From, *Nineteenth-Century Poetry: Criticism and Debates*, ed. Emma Mason and Jonathan Herapath (London and New York: Routledge, 2015)

EMOTION, FEELING, AFFECT

EMMA MASON

Nineteenth-century poetry and poetics is in thrall to the question of what, how and why we feel. As twenty-first century readers, we are regularly confronted with a scientific 'measuring' of feeling by a media spellbound by magnetic resonance imaging and other neuroscientific technologies that ostensibly 'explain' the experience of feeling. Nineteenth-century readers, however, caught between the contradictions of a polite sensibility that produced a raw-nerved middle class, and an expanding industrialized economy dependent on the seeming exploitation of feeling, continually pressed the question of where and why feeling occurs. Is feeling individual or social, bodily or of the mind, moral or unhealthy? Does feeling refer to sense perception, the haptic or proprioceptive? An inner experience one fine-tunes by engaging with art, religion, science or politics? Or an outward expression marked by tears, laughter or blushes? Many poets writing in the period explored specific kinds of feeling the meanings of which resonate with modern definitions (love, joy, sadness, jealousy); other poets focused on feelings the meanings of which have significantly changed (enthusiasm, affection, sentiment, benevolence). Some of these writers responded to philosophical, scientific and medical treatises on feeling; others were more interested in feelings about space and place, from eroded rural landscapes to factories and workhouses. Karl Marx, for example, described the nineteenth-century workplace as a site of affective alienation, one that, in valuing commodities and capital over well being and self-knowledge, cut workers off from the emotional experience of their labour, the products they produced and their fellow workers. Those who sought refuge from this industrialized workplace in rural economies were similarly subjected to long hours and the continual erosion of the landscape on which they worked and emotionally invested. Broadside balladeers bemoaned the horror of the workhouse with as much feeling as elegists mourned the dead, while the expression of feeling commanded further formal returns in the sonnet's revision of romance and the spasmodics' somatic rhythms. Strong feeling was a hallmark of both popular and less mainstream verse and poetry was equally referred to as the cure, foundation, trigger and heart of all manner of emotions, feelings and affects.

While critics find the history of the emotions a compelling field in the early twenty-first century, their critical precursors struggled with it. As Isobel Armstrong noted in 1977, looking back on a twentieth-century aversion to the study of emotion, the 'search to render the "feel" of feelings in poetry verbally" is missing from modern criticism in a way it isn't from nineteenth-century poetry.[1] Armstrong's influential work on Victorian poetry contributed to what critics now refer to as the

'affective turn', restoring emotion to a literary critical field that had become dependent on the idea of itself as a feeling-free intellectual 'discipline' pioneered by university-educated men. Worried that literary studies was over-identified with reading practices associated with a feminized model of sentiment and leisure, early twentieth-century critics weathered an ontological crisis about the relevance and meaning of the field. For critics like F. R. Leavis, I. A. Richards, John Crowe Ransom, T. S. Eliot, W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe Beardsley, literary criticism should be cerebral and quantifiable: the New Criticism movement, with its emphasis on form over feeling, steered readers away from emotional and psychological interpretation. Yet, as Armstrong writes in a later work, *The Radical Aesthetic* (2000), emotion is at once form and feeling, sensual and rational, material and immaterial. By using the active word 'affect', which connotes the impact and effect of feelings on people, she gestures to all aspects of vital being – 'emotions, feelings, passions, moods, anxiety, discharge of psychic energy, motor innervation, pleasure, pain, joy and sorrow, rapture, depression' – belonging as they do 'to mind and soma, straddling conscious and unconscious just as they straddle mind and physiology'.[2]

Against the New Critics, Armstrong cites A. E. Housman's discussion of poetry's 'symptoms': tears, gooseflesh and tightness in the throat. Housman's poet 'experiences affect and transfuses it into the poem: the reader encounters the poem and through it traces back to the author's original state, sensing a "vibration corresponding to what was felt by the writer"'.[3] This model of vibrational correspondence recalls the eighteenth-century philosopher David Hartley's reading of sensation, one that influenced William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge's reading of poetic feeling, which in turn held appeal for Housman. No wonder Richards was rumoured to have exited from one of Housman's Cambridge lectures, mumbling: 'This has put us back ten years'.[4] While Plato's famous warning that the listener of poetry should guard against its allure enjoyed a revival by the beginning of the twentieth century, nineteenth-century readers and writers alike were invested in poetry's rhythmic and metrical properties as a stay against such seduction.[5] Writing in his *Biographia Literaria* (1817), Coleridge described poetry as 'the blossom and the fragrancy of all human knowledge, human thoughts, human passions, emotions, language'; while a year later, William Hazlitt called it the trace of life and movement itself, that which 'puts a spirit of life and motion into the universe. It describes the flowing, not the fixed'.[6] For the religious poet, John Keble, poetry helped to temper feeling, 'a kind of medicine divinely bestowed upon man: which gives healing relief to secret mental emotion'; while Laetitia Elizabeth Landon conceived of it as obligatory 'passion', claiming 'I should almost define poetry to be the necessity of feeling'.[7] John Stuart Mill stressed that even though 'Poetry is feeling confessing itself to itself in moments of solitude', it is still '*overheard*' and so shared.[8] Other critics, like Robert Buchanan, worried that 'bad' poetry was little more than 'the mere fiddlededeeing of empty heads and hollow hearts . . . the true indication of falser tricks and affectations which lie far deeper. They are trifles, light as air, showing how the wind blows'.[9] Sydney Dobell admitted that words 'rhythmically combined affect the feelings of the poetic hearer

or utterer', but considered the imagination a kind of muscle that 'by a reflex action', might at least negotiate its impact.[10] And even at the end of the century, W. B. Yeats still insisted that 'an emotion does not exist, or does not become perceptible and active among us, till it has found its expression, in colour or in sound or in form'.[11]

However varied these definitions might be, all have in common an emphasis on feeling, emotion and affect as that which is experienced rather than owned: nineteenth-century poetry and the context in which it was written are heightened in an awareness of this experience as a social and shared one. The period inherits two distinct readings of feeling: one Cartesian (mind and body are distinct, and mental phenomena thus non-physical); the other non-dualist (experience co-arises from the mutual dependence of mind and body). Adam Smith argued for the first, and located sympathy as the basis of social feeling and the driver behind whom we choose to feel for; Spinoza favoured the second, claiming that the mind has no power over affects, which humans 'imagine' through the experience of the body.[12] For Smith, feeling is affectionate and benevolent; for Spinoza it is raw and energetic.[13] Both theories, however, present emotion, feeling and affect as generated through relationships and disseminated through interaction with others: as Teresa Brennan argues, affect is not insulated within private moments, but rather transmitted back and forth between humans who change the way those feelings are then absorbed by others.[14] Despite the apparent emotional hesitation within lines like Emily Brontë's 'I could not speak the feeling' or Tennyson's 'I sometimes hold it half a sin' / To put in words the grief I feel', they nevertheless share the specifics of anxiety or grief with the poetry reader.[15] Nineteenth-century poetry and poetic theory alike repeatedly attempt to articulate how this expression and reception works in corporeal, textual and imaginative terms. The period's obsession with feelings and the implications of potential definitions for ethics, psychology, religion, philosophy and art are drawn out in the extracts this three-part chapter introduces. The first section explores 'feeling' and 'emotion' through Wordsworth's influential writing on poetry; the second compares how the relationship between 'feeling' and 'thought' signifies for the nineteenth-century and modern reader; and the third considers the emphasis nineteenth-century writers place, not on individuated, private feeling, but on emotion as inherently social and shared.

FEELING AND EMOTION

The etymological histories of the words 'feeling' and 'emotion' are bound to each other. While 'feeling' can mean both tactual sensation and the bodily faculty by which one perceives and senses the world by touching and feeling it, it also signifies the 'condition of being emotionally affected'. 'Emotion', by contrast, derives from the Latin *emotio* and Middle French *émotion*, both of which connote a negative sense of displacement, agitation, unrest, commotion or disturbance. By the eighteenth century, the English word 'emotion' translated such disturbance into

the movement and motion of the body, mind and blood, bringing together physical sensation with intuitive contemplation. Associated with mental as well as physical processes, emotion came to define a sensation that lasts longer than the more immediate 'feeling', although both feeling and emotion are often set against terms like reason, rationality and empirical knowledge. The history of the emotions is charged with competing stories about feeling and emotion, even though many eighteenth and nineteenth-century poets elided their work with these terms: poetry is feeling and feeling is poetry. The most often quoted of these accounts is Wordsworth's 1802 'Preface' to the *Lyrical Ballads*:

> I have said that poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings: it takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquillity: the emotion is contemplated till, by a species of reaction, the tranquillity gradually disappears, and an emotion, kindred to that which was before the subject of contemplation, is gradually produced, and does itself actually exist in the mind. In this mood successful composition generally begins.[16]

Wordsworth's formula distinguishes everyday emotions, which we remember in the quieter moments of our day, from related emotions, which arise once this period of contemplation is over. That is, when we are most at peace, emotions arise that we start to think about, and so 'react' to them both physically and mentally: these 'reactions' disturb the initial calm (tranquillity disappears) and we are left with a related but purer form of the initial emotion, which then sits in our 'mind' and produces a 'mood'. In this mood, Wordsworth argues, we are ready to write. While for Wordsworth, poems are not fountain-like wells of emotion (poems do not have their own feelings), they do provide sites that ideally capture the process by which humans feel emotion. The sound, rhythm, metre and music of poetry all grant access to joyful and painful feeling through a form likely to be read over and over, he argues, and in doing so, the reader undergoes the contemplation necessary to produce his or her own emotion. This is especially important in a newly industrial and capitalist world that denies many humans the time or environment in which the peaceful remembering of emotions might occur. If poetry arises from the remembered emotions of the poet, then the reader of poetry is granted a space in which to remember his or her own feelings.

In a separate note on his poem, 'The Thorn', Wordsworth introduces two further terms into the discussion, defining poetry as both 'passion' and 'the history or science of feelings'.[17] While 'passion' once referred to Christ's suffering, by the end of the eighteenth century it signified a particularly strong or overpowering feeling or emotion, one that is fitful, agitated or excited. This definition underlines Wordsworth's sense that feeling is volatile and unsettled, and that poems, far from sedating such feeling, actually help to generate and transfer it. Poems do not 'express' feeling, but rather musically arrange words as 'things, active and efficient, which are of themselves part of the passion' and that come to life in specific historical and 'scientific' (social) moments of reading. Feeling is not universal, then,

but shared in particular instants through a poetic language that stresses the emotional content of the world over its other concerns. As he writes in his 1815 'Preface', the 'business of poetry' is 'to treat of things not as they *are*, but as they *appear*; not as they exist in themselves, but as they *seem* to exist to the *senses*, and to the *passions*'. Reading for personal feeling, Wordsworth acknowledges, might tempt the reader into a 'world of delusion', one he or she should guard against through the committed and repeated 'study' of poetry. Only when poetry is 'comprehended *as a study*' can it protect against petty worries and more serious suffering, also yielding the capacity to differentiate sensational, empty feeling from feeling that teaches readers about their lives and worlds.[18] In attending to and carefully studying poetry, the reader is almost bound to think and feel at once, recognizing the mutuality of these two faculties distinct from that which is free of thought (un-thoughtful in both senses of that word) and so without feeling.

The argument resounds in Wordsworth's poetry: the first book of *The Prelude* alone makes countless references to the relationship between feeling and thought, and presents the two in words readers today might associate with the other term. In the opening lines, for example, the narrator relates 'trances of thought and mountings of the mind / Come fast upon me': 'trances' and 'mountings', for example, both invoke emotional states of being hypnotized and lifted up, and which are not usually associated with rational thought.[19] Similarly, Wordsworth's description of the 'mind' blurs feeling and thinking to conjure a kind of dynamism or energy that makes the human tick, one that we experience like harmonious music and translate into 'calm existence':

> The mind of Man is fram'd even like a breath
> And harmony of music. There is a dark
> Invisible workmanship that reconciles
> Discordant elements, and makes them move
> In one society. Ah me! that all
> The terrors, all the early miseries
> Regrets, vexations, lassitudes, that all
> The thoughts and feelings which have been infus'd
> Into my mind, should ever have made up
> The calm existence that is mine when I
> Am worthy of myself![20]

The mind brings together thoughts and feelings by 'reconciling' them into a 'society', a word that connotes connection, participation and alliance. This sense of connection is underlined by the 'early miseries' Wordsworth lists – regret, irritation, exhaustion – these are experiences we register with both heart and head, and have the ability to reconfigure into tranquillity through the 'mind'. 'Mind', then, signifies the oneness of thought and feeling: we 'recognize' their impact on us in 'the beatings of the heart'; but remember this impact in 'the tenderness of thought'.[21] Feeling, thinking, emotion, reason exist in a continuum for Wordsworth,

but how does he keep this continuity in play and why does it fracture for the modern reader?

FEELING AND THOUGHT

For Wordsworth, feelings only 'revolt from the sway of reason' when they go undisciplined by contemplation or study. Modern readers tend to split feeling from thought, the subjective from the objective, assuming that feeling is a surface registering of a deeper reasoned response. Reasoned thought, the argument goes, serves as an authoritative check to the otherwise chaotic potential of feeling. The contention is exemplified in Wimsatt and Beardsley's 1949 attack on emotive criticism, 'The Affective Fallacy', wherein they suggest that reading for feeling is vague, 'raw, unarticulated, imprecise' because, on the one hand, emotion is relative and 'personal', and on the other, too dependent on different knowledges, experiences and anthropologies. For them, the 'affective critic' is doomed either to engage indulgently with 'his own experiences', or to attempt such a generalized theory that his 'search for evidence will lead him into the dreary and antiseptic laboratory'. One can guess that their discomfort with psychoanalysis would hold double with current neuroscientific readings of literature. Wimsatt and Beardsley do not ignore emotion (they in fact call for a more nuanced reading of emotion as 'pattern'), nor do they exclude context (they admit that literature tells us much about 'social history' and 'anthropology'). They do, however, attempt to create a fully 'objective' reading practice that excises feeling from criticism. In attempting to banish emotive, impressionistic or intuitive thinking about literature, one that 'induces' 'vivid images, intense feelings, or heightened consciousness', Wimsatt and Beardsley ignored what nineteenth-century writers recognized: that thinking is an emotional act just as feeling involves cognition.[22] While these writers are intent on taxonomising feeling into varieties and degrees, they do not split it from thought so much as seek to explore how a sensation differs from an emotion in relation to the mind that processes it.

If the etymology of emotion ties it to meanings of unrest, movement and disturbance, by the nineteenth century it had come to mean mental phenomena and memory as well as a physical reaction to external stimuli. By the 1820s, its adjectival form – 'emotional' – signified an excess of feeling and was associated with femininity and inevitably with women; 'emotionless', by contrast, came to mean cold and even cruel.[23] While the association of emotion with either too much or too little feeling did not put nineteenth-century readers off engaging with it, they were sensitive to the nuances of 'emotionology'. Passion, for example, which has already been noted as a site of strong and often negative feeling (suffering, pain, desire, anger), was balanced by affection, a morally 'finer' form of feeling connected to benevolence and sympathy.[24] Affection was social and reciprocal, as well as devotional and loving: it served as a counter to the assumed-to-be more dangerous 'enthusiasm', associated with the mad ravings of religious extremists (of Methodist

or Roman Catholic persuasion, depending on the bias of the critic). Sentiment, by contrast, indicated a more refined and even 'affected' or inauthentic excess of feeling; while sensibility denoted a capacity for sensitive, appropriate and compassionate emotional response. The obsession with classifying and distinguishing emotions appealed across the intellectual spectrum too: some readers studied Alexander Bain's scholarly scientific text, *The Emotions and the Will* (1859) to assess what he identifies as eleven 'families of emotion'; while others were drawn to Robert Tyas' *The Sentiments of Flowers* (1836), which lists two hundred different 'sentiments' depicted through a variety of flora. The period's 'emotion culture' also touched on the way other discourses – morality, religion, education, gender, health, taste – were 'felt'. John Abercrombie's *The Philosophy of the Moral Feelings* (1833) and poems like Elizabeth Bonhote's *Feeling, or, Sketches from Life; A Desultory Poem* (1810) and 'Mrs' Stringer's *The Chain of Affection; A Moral Poem* (1830) revealed the extent to which feelings were associated with moral stability and social order. James Martineau's proclamation that 'Worship is an attitude which our nature assumes, not for a purpose, but from an emotion' typifies the connection between feeling and religion, as does Mary Ann Stodart's 'heart-religion, coming from the heart, and travelling to the heart'.[25] Stodart's work is representative too of a nineteenth-century tendency to feminize and domesticate feeling as the duty of 'woman . . . it is her part to soothe, to solace, and to sympathize' by softening and gentling the space of the home.[26] On the other hand, Herbert Spencer considered 'moral sentiments' beyond the emotional capacity of women and children, making the same social and cultural assumptions about biological difference as Stodart but from the opposite perspective.[27] Reading feeling through biological difference is not confined to nineteenth-century thinking, however: modern beliefs about feeling and thinking, hearts and heads, are often used as a basis to make distinctions about the way women and men behave, decision-make and relate. Whether modern accounts make these distinctions via culture (ideology produces women and men differently) or science (hormonal or neural differences account for gendered ways of behaving or responding to the world), such conjecture derives largely from the Victorians.

Nineteenth-century readers were also confronted with such divisions, but reflected on them differently. Coleridge, for example, associated poetic genius with androgyny just as Mary Wollstonecraft claimed that souls had no sex: while critics point out that both writers assume this ideally hybrid human is male, Coleridge and Wollstonecraft nevertheless imply a refusal to equate women with feeling and men with reason.[28] Sarah Ellis argued in *The Education of the Heart: Women's Best Work* (1869), for example, that women needed to be 'trained' to feel as Stodart expected them to, undermining the notion that biology and feeling are directly connected.[29] The phenomenon of the 'poetess' also implicitly challenged women's emotionality by associating the woman poet with linguistic effusion, spontaneity and excess, even as her performance was defined by careful versification. Poems by Landon and Felicia Hemans in particular were frequently compared to 'waters from a fountain, gushing', recalling Germaine de Stael's ad-libbing female laureate

in her novel, *Corinne* (1807). Yet their 'improvisations' were informed by poetic, aesthetic and historical tradition, as well as being strategically published and marketed to a vast readership – men as well as women – who were eager to develop the same emotional intelligence.[30] Only a few decades earlier, for example, Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling* (1771) had ennobled the sentimental and weepy hero Harley by relating his story through the emotions he experiences in different relationships and encounters. By the nineteenth century, Harley's ability to feel had become so popular with readers that an 'Index to Tears' was appended to the novel for quick reference: from Mackenzie's depiction of heroic weeping to Tennyson's grieving self-portrait as 'an infant crying in the night / An infant crying for the light', men were free to emote.[31]

Many male poets suffered for assuming too 'feminine' an emotive stance, however: Tennyson was pulled up by Manley Hopkins for his 'womanly' and 'amatory tenderness' towards the deceased Hallam in *In Memoriam*; and Dante Gabriel Rossetti was accused of 'fleshly' feeling by Robert Buchanan.[32] Where John Keats had been declared guilty of Cockney effeminacy for the expression of a refined feeling beyond his class, Tennyson and Rossetti were denounced for writing about coarse feeling below their cultural status.[33] Part of the anxiety about who could feel what in the period can be attributed to concerns about whether ideas once thought to regulate emotional experience (religion, morality, ethics) could still do so. The appeal of David Hartley to Wordsworth and Coleridge, for example, was his ostensible bringing together of theology and science in *Observations on Man* (1749) to argue that mental phenomena are produced by associations and vibrations felt and interpreted by the body and mind. For Hartley, humans make sense of their worlds by receiving signals about them that vibrate along the nervous system; these sensations are computed as we associate what we see, hear, touch, taste and smell into a sequence of correspondences that then form thoughts, values and judgments. This implies an implicit connection between mental events (thoughts, feelings) and physical events (vibrations in the brain): the immaterial and material are connected just as the motions of planets impact upon our presence in the universe. As Coleridge worked out, the implication of such a theory is that subjective experiences – of the mind and the heart – could be granted as objective a reality as things seen and touched, like rocks or trees.

For Hartley as for Coleridge, this provided a shared 'evidence' of God through the material 'reality' of faith and intuition. Poets writing in the wake of Hartley considered mental phenomena from beliefs and hunches to feelings and moods to be concrete and collective, and not, as some modern critics assume, immaterial and atomized.[34] From Hemans' religious reading, in which she aimed to 'enlarge . . . the sphere of Religious Poetry, by associating with its themes more of the emotions, the affections'; to Shelley's musical exposition, in which the poet is 'an instrument over which a series of external and internal impressions are driven, like the alternations of an ever-changing wind over an Aeolian lyre', poetry gathers readers into a communal and harmonious experience.[35] Like Wordsworth's musical

integration of thought and feeling, nineteenth-century poetry produces as well as records civil relationships founded on 'social sympathies' through which humans co-exist and interact. As Marx states, if 'language, like consciousness, only arises from the need, the necessity, of intercourse with other men', and consciousness registers the 'immediate sensuous environment' and 'connection with other persons and things', then our feelingful awareness of our world is relational and collective.[36]

SOCIAL EMOTION

However affective experience is defined in nineteenth-century poetry it is always social. Wordsworth and Coleridge knew as much when they gave their volume a hybrid form – *Lyrical Ballads* – to encompass the more reclusive lyric and the communal ballad. Poetry of this period relentlessly negotiates the relationship between form and feeling, and so entirely rejects the binary logic that splits off conscious knowing from visceral feeling. Coleridge's claim that poetry is 'a rationalized dream dealing to manifold Forms our own Feelings' does more than attribute a psychological or dream-like origin to verse; it suggests that our thoughts distribute or 'deal out' feelings that are readily articulated through the various forms poetry offers.[37] Poetry might regulate feeling, as Keble thought it could, trusting as he did in rhythm and metre to obliquely communicate with and about God free of enthusiasm or excess; or it might transform feeling into a text, shaping linguistic sites of energetic concentration and release. Either way it negotiates feeling familiar and unfamiliar, bringing readers close up with states material conditions threatened to splinter while gentling the experience of disturbing or difficult self-knowledge. The spasmodics, for example, were both popular for rhythmically mapping the fidgety, restless and alienated body for a society intrigued by emergent physiological knowledges; but also harshly critiqued for apparent insensitivity to the affective biography of human being.[38] Poetry also reached readers concerned with the feelings of non-human beings, specifically the pain animals experienced during scientific experiment. As Jed Mayer argues, the period's vivisection debates were centred on the question of animal emotion, particularly as it was staged in Charles Darwin's *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872), wherein human and animal feelings were linked. Public compassion for animals is a defining emotion of the nineteenth century, from dog-worship to the outcry at Jumbo's sale to the allegedly cruel circus owner, P. T. Barnum, in 1882.[39] Christina Rossetti's religious devotion to all aspects of creation, for example, is as much to do with a 'green' commitment to species and antivivisectionism as to her religious faith.[40] Rossetti's description of her poems as 'records' of 'sensation, fancy' echoes Hemans' focus on the word 'record', notably in *Records of Woman* (1828), which itself 'comes from the Latin *cor/cordis*, for heart, as conventional symbol of the humane and social feelings'.[41]

Even poems that beg to be read as mysterious or esoteric riddles addressed to veiled addressees end up inviting the reader to reflect on their expression and in doing so forge a social pact with them. Joseph Freiherr Von Eichendorff's lyric 'Mondnacht' (1835), for example, is a notoriously enigmatic and moody example, its hermitic intensity incarnated in its language ('It was as though the heavens / Had silently kissed the earth, / Such that in the blossom's lustre, / She was caught in dreams of them . . .') and redoubled in Robert Schumann's romantic setting of the poem.[42] While 'themes' are self-evident – romantic love, the relationship between heaven and earth, the dream-life of the mind, nature and the soul – their emotional content is not: it is almost impossible to relate the 'feelings' here without reducing them to cliché. As Theodor Adorno observes in his essay on Eichendorff, the reader of feeling threatens to collapse 'Mondnacht' into a predetermined message of 'romance' or 'love of nature' by either embracing such content as profound and authentic, or rejecting it as shallow and saccharine. Adorno recalls his schoolteacher's dismissal of Eichendorff's image of the sky kissing the earth as 'trivial'; by contrast, a participant in a recent study of music psychology stated that the lines evoke a 'mystical experience . . . an enchantment.'[43] Adorno moves beyond this impasse by suggesting that the critic stave off the oblivion of individual taste by subordinating the narrative to the interpretive, and so turning the work of affects back on the reader. That poetry should enable readers to face and reflect upon emotion without defensiveness is a desperately urgent task for Adorno, writing as he was in the context of post-war Germany: if people 'allow themselves more of their affects and passions, if they do not once again repeat in themselves the pressure that society exerts upon them, then they will be far less evil, far less sadistic, and far less malicious than they sometimes are today'.[44] The question holds import too for our own neoliberal moment, one that champions individual choice as a freedom of market transactions, but in doing so demotes social relationships, welfare provisions and environmental sustainability in the name of capital value. This brutal commercialization of human experience and feeling is forewarned, not only by Marx, but by many of the poets commented on in this volume. Nineteenth-century poetry might appear to line up as a precursor to the commodification of feeling, its pathos and sentimentality satisfying the reader just enough to distract and benumb. Yet, as this discussion suggests, the focus of the period's poetry and poetics on emotion as the medium of reading and thinking invites the reader of the past and present to interrupt the assurances of subjective feeling to reflect instead on its consequences for relationship and community.

---

[1] Isobel Armstrong, 'The Role and Treatment of Emotion in Victorian Criticism of Poetry', *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, 10 (1977), 3-16 (14).

[2] Isobel Armstrong, *The Radical Aesthetic* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), p. 108; and see Tamara Ketabgian, 'Affect', in Juliet John, ed., *Oxford Bibliographies in Victorian Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); and Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, 'An Inventory

of Shimmers', in Gregg and Seigworth, ed., *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010), pp. 1-25.
[3] Armstrong, *Radical Aesthetic*, p. 109, quoting A. E. Housman, 'The Name and Nature of Poetry (1933).
[4] Richard Aldington, *A. E. Housman and W. B. Yeats: Two Lectures* (Hurst, Berkshire: Peacocks Press, 1955), p. 11.
[5] Plato, *The Republic* (London: Penguin, 2007).
[6] S. T. Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria* (1815-17), chapter XV, in H. J. Jackson, ed., *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2008), p. 325; William Hazlitt, 'On Poetry in General,' *Lectures on English Poets and The Spirit of the Age* (London: J. M. Dent, 1910), pp. 3-18 (p. 3).
[7] John Keble, *Lectures on Poetry 1832-1841*, trans. E. K. Francis, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), p. 22; Letitia Elizabeth Landon, 'On the Character of Mrs Hemans' Writings,' *New Monthly Magazine*, 44 (1835), in Jerome McGann and Daniel Riess, *Letitia Elizabeth Landon: Selected Writings* (Ontario: Broadview, 1997), pp. 173-186 (p. 173).
[8] John Stuart Mill, 'What is Poetry', in Edward Alexander, ed., *Literary Essays* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Herrill, 1967), p. 56.
[9] Robert Buchanan [Thomas Maitland], 'The Fleshly School of Poetry. Mr D. G. Rossetti', *The Contemporary Review*, October, 1871;
http://www.rossettiarchive.org/docs/ap4.c7.18.rad.html
[10] Sydney Dobell, *Thoughts on Art, Philosophy, and Religion, Selected from the Unpublished Papers of Sydney Dobell* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co, 1876), pp. 36-37.
[11] William Butler Yeats, 'The Symbolism of Poetry,' from *Ideas of Good and Evil* (London: A. H. Bullen, 1903), p. 244.
[12] Adam Smith, *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* (1759), 2olvs (Edinburgh: Bell and Bradfute Lackington, Allen and Co, 1808); Benedict de Spinoza, *Ethics* (1677), trans. George Eliot (Salzburg: University of Salzburg, 1981).
[13] On Smith and Spinoza, see Isobel Armstrong, 'George Eliot, Spinoza, and the Emotions,' in Amanda Anderson and Harry E. Shaw, ed., *A Companion to George Eliot* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), pp. 294-308.
[14] Teresa Brennan, *The Transmission of Affect* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).
[15] Emily Brontë, 'Alone I sat; the summer day' (1837), in Derek Roper, ed., *The Poems of Emily Brontë* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Alfred Tennyson, *In Memoriam* (1850), in Erik Gray, ed., *In Memoriam: Norton Critical Editions* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), verse 5, ll. 1-12.
[16] William Wordsworth, 'Preface to *Lyrical Ballads, with Pastoral and Other Poems* (1802)', in Stephen Gill, *William Wordsworth: The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2008), p. 611.
[17] William Wordsworth, 'Note to 'The Thorn' (1800)', in Gill, ed. *Wordsworth*, p. 594.
[18] William Wordsworth, 'Essay, Supplementary to the Preface (1815)', in Gill, ed. *Wordsworth*, p. 641.
[19] William Wordsworth, *The Prelude* (1805), in M. H. Abrams, Stephen Gill, Jonathan Wordsworth, ed., *The Prelude 1799, 1805, 1850: Authoritative Texts, Context and Reception, Recent Critical Essays: Norton Critical Editions* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1979), Book 1, l. 20.
[20] Wordsworth, *The Prelude*, Book 1, ll. 351-361.
[21] Wordsworth, *The Prelude,* Book 1, l. 441; l. 600.
[22] W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley, 'The Affective Fallacy', *The Sewanee Review*, 57.1 (1949), 31-55 (34, 39, 44, 45).
[23] See 'Emotion', University of Pittsburgh Keyword Project:
http://keywords.pitt.edu/keywords_defined/emotion.html
[24] See Francis Hutcheson, *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections with Illustrations on the Moral Sense* (1728), 3rd edn (1742) (Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1969).
[25] James Martineau, *Hymns for the Christian Church and Home* (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1859), p. 8; Mary Ann Stodart, *Every Day Duties: In Letters to a Young Lady* (London: Seeley and Burnside, 1840), p. 206.

[26] Stodart, *Every Day Duties*, p. 16.
[27] Herbert Spencer, 'Morals and Moral Sentiments' (1852), in *Essays: Scientific, Political and Speculative* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1891).
[28] Theresa Kelley, 'Women, Gender and Literary Criticism', in Marshall Brown, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 321-337 (p. 330).
[29] 165. gesa Sarah Ellis argued in *The Education of the Heart: Women's Best Work* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1869), p. 206.
[30] Linda H. Peterson, 'Rewriting *A History of the Lyre*: Laetitia Landon, Elizabeth Barrett Browning and the (Re)Construction of the Nineteenth-Century Woman Poet,' in Isobel Armstrong and Virginia Blain, ed., *Women's Poetry Late Romantic to Late Victorian* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), pp. 115-132.
[31] Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, verse 56, ll. 18-19.
[32] Manley Hopkins, 'The Poetry of Sorrow', *The Times* (November 28, 1851), p. 8, issue 20971; Buchanan, 'Fleshly School'.
[33] See Jeffrey N. Cox, *Poetry and Politics in the Cockney School: Keats, Shelley, Hunt and their Circle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
[34] For example, see Helen Vendler's statement that 'Lyric is the genre of private life: it is what we say to ourselves when we are alone', in *Poems, Poets, Poetry: An Introduction and Anthology* (Boston: St Martin's, 2002), p. xlii.
[35] Felicia Hemans, 'Preface,' *Scenes and Hymns of Life, with Other Religious Poems* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood; London: T. Cadell, 1834), vii *; and P. B. Shelley, *A Defence of Poetry* (1821), in Zachary Leader and Michael O'Neill, ed., *Percy Bysshe Shelley: The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2009), p. 675.
[36] Karl Marx, 'Part I: Feuerbach. Opposition of the Materialist and Idealist Outlook', in *The German Ideology* (1845), 'https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm
[37] Seamus Perry, ed., *Coleridge's Notebooks: A Selection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 66.
[38] See Jason Rudy and Charles LaPorte, ed., 'Spasmodic Poetry and Poetics', *Victorian Poetry*, special issue, 42.4 (2004).
[39] See Harriet Ritvo, *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).
[40] Emma Mason, ""Whales and all that move in the waters":
Christina Rossetti's ecology of grace', in Wendy Parkins, ed., *Victorian Sustainability* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2016).
[41] Gary Kelly, ed., 'Introduction', *Felicia Hemans: Selected Poems, Prose and Letters* (Ontario: Bradoview, 2002), pp. 15-85 (pp. 28-29).
[42] Joseph Freiherr von Eichendorff , 'Mondnacht' (1837), trans. K. Winter as 'Moonlit Night' http://www.henleusa.com/en/schumann-anniversary-2010/schumann-forum/mondnacht.html; see Robert Schumann, Song Cycle Opus 39 (1840).
[43] Theodor W. Adorno, *Notes to Literature: Volume 1*, trans. Shierry Weber Nicholsen (New York: Columbia University Press), p. 56; Alf Gabrielsson, *Strong Experiences with Music: Music is Much More Than Just Music*, trans. Rod Bradbury (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 223-234.
[44] Theodor W. Adorno, 'Discussion of Professor Adorno's Lecture "The Meaning of Working Through the Past"', *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), pp. 295-306 (pp. 299-300).