

801
W45

p. 32 "But usually the case for the isolation of literary history from literary criticism is put on different grounds. It is not denied that acts of judgment are necessary, but it is argued that literary history has its own peculiar standards and criteria, i.e., those of other ages. We must, these literary reconstructionists argue, enter into the mind and attitudes of past periods and accept their standards, deliberately excluding the intrusions of our own preconceptions. This view, called "historicism," was elaborated consistently in Germany during the nineteenth century, though even there it has been criticized by historical theorists of such eminence as Ernst Troeltsch.² It seems now to have penetrated directly or indirectly into the United States, and to it many of our "literary historians" more or less clearly profess allegiance. Hardin Craig, for instance, said that the newest and best phase of recent scholarship is the "avoidance of anachronistic thinking."⁴ E. E. Stoll, studying the conventions of the Elizabethan stage and the expectations of its audience, works on the theory that the reconstruction of the author's intention is the central purpose of literary history.⁵ Some such theory is implied in the many attempts to study Elizabethan psychological theories, such as the doctrines of humors, or of the scientific or pseudo-scientific conceptions of poets.⁶ Rosemond Tuve has tried to explain the origin and meaning of metaphysical imagery by reference to the training in Ramist logic received by Donne and his contemporaries.⁷

p. 40 General, Comparative, and National Literature.
 "But this conception of "comparative literature" has also, one recognizes, its peculiar difficulties.⁸ No distinct system can, . . . emerge from the accumulation of such studies. There is no methodological distinction between a study of "Shakespeare in France" and a study of "Shakespeare in eighteenth-century England," or between a study of Poe's influence on Comparisons between literatures, if isolated from concern with the total national literatures, tend to restrict themselves to external problems of sources and influences, reputation and fame. Such studies do not permit us to analyze and judge an individual work of art, or even to consider the complicated whole of its genesis; instead, they are mainly devoted either to such echoes of a masterpiece as translations and imitations, frequently by second-rate authors, or to the prehistory of a masterpiece, the migrations and the spread of its themes and forms. The emphasis ~~on~~ of "comparative literature" thus conceived is on externals; and the decline of "comparative literature" in recent decades reflects the general turning away from stress on mere "facts", on sources and influences.

p. 49,50 Two levels of operations: (1) the assembling and preparing of a text; (2) the problems of chronology, authenticity, authorship, collaboration, revision, and the like, which have been frequently described as "higher criticism," a rather unfortunate term derived from Biblical studies. 58.1

Read carefully pages 50 - 62 on "The Ordering and Establishing of Evidence."

p. 51 Editing is often an extremely complex series of labors, inclusive of both interpretation and historical research. . . . Editions have played a very important part in the history of literary studies: they may - to quote a recent example, like F. N. Robinson's edition of Chaucer - serve as a repository of learning, as a handbook of all the knowledge about an author. But taken in its central meaning as the establishment of the text of a work, editing has its own problems, among which actual "textual criticism" is a highly developed technique with a long history especially in classical and Biblical scholarship.⁷ (see Bibliography on pages 352, 353)