1

Characteristics and changes of the publishing system