

Romanticism in Historical Perspective

Author(s): Lilian R. Furst

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Jun., 1968), pp. 115-143

Published by: [Penn State University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40467744>

Accessed: 16/02/2012 09:05

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Penn State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Comparative Literature Studies*.

Romanticism in Historical Perspective

LILIAN R. FURST

ABSTRACT

This article gives a chronological survey of the emergence of the Romantic movements in England, France, and Germany. The spread of new ideas is traced from country to country in the successive waves of Romantic writing between 1750 and 1830. The principal aim is to ascertain the correct sequence and historical perspective; for by recognizing that Romanticism was not a simultaneous outburst, but rather a series of distinct upsurges, a sounder basis is established for the exploration of the maze of similarities and differences linking the Romantic movements in Europe. [L. R. F.]

No subject in the whole field of comparative literary studies has provoked as much critical writing as Romanticism. And rightly so, for none indeed so insistently demands, and so richly rewards, a broad approach embracing several literatures. But all the attempts to discern the salient features of European Romanticism, all the arguments as to its fundamental unity or otherwise, and all the tentative definitions seem to be based on the assumption that simultaneous outbursts of Romanticism occurred in various countries about the beginning of the nineteenth century. This was simply not the case: the spread of Romanticism is characterized by curious time lags and unexpected spurts. In fact the movement's external history sheds so much light on its inner nature that a chronological survey, though apparently an elementary exercise in literary history, is a necessary and potentially illuminating preliminary to any fur-

ther discussion. To establish the correct sequence and perspective not only obviates some, at least, of the more common misapprehensions but also creates a sounder base from which to explore the maze of Romantic movements in Europe.

"Une crise de la conscience européenne":¹ this is the succinct and telling phrase chosen by van Tieghem to describe the Romantic movement in Europe. The claim that it was far more than just another literary movement is not based primarily on the sheer extent, the expanse of Romanticism, though it is in fact true that no other literary movement has ever evoked such a wide response throughout Europe. The real significance of Romanticism as a *"crise de la conscience européenne"* lies not in its mere quantity, but in the *quality* of the changes it implied. For Romanticism brought not just a greater freedom and a new technique; these were only the outer manifestations of a complete and deep-seated re-orientation, not to say revolution, in the manners of thought, perception, and consequently of expression too. The nature of this revolution has recently been outlined in vivid terms by Isaiah Berlin who defined it as a "shift of consciousness" that "cracked the backbone of European thought."² That backbone had been the belief in the possibility of a rational comprehension of the universe. When the rationalistic approach was applied to the arts as well as to the emergent physical sciences, it resulted in those rigid pronouncements on the immutable 'rules' of literature that were the bane of Neoclassicism. This dogmatism was first cautiously questioned and then vehemently rejected in the course of the eighteenth century, and finally the old standards were ousted by the Romantics' new criteria and values. In place of the Neoclassical ideals of rationalism, traditionalism, and formal harmony, the Romantics emphasized individualism, imagination, and emotion as their guiding principles. Hence the old 'rules' of 'good taste,' regularity, and conformity gave way to the unbridled creative urge of the original genius, and the ideal of a smooth beauty was scorned in favour of a dynamic outpouring of feeling. A new mode of imaginative perception gave birth to a whole new vocabulary and new forms of artistic expression: this is the essence of that *"crise de la conscience européenne"* which lies at the heart of the Romantic revolution, and this is also perhaps as near an approximation to a definition of Romanticism as is possible. It may not have the neatness of a snappy catchphrase (such as 'the return to nature' or 'the cult of the extinct'), but it is

sufficiently comprehensive and sufficiently plain to serve as a viable working basis.

This reorientation occurred in varying degrees throughout Europe in the latter part of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth centuries. In this sense Romanticism can rightly be regarded as a European phenomenon that can be appreciated in all its implications only by means of a comparative study. Many of the Romantics themselves were well aware of the supranational character of the movement: the brothers Schlegel consciously cherished the notion of a specifically European Romantic literature as part of their striving for an all-embracing 'universal poetry,' and both Coleridge and Novalis hoped for an eventual European reintegration. Perhaps these cosmopolitan tendencies of the Romantics have encouraged critics to seek out the common denominators of the Romantic movements and to overemphasize the similarities between the literatures of various countries. The 'family likeness' which certainly meets the eye can be traced back to the communal ancestry of Romanticism throughout Europe, which springs from one and the same momentous spiritual and intellectual reorientation.

To delve into the origins of this revolution is beyond the scope of this study. The first unmistakable signs of impending change manifested themselves before the middle of the eighteenth century, and in this earliest phase—say 1740 to 1770—it is England that was to the fore. As early as 1742, Young, inspired by personal grief at the death of his daughter and of a friend, published his *Night Thoughts*, which were followed in 1745 by Akenside's *Pleasures of Imagination*. Historically these two works have much in common in that they stand midway between the conventional moralism of the age and a fresh outlook which admits imagination to respectability in poetic practice. Imagination, according to Akenside, "diffuses its enchantment" and makes the soul "to that harmonious movement from without / Responsive":⁸ no very startling claim as yet, but at least a first glimmer of a recognition of the powers of the imagination. The personal melancholy and the funereal cult of the *Night Thoughts* were reiterated in Hervey's *Meditations Among the Tombs* (1746) and Gray's *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard* (1751) with their awareness of the fleetingness and pathos of human life, their preference for darkness, solitude, the evocation of solemn, somber scenes. The slightly moralizing sensibility of the period is as apparent in these poems as in the novels of Richardson and his

imitators. This sensibility was deeply affected by Macpherson's *Fingal* (1762) which, together with Percy's *Reliques* (1765), laid the foundations for the subsequent popularity of supposedly naive folk-poetry, the natural utterances of primitive, spontaneous genius. Macpherson's concoctions, purporting to be a transcription from the ancient bard Ossian, made a particularly strong impression throughout Europe with their highly-coloured intrigues, their gloomy Northern setting, their whole outlandishness, and, above all, their rhythmic prose, which seemed so much more poetic than the poetry of the early eighteenth century:

Star of descending night! fair is thy light in the west! thou liftest thy unshorn head from thy cloud: thy steps are stately on thy hill. What dost thou behold in the plain? The stormy winds are laid. The murmur of the torrent comes from afar. Roaring waves climb the distant rock. The flies of evening are on their feeble wings; the hum of their course is on the field. What dost thou behold, fair light? But thou dost smile and depart. The waves come with joy around thee: they bathe thy lovely hair. Farewell, thou silent beam! Let the light of Ossian's soul arise! ⁴

Alongside Ossian, the other decisive document of English pre-Romanticism, Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759), was of far-reaching import as the herald of the new aesthetics. Some of Young's ideas were, it is true, already current in England among his contemporaries, notably in the discourses of Burke, Thomas and Joseph Warton, and William Sharpe. But never before had these ideas been stated as cogently as in the *Conjectures*; by his clear-sighted distinctions between imitation and originality, the ancients and the moderns, learning and genius, the observation of rules and the energy of the inspired enthusiast, Young was crucial in precipitating the reorientation away from the old accepted notions. Here for the first time, the superiority of the new ideals was proclaimed beyond a shadow of doubt: "An Original may be said to be of a vegetable nature; it rises spontaneously from the vital root of genius; it grows, it is not made: Imitations are often a sort of manufacture, wrought by those mechanics, art and labour, out of pre-existent materials not their own." ⁵ Or again, take the contrast between a "genius" and a "good understanding": "A genius differs from a good understanding, as a magician from a good architect; that raises his structure by means invisible; this by skilful use of common tools. Hence genius has ever been supposed to partake of something divine." ⁶ These two brief examples alone suffice to illustrate the

incisive quality of Young's thinking. Many of the key concepts of Romanticism are already contained in the *Conjectures*, in the prominence given to such words as "original," "genius," "grows," "magician," "divine." There is thus some justification for the contention that "this vast romantic movement was the European reverberation of English eighteenth century romanticism, like the thunder of Alpine re-echoing to a pistol-shot." Many of the essential elements of Romanticism were indeed present in England toward the middle of the eighteenth century: some recognition of the role of the imagination, the emphasis on the original composition of the genius, the cult of sensibility, the vague religious feeling, the melancholy reverie, the interest in 'natural' poetry, the discovery of external nature. But it would be premature to call this anything other than pre-Romanticism, for these were merely trends and beginnings with the stress on the natural—no doubt in reaction against the artificial overrefinement of Neoclassicism—whereas the dominant factor in Romanticism proper was the transfiguring imagination, whose true significance was not yet appreciated.

While this reorientation was progressing rapidly in England, France and Germany were far behind during this initial phase. France was still suffering from the backwash of its glorious Neoclassical age, which continued to overshadow creative writing and to a large extent to stifle innovation. A spirit of enlightenment does pervade at least the early criticism of Diderot, such as the prefaces to his plays *Le fils naturel* (1757) and *Le père de famille* (1758), where he advocates a greater realism; but after this advance towards emotionalism he was, in his later works, to return to the assumptions of the Neoclassical creed. Only Rousseau broke really new ground: his disgust with the social order of the time, based on ownership of land and goods, led him to idealize the primitive state of mankind and to call for the famous return to nature. Important though this was, it was by no means Rousseau's sole contribution to pre-Romanticism; his assimilation of external nature to man's moods in *Les rêveries du promeneur solitaire* and *La nouvelle Héloïse*, his musical prose style, and his spotlight on his ego in his autobiographical writings all plainly foreshadow certain later developments. Rousseau, however, was not understood, at least not in France, until later; meanwhile his most immediate effect was in Germany through the intermediary of Herder, an enthusiastic disciple of Rousseau's,

who transmitted his admiration for Rousseau to the young adherents of the *Sturm und Drang* movement.

In the mid-eighteenth century Germany was in the literary field the most backward of the major European countries; politically disunited and economically disrupted by internal strife, Germany had in the latter half of the seventeenth and the early years of the eighteenth century virtually been lying fallow. A new era began to dawn in the 1730's with the notorious quarrel between the doctrinal rationalist Gottsched and the somewhat less narrow-minded Swiss critics Bodmer and Breitinger, who realized that poetry could not be made according to a set recipe—like a cake—as Gottsched had assumed. Bodmer in 1740 published his *Kritische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie* ("Discourse Concerning the Wondrous Element in Poetry"), the title of which already indicates the progression towards a more fruitful conception of art. The Enlightenment found its most vigorous and wise exponent in Lessing, who savagely attacked the 'frenchified' ("*französierend*") he contemptuously calls it in the seventeenth *Literaturbriefe*) mode of writing favoured by Gottsched. He pleaded instead that German writers should model themselves on the freer products of the English, whose spirit was more akin to their own. Lessing was not the first to turn his gaze towards England; Bodmer and Breitinger had earlier championed and translated Milton, and Klopstock's *Messias* (1748) is patently indebted to *Paradise Lost*. Although Lessing was thus not the first to point towards England, nevertheless his position in Germany was as crucial as, and in some respects comparable to, that of Young in England. For it was Lessing who in his *Literaturbriefe* (1759) and *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767) presented a reasoned and compelling case for the decisive reorientation not only from France to England but also from imitation to original creation, extolling Shakespeare as the supreme creative genius. Herder in his rhapsodic appraisal of Shakespeare and also of Ossian furthered the cult of genius, stimulated no doubt by the German translation of Young's *Conjectures* which appeared in 1760. The vital impetus therefore reached Germany from England, the fountainhead of European pre-Romanticism.

In the second phase, between about 1770 and 1790, this position was reversed, for the ascendancy which had been England's now passed to Germany. Both England and France were in no haste to accept new notions, perhaps because the native literary tradition

was firmly established; in France it tended to exercise a retarding influence—the great ‘battle’ of *Hernani* took place only in the year 1830—while in England the lack of resistance to innovations paradoxically led to their comparatively slow infiltration. Germany, on the contrary, was thirsting for a fresh start after its long period of inertia. So Germany’s very backwardness proved in fact an advantage when the young writers of the *Sturm und Drang* movement, for lack of a strong native tradition, eagerly seized on the stimuli from abroad, and it was they who popularized and propagated the new attitudes throughout Europe.

The essence of the *Sturm und Drang*, whose name was derived from Klinger’s drama of 1776, lay in rebellion against finite restriction in any shape or form—literary, political, or social. This self-assertive rebelliousness was more than the adolescent defiance of a few gifted young men; it arose directly out of the proud conviction of the limitless rights and powers of the divinely-inspired genius. Thus the theories formulated a few years earlier by Young were activated by the *Sturm und Drang* and found living examples in the youthful Goethe and Schiller. All the favourite ideas of the *Sturm und Drang* pivoted on the figure of the truly great, exceptional man; it was his personal experiences and emotions which were to be transformed into art through the creative power of his unbridled imagination. No wonder that the *Sturm und Drang* is often and aptly termed the *Geniezeit* (“Period of Genius”). Incoherent and supremely arrogant though it was, the credo of the *Sturm und Drang* foreshadowed very many of the basic concepts of Romanticism: the belief in the autonomy of the divinely inspired genius, the release of the imagination from the bondage of ‘good taste,’ the primacy of spontaneous and intuitive feeling, the complete freedom of artistic expression, and, finally, the notion of organic growth and development, from which arose both an interest in the past, particularly the Middle Ages, and a new pantheistic vision of nature as part of a unified cosmos. Nor were these ideas to remain mere theories any longer; in the early works of Goethe and Schiller the new mode of perception and expression burst upon a startled Europe. And how immeasurable is the gulf that separates Goethe’s dynamic nature poetry from the pretty lyrics of the preceding generation! Consider the formal, pedestrian description by Brockes in his “Betrachtungen des Mondscheins in einer angeneh-

men Frühlingsnacht" in the 1721 collection *Irdisches Vergnügen in Gott* (note the clumsy titles):

Kaum hatte sich die Nacht zu zeigen angefangen,
Die nach der Hitze Last der Kühlung Lust verhiess,
Als sich ein neuer Tag dem Schein nach sehen liess:
Der volle Mond war aus dem grauen Duft,
Der nach des Tages schwüler Luft
Mit Purpur untermischt den Horizont bedeckte
Wie rötlich Gold nur eben aufgegangen,
Aus dessen wandelbarem Kreise,
Der alles in der Nacht mit Licht und Schimmer füllt,
Mehr Anmut noch als Licht und Schimmer quillt.⁸

Compare these mundane lines with the intensely imaginative, mysteriously intuitive perception of the same scene in Goethe's bewitching "An den Mond":

Füllest wieder Busch und Tal
Still mit Nebelglanz,
Lösest endlich auch einmal
Meine Seele ganz;
Breitest über mein Gefild
Lindernd deinen Blick,
Wie des Freundes Auge mild
Über mein Geschick.⁹

In the face of these two texts, further verbal comment on the revolution wrought by the *Sturm und Drang* becomes superfluous. It was at this time too, in the early 1770's, that the great Romantic prototypes were delineated in the melancholy hero Werther and the insatiable seeker Faust, figures that were to haunt Europe. The impact of *Werther* is already notorious; Goethe became the idol of Europe. The success of Schiller's *Die Räuber* was even more immediate and widespread: in England as well as in France, Schiller was acclaimed with such wild enthusiasm as to trigger a veritable mania for the German theatre, admittedly excessive and short lived. Nevertheless, Goethe and Schiller remained in the eyes of both the English and the French the typical representatives of German Romanticism, and strange though this misconception may at first seem, it is in fact not without some justification. For in the *Sturm und Drang*, the culmination of pre-Romanticism, the first significant breakthrough was achieved, and in this Goethe and Schiller were largely instrumental. With the publication of Kant's three major works, the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* in 1781, the *Kritik der*

praktischen Vernunft in 1788, and the *Kritik der Urteilskraft* in 1790, the mortal blows were struck at the old rationalist system. F. Schlegel was justified in his proud claim that the springs of the new age were rising in Germany. To suggest, however, that Romanticism should really be called "Germanicism" on account of its essentially Germanic roots and spirit¹⁰ is an exaggeration, not to say a distortion in view of its early sources in England, although it is not without some element of (albeit poetic) truth, and the high incidence of German words used in connection with Romanticism (*Sehnsucht, Weltschmerz, europamüde, Dies- und Jenseitigkeit*) in itself indicates Romanticism's deep entrenchment in Germany.

Thenceforth the overall picture of European Romanticism becomes increasingly complex as the new creed slowly spread from country to country. For a time yet Germany was to remain in the ascendancy, so that this third phase was again largely overshadowed by Germany. This was her most glorious age, for the 1790's witness not only the elaboration of Romanticism but also the heyday of her Neoclassical period. These were the momentous years of the Goethe-Schiller friendship when the former wrote *Reineke Fuchs* (1794), *Römische Elegien* (1795), *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1795), *Venezianische Epigramme* (1797), *Hermann und Dorothea* (1798), and many of his best-known ballads, while Schiller's work included *Über Anmut und Würde* (1793), *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* (1795), *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen* (1795), *Das Ideal und das Leben* (1795), *Wallenstein* (1798-99), *Das Lied von der Glocke* (1799) and other ballads, as well as the *Xenien* (1796) on which the two friends collaborated. In order to realize fully the extent to which Romantic and Neoclassical strains were contemporaneous in Germany—a fact that is often forgotten or overlooked—it is perhaps worth enumerating briefly some of the other works which appeared during this period: in 1794, Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre*; in 1797, the great ballad-year of Goethe and Schiller, Schelling's *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur*, Tieck's *Volkmärchen*, Wackenroder's *Herzensergiessungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders*, A. W. Schlegel's first translations from Shakespeare; in 1798, the journal of the Jena Romantic group, the *Athenäum*; in 1799, Schleiermacher's *Reden über die Religion* and F. Schlegel's *Lucinde*; and the new century opened with Novalis' *Hymnen an die Nacht*. In these works the writers of the Jena Romantic group expounded their own *Weltanschauung*

which was in many essential points a development of the earlier ideas of the *Sturm und Drang*, although these had never been fashioned into a coherent aesthetic system. Like their predecessors, the Jena group founded their whole system on the unquestioned primacy of the subjective imagination of the original creative genius, a doctrine which had been strengthened by the powerful support of Fichte's philosophy, so that this subjective imagination now became literally the alpha and omega of the universe. The notion of organic growth and development and the consequent interest in history and in living nature, the arrogation of complete artistic freedom as the birthright of the autonomous divine genius, the trust in spontaneous emotion and instinct: all these were inherited from the *Sturm und Drang*, although German Romanticism was not a mere continuation of the earlier movement and there were vital shifts of emphasis and mood which reveal the distinct character of the Jena school. The later group was more complex than the relatively straightforward rebels of the *Sturm und Drang* who sought to live and create solely according to the dictates of feeling, while the Romantic strives also for knowledge, consciousness, a mastery of those feelings which in turn produced a certain self-detachment, the key to that curious Romantic concept of irony. As its name implies, the *Sturm und Drang* had been youthful, forward-looking, vigorous, and realistic in its rebellion against an irksome reality, whereas with the Jena school an introvert, transcendental longing came to the fore as the Romantic looked beyond this world in his quest for an intangible, unattainable ideal in a dream sphere of his own creation. To the revolutionary naturalism of Rousseau and the melancholy pietism of English pre-Romanticism was now added the transcendentalism of the German philosophers, for the Jena Romantic group, speculative rather than creative by nature, was responsible for the major body of German Romantic philosophy and it was at this point that German Romanticism assumed its characteristic hue. An all-embracing expansiveness, coloured by a pervasive mysticism, is its hallmark, so that it is a way of living and perceiving rather than merely of writing which was expounded in the theories of the brothers Schlegel, Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Wackenroder. The spread in scope and breadth is vast. As poetry turns into "*eine progressive Universalpoesie*,"¹¹ it tends not only to mingle the various genres and media but also more and more to lose its specific meaning and to become confused

and amalgamated with philosophy, religion, history, philology, science, and politics. This cosmic extension of the meaning of poetry was to be of the utmost importance for the whole of the nineteenth century and beyond too.

So rapidly had the European balance changed that in these years it was the turn of England and France to be comparatively backward. In France, the Revolution blotted all else from men's minds and the Reign of Terror virtually silenced creative writing for a time. As Mme. de Staël reported: "Les Français, depuis vingt années, sont tellement préoccupés par les événements politiques, que toutes leurs études en littérature ont été suspendues."¹² Or again: "Depuis quelque temps on ne lit guère en France que des mémoires ou des romans; et ce n'est pas tout à fait par frivolité qu'on est devenu moins capable de lectures plus sérieuses, c'est parce que les événements de la Révolution ont accoutumé à ne mettre de prix qu'à la connaissance des faits et des hommes."¹³ From the welter of arguments as to whether the Revolution impeded the advance of Romanticism or fostered it by breaking down the old authoritarian order in the social sphere, only one fact emerges with any certainty: namely, the dearth of creative writing during the Revolutionary period. Hence that curious hiatus in French literary development in the years 1790 to 1820. The few works which did appear were mainly in the Rousseauistic tradition, such as the exotic novels of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre whose *Paul et Virginie* (1787) and *La chaumière indienne* (1791) both illustrate the so-called return to nature. Chateaubriand's *Atala* (1801) and *René* (1805) are also indebted to the ideas of Rousseau, and none of these, no more than the *Génie du Christianisme* (1802), was regarded by contemporaries as a serious menace to the Neoclassical tradition which still reigned unchallenged. French Romanticism, when it did finally assert itself, was to be above all a revolt against this firmly entrenched and ossified Neoclassicism and it is significant that the earliest glimmerings of the new orientation first insinuated themselves into the stronghold of Neoclassicism in prose, the genre least subject to the dictates and rules of the Neoclassical creed.

There were no such hindrances to overcome in England, which was gradually awakening to the new tendencies. In Blake's *Songs of Innocence* (1787) and *Songs of Experience* (1794), imagery was used in a manner totally different from its eighteenth-century decorative function, and this was a vital breakthrough of the new type of

poetic expression. The mid-1790's also witnessed the growing popularity of tales of horror with Mrs. Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho* in 1794 and *The Monk* by Lewis in 1796. It was in 1798, the year of the *Lyrical Ballads*, that Wordsworth accompanied Coleridge to Germany. Ironically, England was now to receive its stimulus from Germany, from ideas which had in fact originated on her shores and had been elaborated abroad while they were more or less ignored at home. That homecoming began in the 1790's with the spread of knowledge about German literature which had previously been dismissed, in spite of the success of *Werther*, as revolutionary, sensationalist, extravagantly sentimental, and not quite respectable. The term 'German Novel,' for instance, was for long a self-explanatory expression of opprobrium, a stigma stemming from the many worthless *Schauerromane*, stories that send a shudder down the reader's spine, which had been translated into English to satisfy the thirst for horror stories. A number of original English Gothic novels of dubious quality were at that time passed off as renderings from German, thus bringing German literature into further disrepute. Gradually a truer picture was to emerge, dating from Henry Mackenzie's paper on German drama read before the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1788 and published in 1790. Here Schiller was mentioned for the first time in Britain in a startling eulogy of *Die Räuber*, the tremendous appeal of which lay in the novelty of its subject, the atmosphere of horror, and the unbridled expression of emotional crises. It made a vehement impression on Coleridge when he read it in 1794, arousing the curiosity about German literature that was to take him and Wordsworth to Germany in 1798.

While France was in the throes of the Revolution, and England was only gradually assimilating the new tendencies, Germany still remained the home of Romanticism. The Heidelberg group of 1805-1815 differed from the earlier, more closely-knit Jena circle in that it was far less philosophically inclined. Forsaking the metaphysical speculations of the Jena theorists, the Heidelberg poets created many of the works for which German Romanticism earned its fame abroad, such as the tales of Hoffmann, Chamisso, Fouqué, the poems of Uhland, Körner, Brentano, Arnim. More extrovert than their immediate predecessors, these Heidelberg poets exploited the Jena theories for practical creative purposes. Their demand for a spontaneous expression of emotion led to a glorious blossoming of lyric poetry; the probing of the irrational aspects of life—the

so-called nocturnal sides of nature—was now precipitated into a host of supernatural and fantastic stories, such as those of Tieck and Hoffmann; and finally the interest in history, formerly part of a composite belief in organic growth and development, now also assumed more specific forms either in scholarly research into the past, as exemplified by the philological enquiries of the brothers Grimm, or in the newly emergent national consciousness and pride which evoked, under the threat of the Napoleonic wars, lyric cycles with such titles as the *Geharnischte Sonette* ("Sonnets in Armour") by Rückert (1814), Körner's *Leyer und Schwert* ("Lyre and Sword") of the same year, and Arndt's *Lieder für Teutsche* ("Songs for Germans"). This was the climate which fostered Arnim's and Brentano's *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* (1806-1808) and like collections of folktales in Görres' *Die deutschen Volksbücher* (1807) and Grimm's *Märchen* (1812). In these patriotic nationalistic endeavours the writers of the Heidelberg group foreshadowed the more directly political and social aims of the *Jung-Deutschland* movement of the mid-nineteenth century. It is at this point that the time lag in European Romanticism is at its most blatant; for while Romanticism has hardly stirred in France as yet and is only about to unfold fully in England, in Germany it is already past its zenith and moving steadily towards the more sober social preoccupations of the subsequent period. In the face of these discrepancies alone, who would dare to envisage European Romanticism as one unified and consistent entity?

In this interregnum there appeared a work that was of extraordinary importance in the history of Romanticism in Europe: Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*. During her exile from France, Mme de Staël travelled fairly extensively in Germany, where she met, among others, Goethe, Schiller, and A. W. Schlegel, who became her son's tutor. In contrast to his volatile and inventive brother Friedrich, August Wilhelm Schlegel was the most perceptive and orderly of the Jena group, so that his elegantly clear formulations of German Romantic thought were more comprehensible and accessible to foreigners than the perhaps profounder, transcendental thinking of Friedrich Schlegel, Schelling, or Schleiermacher; and with the translations of his *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur* into French in 1813 and into English in 1815, A. W. Schlegel truly became the "*Herold oder Dolmetscher*"¹⁴ of Romantic thought. In A. W. Schlegel, Mme de Staël thus met a man well

able to fan her enthusiasm for Germany. The external history of *De l'Allemagne*—the hindrances to publication, the role of political considerations, etc.—are irrelevant in the present context except in so far as this opposition in itself indicates the French reluctance, indeed fear, to import foreign ideas which seemed an insult and a menace to French cultural dominance. In spite, or perhaps partly because, of the violent resistance to its publication, *De l'Allemagne* became the standard source of knowledge on Germany, and beyond that a manifesto of the new cosmopolitanism and a decisive step in the renewal of French literature after its long subservience to the tenets of an emasculated Neoclassicism. In this work Mme de Staël sought to delineate the concept of a poetry different from the great native tradition of France, for she fully realized the need for a transfusion of new blood. In introducing contemporary German writing to France, she constantly contrasted its originality, vitality, and imagination with the sterile rigidity, "*le genre maniéré*,"¹⁵ of moribund French Neoclassicism. Much valid criticism can be levelled against Mme de Staël: she saw Germany in the literary as well as in the social and moral sense as the country of *Hermann und Dorothea*, thereby nurturing the strangely persistent French picture of Germany as "*une région fabuleuse, où les hommes gazouillent et chantent comme les oiseaux*."¹⁶ Moreover, she had little acquaintance with the work of the Jena group (there is, for instance, no mention whatsoever of Novalis) and regarded Goethe, Schiller, Bürger, and Tieck as the representative German Romantic poets; nor had she much head for abstract philosophy and no more than a superficial comprehension of Romanticism, distinguishing between Classical and Romantic poetry as "*celle qui a précédé l'établissement du christianisme et celle qui l'a suivi*."¹⁷ All her judgments are formed from a plainly French standpoint so that she regards German and English literature as one entity, the literature of the Romantic North, as against the Classical literature of France and Southern Europe. Nevertheless, in spite of her undeniable weaknesses and failings, Mme de Staël was an astute, perspicacious arbiter, whose observations are often acute and who grasped the essence of the new orientation of German literature. In some respects Mme de Staël's position is reminiscent of that of Lessing: though more emotional and fanciful in manner than the sensible exponent of the Enlightenment, basically she advocates the same emancipation from the traditional rules in favour of a poetry fathered by the

enthusiasm of genius. In fact, *De l'Allemagne* presents an admirable survey of the *Sturm und Drang* phase of German literature, that is, of pre-Romanticism rather than of the Romantic groups themselves. This is a crucial factor for the comprehension of European Romanticism since the opinions expressed by Mme de Staël and, perhaps even more important, her omissions, for long not only determined the French (and to a lesser extent the English) view of German literature but also shaped the course and nature of the French Romantic movement. So the preference for Schiller, the conception of Goethe as "*le chef de l'école mélancolique*,"¹⁸ the appraisal of *Faust* as the supreme Romantic masterpiece, the emphasis on the picturesque element in poetry, and the belief that German literature is characterized primarily by 'fantasy' and 'liberty': all these curious notions stem from *De l'Allemagne*. And Mme de Staël's view of German literature was persistent as well as potent; until after 1830 the French continued to believe that German literature consisted solely of Goethe, Schiller, Bürger, Tieck, and Jean Paul. No good history of German literature was available in French; and while a few works, notably *Werther*, *Faust*, *Die Räuber*, and later, the dramas of Werner were read with respect and devotion, poets such as Novalis, Brentano, and Arnim were virtually unknown to the French Romantic poets, very few of whom, incidentally, had any knowledge of German. The belief that French Romanticism was directly influenced by German Romanticism, one of the principal and most common misapprehensions about the history of Romanticism in Europe, is therefore contravened by the undeniable evidence of chronological fact. The true relationship is rather between the German *Sturm und Drang* and French Romanticism. Once this correct historical perspective is established, the striking differences between the faces of Romanticism in Germany and France become somewhat less puzzling.

De l'Allemagne, which was originally published in England, also served in some degree as a mediator between Germany and England. In the early years of the nineteenth century, because of the political situation—the opposition to Napoleon—the English tended to turn more to Germany than to France, and many links were forged between the two lands through both travelers and translations.¹⁹ These links were remarkable rather for their large number than for their depth, there being little to suggest any very decisive significance. As in France, so in England actual knowledge about Germany

was fairly scant; the Carlylean image of a land of poets and thinkers succeeded the earlier one of a realm of the picturesque and fantastic. As for German literature, it was again the *Sturm und Drang* which made the only real impression through the early works of Goethe and Schiller and the dramas of Kotzebue, whose popularity turned into an absolute furor. The writings of the Jena group, on the other hand, gained little or no hearing until well into the nineteenth century; Carlyle was the first to write about Novalis in 1829, and even then Novalis was interpreted as a disciple of Kant and Fichte without any appreciation of his poetry. In her relationship with her European neighbours, England showed that same sturdy independence that characterizes her own Romantic movement. England had indeed no need to be instructed in Romantic thought and feeling by other nations, for in Shakespeare, Milton, Young, Macpherson, Percy, and Richardson she exported far more than she imported in Schiller, Goethe, and Rousseau.

The great flowering of English Romanticism occurred about the middle of the second decade of the nineteenth century when for some ten years England became the focus of European Romanticism. By then the Romantic impetus had slackened in Germany and was gradually being diluted by the beginnings of the sober realism of the mid-nineteenth century. Meanwhile France, apparently still stunned by the consequences of the Revolution, was taking stock in social and political affairs with thinkers such as Saint-Simon, Cousin, and Thierry, while artistic creativity was relegated to the background. England with a galaxy of fine poets in Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, and Byron assumed the primacy which had been Germany's. Not that there was ever a Romantic 'school' in England as there had been in Germany; there was no conscious homogeneous program and there were few manifestos or literary discussions compared with those in Germany and with the violent controversies that were to sway France. Wordsworth's famous *Preface to the "Lyrical Ballads"* was conceived chiefly to counter criticism and to forestall further attacks. The second generation of English Romantic poets was even less concerned than the first with questions of poetic technique; Keats indeed was outspoken in his rejection of abstract theorizing, which he branded as "the whims of an Egotist." In a letter to J. H. Reynolds (February 3, 1818) he wrote: "Every man has his speculations, but every man does not brood and peacock over them till he makes a false coinage and

deceives himself. . . . Poetry should be great and unobtrusive, a thing which enters into one's soul, and does not startle it or amaze it with itself, but with its subject.—How beautiful are the retired flowers! how would they lose their beauty were they to throng into the highway crying out, 'admire me I am a violet!—dote upon me I am a primrose!'"²⁰ Informal in character, "a warm intuitive muddle," as it has rightly been called,²¹ English Romanticism remained less systematic, less dogmatic, less self-conscious than its Continental counterparts, of an independent approach consonant with the innate individualism of the Briton. Although Jeffrey, the most vehement opponent of the Lake Poets, accused them in the *Edinburgh Review* of 1802 of being "dissenters from the established systems in poetry," who had borrowed their doctrines from the Germans and from "the great apostle of Geneva," this charge was far from true. For the Romantic movement in England was above all of evolutionary, not revolutionary, origin; a sense of belonging to and restoring the native tradition distinguishes the Romantic poets in England, where there was no incisive break in continuity as in Germany and France. The English pre-Romantics and Romantics looked back with approval on Shakespeare and the pre-Restoration poets, nor did the Augustans rouse opposition comparable to the rebelliousness of the German *Stürmer und Dränger* or the French onslaught on their tyrannical literary establishment. In contrast to the necessity imposed on the French and Germans to find some way out of a kind of cul-de-sac, the English were cast in a historically more fortunate position. Whereas the Germans and the French Romantics had to follow and in some way outdo their glorious immediate predecessors, the English Romantics were strongly conscious of representing a new beginning and upsurge, not a reaction as in France or an overrefinement as in Germany. From this, perhaps, English Romanticism derives its special quality of freshness, freedom, flexibility, and grace.

With the deaths of Keats in 1821, Shelley in 1822, and Byron in 1824, the period of English ascendancy came to an abrupt and untimely end. Now it was the turn of France in the 1820's and 1830's. But how different was the face and spirit of Romanticism in France from what it had been in England! Whereas the English Romantic movement had evolved slowly and organically out of the native tradition, French Romanticism was essentially a revolt against the native tradition, an ousting of the firmly rooted Neo-

classical attitudes and forms by alien lines of thought and feeling. Hence the violence and bitterness of the quarrels attendant on the emergence of Romanticism in France, hence also the stubbornness and vehemence of the opposition. For this was far more than a literary debate; all manner of political and national considerations were implicated in the complex web of this "*querelle nationale*."²² The Revolution, though it had halted literary development for many years, can also be evaluated as an indirectly positive factor, for with the fall of the absolute monarchy the Neoclassical dogmatism that had been associated with it was severely undermined: "*à société nouvelle, littérature nouvelle*" became the popular slogan. Moreover, the revolutionary era with its free spectacle of the guillotine created a new theatre audience avid for rapid action, melodrama, and sharp contrasts. On the other hand, Napoleon's Empire tended to have a reactionary effect not only through its strict censorship but also through its revival of Neoclassical taste as exemplified by Corneille's heroic characters who were regarded as the apotheosis of martial glory. Romanticism was therefore feared as a tendency associated with revolution, violence, and foreign domination, a threat to the national heritage of Greco-Latin origin. Even in 1825 *Le Globe* still reported that: "On se sert aujourd'hui en France du mot 'romantique' pour désigner toute composition contraire au système suivi en France depuis Louis XIV."²³ This fear of the Romantic as tantamount to the revolutionary explains, in part at least, Constant's extraordinarily cautious attitude in his preface to *Wallstein*, where he compared the German and French dramatic systems. He deliberately avoided the word 'romantic' altogether and repeatedly stressed his support of the native tradition, which was to be strengthened and refreshed, not ousted by innovations from abroad. A similar revival of the French heritage was advocated in Sainte-Beuve's *Tableau de la poésie au seizième siècle* (1827) which was of vital importance in the history of Romanticism in France; here Sainte-Beuve rehabilitated the hitherto neglected French poets of the sixteenth century, thereby pointing to the existence of a native tradition anterior to and different from the Neoclassical one.

Considering the strength of this Neoclassical canon of clarity, harmony, and 'good taste,' as well as the complexity of the political and social background, it is little wonder that the new Romantic orientation was so slow to infiltrate into France. The French

Romantics had begun to emerge as a shadowy force in opposition to the Neoclassicists towards the middle of the 1810's, stimulated by *De l'Allemagne* and also by the translation in 1813 of A. W. Schlegel's *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur*. During the years 1814-1822 an outburst of anglomania swept through France following the isolation during the Napoleonic wars; lively interest was focused on the 'conqueror,' on the workings of the constitutional monarchy and parliamentary government, the industrial revolution, new economic doctrines, and, of course, new writing, although unfortunately there was no outstanding personality to do for England what Mme de Staël had done for Germany. Nevertheless the technique of the 'Lakistes,' their use of imagery, the music and innovations of their verse, and their note of mystery aroused curiosity. In fact, Scott, Byron, and Shakespeare as well as Goethe and Schiller were already known in France, but their real vogue came only about 1820 onward, when Byron in particular became the object of an idolatrous enthusiasm. This growing appreciation of English and German poets coincided with the formation of a number of Romantic groups centered either on a literary journal such as the *Muse française* (1823-4) or the famous *Le Globe* (1824-32), or in the French tradition on a salon such as that of Deschamps (1820), the *Société des bonnes-lettres* (1821), Charles Nodier (1823), and finally the *Cénacle* of Hugo and Sainte-Beuve (1827). The French Romantics were thus unlike the English, and more like the Germans, in their preference for groups, and the dates of these various groups and journals help to site the real breakthrough of Romanticism in France. Opposition was, however, far from silenced by the early 1820's; the traditionalists continued to attack Romanticism as an alien, dangerous element, branding it as a "*romantisme bâtard*," to quote the phrase coined in 1824 by Auger, the director of the Académie Française, in spite of the efforts of the movement's defenders, such as Charles Nodier, who sought to distinguish between *le frénétique* (vampirism, mere sensationalism) and the genuinely *romantique*.

Long after Romanticism had become more or less acceptable in lyric poetry through the works of Lamartine, Hugo, and Vigny in the years 1822-26, the final and most acrimonious battle was fought in the field of drama, the "*dernière forteresse*," the "*bastille littéraire*"²⁴ of the Neoclassical tradition. Several earlier attempts to storm this bastion had failed; a performance in 1809 of Lemercier's

Christophe Colomb, subtitled a "comédie shakespeareienne," proved an utter fiasco, and in his rendering of Schiller's *Wallenstein* trilogy, which dates from the same year, Constant cautiously felt the need to respect the rules of our drama, as he put it, by reducing the number of acts to five and the characters to twelve. In the winter of 1827-28 a company of English actors made a deep impression in Paris, and it was during that winter, when enthusiasm for Shakespeare was at its zenith, that Hugo wrote *Cromwell* with its epoch-making preface. Not that Hugo's ideas in themselves were of startling originality; sensational though it was in its historical context, Hugo's attack on the three unities is in fact very reminiscent of Lessing's arguments in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. Indeed the whole tone and spirit of the polemics in France in the 1820's recalls the mood of the German *Sturm und Drang* of the 1770's. Thus *Le Globe* defines its doctrine as "la liberté," "l'imitation directe de la nature," "l'originalité,"²⁵ while the concept "romantique" is equated with "vie, activité, mouvement en avant,"²⁶ that is, in terms which clearly echo the dynamism of the *Sturm und Drang*. There is, therefore, ample justification for Goethe's perspicacious comment: "Was die Franzosen bei ihrer jetzigen literarischen Richtung für etwas Neues halten, ist im Grunde weiter nichts als der Widerschein desjenigen, was die deutsche Literatur seit fünfzig Jahren gewollt und geworden."²⁷ Goethe's estimate of fifty years as the time lag between Germany and France is well judged, for it was only with the noisy victory of *Hernani* in 1830 that French drama achieved the freedom attained in Germany in the 1770's by *Götz von Berlichingen* and *Die Räuber*. Moreover, while the French Romantics were related to the German *Stürmer und Dränger*, the true heirs of the German Romanticism of 1800-1815 were undoubtedly the French Symbolist poets of the latter half of the nineteenth century. Baudelaire, Mallarmé, and Rimbaud subscribed to a new conception of art and the artist, a conception which was closely akin to the theories of the German Jena Romantic group: poetic experience was envisaged as essentially different from ordinary experience, a magic form of intuitive spiritual activity, a mysterious expansion into the transcendental in which the visionary poet adventured into a dream-realm to explore the hidden sources and 'correspondences' of life.

The battle for *Hernani* in 1830 marks the last great milestone in the Romantic conquest of Europe. Although Romanticism was to

reign in France for some ten more years, other currents were increasingly in evidence. By the mid-1830's Hugo was already advancing a more utilitarian conception of art, urging the artist to an awareness of his serious duty to further the progress of mankind. In this change of outlook, Hugo was anticipating a trend characteristic of the mid-nineteenth century throughout Europe. In England and Germany the springs of Romanticism had dried up much earlier than in that late-starter France, and in both countries by the mid-1830's only a diluted, rather sentimentalized form of Romanticism survived alongside some witty satire directed against Romantic attitudes, satire like Peacock's *Crotchet Castle* (1831), Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* (1833-34), Heine's *Romantische Schule* (1833), and Immermann's *Die Epigonen* (1836) with its significant title, as well as his comic *Münchhausen* (1839). Romanticism was increasingly out of tune with the spirit of the age as the century advanced; the new sober mood and materialistic aims of the industrial era had little sympathy for obscure flights of individual imagination and no use whatsoever for an art that 'bakes no bread' to quote a pertinent American proverb. The artist was called to cease his selfish exploration of his private realm, to come out of his ivory tower, and to assume his share of social responsibility. The disciplined objectivity of Realism came to replace—at least for a time—the autonomous imagination of Romanticism.

This chronological survey should dispel a number of common misconceptions regarding Romanticism. Foremost among these is the misapprehension that European Romanticism is a clearly defined entity, a unified school which manifested itself in several countries simultaneously and shared certain ideals and predilections. Almost equally prevalent and mistaken is the belief that the origins of Romanticism are to be found in Germany and that both the English and the French Romantic poets were directly and decisively influenced by the German theories. Such notions are more than gross oversimplifications; they are false premises that can only breed further error. A historical analysis of the course of Romanticism in Europe reveals a far more complicated picture, for the Romantic manner of perception and expression appeared in various literatures at different times and in different guises. Its emergence is an uneven, straggling process of long duration, punctuated by curious time lags as the ascendancy passed from one land to another. Moreover, since the spread of new ideas was largely

dependent on the chance reports of travelers in an age when communications were still relatively poor and further disrupted by war, information on contemporary developments even in neighboring countries was often so scant and belated that many assumptions of influence must be discounted. The outstanding example of such slow and fragmentary infiltration of ideas is to be found in *De l'Allemagne*: though written by a perspicacious and widely-traveled critic, it contains in 1810 very few of the ideas of the Jena Romantics which were to reach France only some half a century later.

The outer history of European Romanticism—its successive waves, its new upsurge in one country after another—suggests both the vehemence of its impetus and the complexity of its nature. Though part of that fundamental reorientation of values that took place throughout Europe at the turn of the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, it was not a single but a multiple movement; indeed it comprised a whole series of movements from the *Sturm und Drang* onward, each separate and distinct in character, yet all involved in a profound "*crise de la conscience*" as individualistic, imaginative, subjective attitudes replaced the old rationalistic approach. The timing and form of this crisis differed from land to land because it was in each case determined by the literary background as well as by social and political factors. Hence the bewildering variety of the faces and products of Romanticism: it is not just a matter of genre, with the English excelling at lyric poetry, the French concentrating on drama in their battle against the stronghold of the Neoclassical theatre, while the transcendental yearnings of the Germans find their most appropriate vehicle in the *Märchen*-like narrative. This in itself is only a symptom of far deeper divergences. German Romanticism, for instance, is not only the most radical and thoroughgoing, embracing all the arts and philosophy, politics, religion, science, and history, but also distinguished from its English and French counterparts at first by a strong bias towards the metaphysical and later by its patriotic colouring. French Romanticism resembles the German brand in its preference for organization in groups and in its dynamic thrust; on the other hand, it differs from the German movement (and is herein closer to the English) in remaining almost entirely in the domain of art, and it is characterized above all by its violent revolt against the stifling dominance of the native Neoclassical tradition. In contrast, English Romanticism is the freshest and freest, the least self-conscious and codified

CHRONOLOGY

	ENGLAND	GERMANY	FRANCE
1726-			
1730	Thomson: <i>Seasons</i>		
1740		Bodmer: <i>Kritische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie</i>	
1742	Young: <i>Night Thoughts</i>		
1745	Akenside: <i>Pleasures of Imagination</i>		
1747	Richardson: <i>Clarissa Harlowe</i>		
1750	Gray: <i>Elegy in a Country Churchyard</i>		Condillac: <i>Traité des sensations</i>
1754			
1755			
1758			Diderot: <i>Discours sur la poésie dramatique</i>
1759	Young: <i>Conjectures on Original Composition</i>	Lessing: <i>Literaturbriefe</i> Translation	
1760	MacPherson: <i>Fragments</i>		Rousseau: <i>La nouvelle Héloïse</i>
1761			
1762	MacPherson: <i>Fingal</i> , translation from Ossian	Translation	
1764			
1765	Percy: <i>Reliques</i>		
1766		Herder: <i>Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Literatur</i>	
1767		Lessing: <i>Hamburgische Dramaturgie</i>	
1769		Herder: <i>Journal meiner Reise</i>	
1770			
1773		<i>Von deutscher Art und Kunst</i>	
1774		Goethe: <i>Götz von Berlichingen</i>	
		Goethe: <i>Werther</i>	
1775		First translation of Shakespeare	

- | | ENGLAND | GERMANY | FRANCE |
|------|---|---|---|
| 1776 | | Klinger: <i>Sturm und Drang</i> | Rousseau: <i>Réveries du promeneur solitaire</i> |
| 1778 | | Herder: <i>Stimmen der Völker</i> | |
| 1781 | | Schiller: <i>Die Räuber</i> | Rousseau: <i>Confessions</i> |
| 1787 | Blake: <i>Songs of Innocence</i> | Kant: <i>Kritik der reinen Vernunft</i> | B. de St. Pierre: <i>Paul et Virginie</i> |
| 1788 | | Kant: <i>Kritik der praktischen Vernunft</i> | |
| 1790 | Paine: <i>Rights of Man</i> | Kant: <i>Kritik der Urteilskraft</i> | B. de St. Pierre: <i>La chaumière indienne</i> |
| 1791 | | | Rouget de Lisle: <i>La Marseillaise</i> |
| 1792 | | | |
| 1793 | Wordsworth: <i>An Evening Walk</i>
: <i>Descriptive Sketches</i> | Fichte: <i>Wissenschaftslehre</i> | |
| 1794 | Blake: <i>Songs of Experience</i> | Schiller: <i>Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung</i> | |
| 1796 | Coleridge: <i>The Aeolian Harp</i> | A. W. Schlegel: Translation of Shakespeare | |
| 1797 | | Schelling: <i>Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur</i> | |
| | | Tieck: <i>Volksmärchen</i> | |
| | | Wackenroder: <i>Herzensergiessungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders</i> | |
| 1798 | Wordsworth: <i>Lyrical Ballads</i>
Coleridge: <i>The Ancient Mariner</i>
: <i>Frost at Midnight</i>
: <i>Fears in Solitude</i>
: <i>The Nightingale</i> | Athenäum | La Harpe: <i>Cours de littérature ancienne et moderne</i> |
| 1799 | | Schleiermacher: <i>Reden über die Religion</i>
F. Schlegel: <i>Lucinde</i> | |

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|---|
| 1800 | Wordsworth: <i>Michael</i>
: <i>Ruth</i> | Novalis: <i>Hymnen an die Nacht</i> | Mmc. de Staël: <i>De la littérature</i> |
| 1801 | | | Chatcaubriand: <i>Atala</i> |
| 1802 | Coleridge: <i>Dejection</i> | Novalis: <i>Heinrich von Ofterdingen</i> | Chatcaubriand: <i>Génie du Christianisme</i> |
| 1804 | | | Chatcaubriand: <i>René</i> |
| 1805 | Wordsworth: <i>Pretude</i> | Armin u. Brentano: <i>Des Knaben Wun-
derhorn</i> (-1808) | |
| 1806 | | Fichtc: <i>Reden an die deutsche Nation</i> | Lemercier: <i>Christophe Colomb</i> |
| 1807 | | Görres: <i>Die teutschen Volksbücher</i> | De Villers: <i>Sur l'état actuel de la littéra-
ture ancienne et de l'histoire en Alle-
magne</i> |
| 1809 | | A. W. Schlegel: <i>Über dramatische Kunst
und Literatur</i> | Constant: <i>Wallstein</i> |
| 1810 | | | Mmc. de Staël: <i>De l'Allemagne</i> |
| 1812 | Byron: <i>Childe Harold</i> | Grimm: <i>Märchen</i> | |
| 1813 | Shelley: <i>Queen Mab</i> | Arndt: <i>Lieder für Teutsche</i> | |
| 1814 | Wordsworth: <i>The Excursion</i>
Byron: <i>The Corsair</i>
: <i>Lara</i>
: <i>Bride of Abydos</i> | Rückert: <i>Geharnischte Sonette</i>
Körner: <i>Leyer und Schwert</i>
Chamisso: <i>Peter Schlemihl</i> | |
| 1815 | Scott: <i>Waverley</i>
Wordsworth: <i>Poems</i> | | |
| 1816 | Byron: <i>Siege of Corinth</i>
: <i>Prisoner of Chillon</i>
Coleridge: <i>Kubla Khan</i>
: <i>Christabel</i>
Shelley: <i>Alastor</i> | Hoffman: <i>Elixiere des Teufels</i>
Uhland: <i>Gedichte</i>
Tieck: <i>Phantasia</i> | |
| 1817 | Byron: <i>Mansfred</i>
Keats: <i>Poems</i>
Coleridge: <i>Sibylline Leaves</i>
: <i>Biographia Literaria</i> | Hoffmann: <i>Nachtstücke</i> | |

	ENGLAND	GERMANY	FRANCE
1818	Keats: <i>Endymion</i> Hazlitt: <i>Lectures on the English Poets</i>		
1819	Peacock: <i>Nightmare Abbey</i> (-1824) Byron: <i>Don Juan</i> (-1824) : <i>Mazèppa</i> Keats: <i>Eve of St. Agnes</i> Shelley: <i>The Cenci</i>	Hoffmann: <i>Die Serapionsbrüder</i> : <i>Klein Zaches</i> Schopenhauer: <i>Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung</i>	Lamartine: <i>Méditations poétiques</i> <i>Conservateur littéraire</i> Lebrun: <i>Maria Stuart</i> <i>Société des bonnes-lettres</i>
1820	Keats: <i>Hyperion</i> : <i>Lamia</i> Shelley: <i>Prometheus Unbound</i>		
1821	Byron: <i>Cain</i> : <i>Sardanapalus</i> Shelley: <i>Adonais</i> : <i>Epipsychidion</i> : <i>Defence of Poetry</i>	Hoffmann: <i>Kater Murr</i>	
1822	De Quincey: <i>Confessions of an English Opium Eater</i>		Vigny: <i>Poèmes</i>
1823	Shelley: <i>Hellas</i> Byron: <i>Vision of Judgement</i> Carlyle: <i>Life of Schiller</i>	Hoffmann: <i>Meister Floh</i> Heine: <i>Gedichte</i>	Hugo: <i>Odes</i> Lamartine: <i>Nouvelles méditations poétiques</i> Stendhal: <i>Racine et Shakespeare</i> Hugo: <i>Han d'Islande</i> <i>Muse française</i> <i>Mercur du XIX^e siècle</i> Vigny: <i>Eloa</i> Hugo: <i>Odes nouvelles</i> <i>Le Globe</i>
1824	Byron: <i>The Island</i> Shelley: <i>Posthumous Poems</i> : <i>Triumph of Life</i>	Mörrike: <i>Gedichte</i>	
1825	Hazlitt: <i>Spirit of the Age</i> Coleridge: <i>Aids to Reflection</i>	Tieck & Schlegel: <i>Shakespeare Translations</i> (-1833) Eichendorff: <i>Taugenichts</i> Heine: <i>Hatzreise</i> Kerner: <i>Gedichte</i> Hölderlin: <i>Gedichte</i>	Hugo: <i>Odes et ballades</i> Vigny: <i>Poèmes</i> : <i>Cinq mars</i>
1826		Tieck: <i>Aufruhr in den Geveennen</i>	

- 1827
 1828 Carlyle: *Goethe*
 1829 Carlyle: *Novels*
- 1830
- 1831 Peacock: *Crotchet Castle*
- 1832
 1833 Carlyle: *Sartor Resartus*
 1834
- 1835
- 1836
- 1837
- 1838
- 1839
- Hugo: *Cromwell*
- Sainte-Beuve: *Tableau historique*
 Vigny: *Othello*
 : *Poèmes*
- Deschamps: *Préface des études françaises et étrangères*
- Hugo: *Les Orientales*
- Hugo: *Hernani*
- Lamartine: *Harmonies poétiques*
- Gautier: *Poésies*
- Musset: *Contes d'Espagne et d'Italie*
- Hugo: *Notre Dame de Paris*
 : *Feuilles d'automne*
- Hugo: *Le roi s'amuse*
- Vigny: *Stello*
- Musset: *Les caprices de Marianne/Rolla*
- Musset: *On ne badine pas*
 : *Lorenzaccio*
 : *Fantasia*
- Vigny: *Chatterton/Servitude et grandeur militaires*
- Hugo: *Chants du crépuscule*
- Musset: *La Nuit de mai*
 : *La Nuit de décembre*
- Musset: *La Nuit d'août*
 : *Il ne faut jurer de rien*
 : *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*
 : *Lettres de Dupuis et Colonne*
- Lamartine: *Jocelyn*
- Musset: *La Nuit d'octobre*
- Hugo: *Les voix intérieures*
- Hugo: *Ruy Blas*
- Lamartine: *La chute d'un ange*
- Musset: *L'espoir en Dieu*
- Lamartine: *Recueils poétiques*
- Heine: *Buch der Lieder*
 : *Reisebilder*
- Lenau: *Gedichte*
- Immermann: *Die Epigonen*
- Eichendorff: *Gedichte*
- Mörke: *Gedichte*
 Lenau: *Gedichte*

because it evolved not against, but organically out of, the native tradition.

In view of the confusion surrounding the term and the concept of Romanticism, there is surely a strong case for an honest recognition of these differences—of the fact that there have been a number of Romantic movements in Europe. It is only in the light of the correct historical perspective that a new approach can then be made to the Romantic movements in England, France, and Germany in an attempt to appreciate the particular character of each and at the same time to understand their interrelationship.

LILLIAN R. FURST · *University of Manchester, England*

NOTES

-
1. P. van Tieghem, *Le Romantisme dans la littérature européenne* (Paris, 1948), p. 247.
 2. I. Berlin, "Some Sources of Romanticism," six lectures delivered in Washington, broadcast B.B.C. "Third Programme," August-September 1966.
 3. M. Akenside, *Pleasures of Imagination*, Bk. I, l. 120.
 4. J. Macpherson, *The Poems of Ossian*, I (London, 1784), 205.
 5. E. Young, *Conjectures on Original Composition* (Manchester, England, 1918), p. 7.
 6. Young, *Conjectures*, p. 13.
 7. L. Abercrombie, *Romanticism* (London, 1926), p. 28, footnote.
 8. Brockes, "Considerations on the moonlight of a pleasant spring evening," *Earthly Joy in God*, reprinted in *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen: Das Weltbild der deutschen Aufklärung* (Leipzig, 1930), p. 245:

Hardly had the night begun to appear
Which promised the joy of cool after the burden of the day's heat,
When a new day seemed to dawn:
Out of the grey mist covering the horizon with crimson streaks
After the sultry atmosphere of the day
The full moon had just risen with a reddish gold shine,
And from its changing circle,
Which fills the night with shimmering light,
More grace flower than shimmering light.
 9. Goethe, "To the Moon":

Once more you fill the bushes and the valley
Silently with a misty radiance,
At last too you release
My soul completely;
Over my fields you spread
Your gaze soothingly,
Like the gentle eye of a friend
Watching my destiny.

10. F. Strich, "Europe and the Romantic movement," *German Life and Letters*, II (1948-9), 87.
11. F. Schlegel, *Kritische Schriften*, ed. W. Rasch (Munich, 1956), p. 37: "a progressive universal poetry."
12. Mme de Staël, *De l'Allemagne* (Oxford, 1906), p. 1: "For the past twenty years the French have been so preoccupied with political happenings that all literary matters have been in abeyance."
13. Staël, *De l'Allemagne*, p. 171: "For some time people in France have been reading hardly anything other than memoirs and novels; it is not entirely out of frivolity that people have become less equal to serious reading, but because the happenings of the Revolution have accustomed them to attach importance solely to knowledge of events and men."
14. F. F. Schirmer, *Kleine Schriften* (Tubingen, 1950), p. 173: "herald or interpreter."
15. Staël, *De l'Allemagne*, p. 178: "the mannered style of writing."
16. X. Marmier, preface to a translation of Schiller's poems (1854), p. vi: "a fairy-tale land, where men warble and sing like birds."
17. Staël, *De l'Allemagne*, p. 33: "that which preceded Christianity and that which followed it."
18. Nodier, *Débats*, April 19, 1817: "the head of the school of melancholy."
19. F. W. Stokoe, *German Influence in the English Romantic Period*, Appendix V, pp. 180-87, lists German works translated into English 1789-1803.
20. Keats, *Letters* (Oxford, 1934), p. 72.
21. H. N. Fairchild, "The Romantic movement in England," *PMLA*, LV (1940), 24.
22. Nodier, *Débats*, January 6, 1816: "national controversy."
23. Duvicquet, *Le Globe*, December 6, 1825: "the word 'romantic' is used in France nowadays to denote any work contrary to the system current in France since Louis XIV."
24. Desmarais, *Le Globe*, October 29, 1825: "the final bastion, the literary Bastille."
25. Anon., *Le Globe*, October 29, 1825: "freedom," "imitation only from nature," "originality."
26. Duvergier de Hauranne, *Le Globe*, March 24, 1825: "life, activity, surging forwards."
27. Goethe, as reported by Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe* (1955), p. 673, 6th March, 1830: "What the French now regard as a new tendency in their literature is basically nothing but a reflection of what German literature has sought and achieved during the last fifty years."