

Contents

Introduction

The relationship between scholarship and criticism. Why criticism is intellectually exercising; why critics should be exercised by it. We shall be particularly concerned with critical disagreements. 1

The structure and methodology of this book. Central concern with criticism of literature. 6

Chapter One The complexities of critical judgements. 8

1 A banal classificatory judgement may conceal moral and evaluative dimensions. 8

2 Can the usual distinction between what is banal and what is true be preserved in criticism? Response terms. Can works of art establish moral truths? 10

3 Certain assumptions underlie even a banal interpretative judgement about the literal sense of a work. 17

4 The basis of an incontestable interpretative claim about the non-literal significance of a work. Allegory as an example. The role of information external to the text. 18

5 The basis of a contestable interpretative claim about a work's non-literal significance. Different role of external information in different cases. Historicity of art objects. 21

6 Difficulties where an irrefutable judgement about the literal sense of a work coincides verbally with a problematic judgement about its deeper significance. 24

7 How do we decide between different interpretative claims both of which have a basis in the literal sense of the text? (This question is considered further in the following three sections.) The role of critical principles. 25

8 Where two interpretative judgements are supported equally by the literal sense of the work, it may be that neither is wrong. 'Seeing an aspect'. Differing roles of knowledge about author's intention in such cases. 27

9 Consistency with the literal sense of a work is not a sufficient condition for an interpretative judgement's being tenable. Role of connotations of words in a work. (Example: critical views of Andrew Marvell's 'To His Coy Mistress'.) 30

10	Why some interpretative judgements are inconsistent with literal sense. Is consistency with literal sense a necessary condition for a judgement's being tenable? The attraction of complexity for modern critics. (Example: critical views of Gerard Manley Hopkins' 'The Windhover'.)	33
11	Critics may agree in their interpretation of a work but disagree in their evaluation of it; such a disagreement cannot be resolved by appeal to the text. Critical disagreement may conceal a moral conflict; role of moral considerations in criticism. The cogency of these critical arguments depends on how we respond when we read the work. (Example: critical views of D.H. Lawrence.)	39
	<i>Chapter Two The nature of critical arguments.</i>	44
1	What is the nature of a critical argument? (Example: the arguments of F.R. Leavis and R.H. Fogle in their disagreement over Shelley.) Nature and location of the disagreement. Relationship between feature and effect in Leavis' argument more than causal. Fogle's method of reply. In Leavis' 'argument' the conclusion is logically prior to the particular observations made in support of it. Ways of replying other than Fogle's still encounter this difficulty.	44
	Is Leavis' then an argument at all? Priority of 'conclusion' is not peculiar to critical argument. Distinction between critical and scientific arguments. Agreement between critical responses is the basis of the objective idiom of critical discourse.	48
	Logical relationship between Leavis' critical terms and his evaluative judgements. Is the connection between trait and evaluation immediate, or do the two 'go together'? His terms are context-bound. Consequent difficulties of articulating a disagreement with Leavis. Some critical terms are general in their meaning but can be fully understood only through their use in particular cases; Leavis' terms may be of this sort. These terms are not used as criteria. Leavis' insistence that appeal to criteria is inappropriate in criticism.	50
	Seeing an aspect; but we can't see anything as anything. We do sometimes argue <i>to</i> an aesthetic appreciation. The Leavis/Fogle disagreement is not necessarily characteristic.	54
2	Certain interpretative judgements, including some which have been chronically debated, can be shown to be correct. Features of the work which explain the continuing disagreement. The presence of a feature in a work is not sufficient for its having the effect suggested by the critic. (Example: critical views of Milton's style.)	56
3	Is it appropriate to put an experimental construction on	

critical explanations? The correctness of an ostensibly substantial claim depends on its being accepted. Yet acceptance may then generate the substance. This meta-critical thesis is an empirical one. (Example: Cleanth Brooks on Housman.) 62

4 How do we decide whether a critical explanation is correct (assuming the truth of what is to be explained)? The attraction of an explanation. A plausible explanation may 'create' the response it seeks to explain. (Example: Christopher Ricks on Milton.) 65

5 Detailed examination of the possibility of experimentally testing a critical explanation. (Example: a claim by J. Stallworthy about W.B. Yeats' 'A Coat'.) 68

Chapter Three The logical richness of criticism; an analysis of Ricks on Tennyson. 84

A comprehensive analysis of a sustained piece of criticism and fuller discussion of some large problems already raised. (Example: Ricks' criticism of part of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*.) 84

Complexity and ambiguity of apparently straightforward claims. Compression and interfusion of different dimensions of critical remarks. 89

Critical terms may not be univocal, even within a single piece of criticism; 'interpretation' as an illustration. 90

Logical relationships between and within claims. A detailed examination of the relationship between a feature and the effect Ricks claims it has (his claim about the effect of an abba rhyme scheme). 92

The normative dimension of critical argument; does not rule out but rather presupposes and requires a causal dimension. The role of common sensibility and general connections. Distinction between natural and conventional connections. The difficulty of isolating the effect of individual features in works of art. When does hyper-acuity become over-sensitivity? 101

A claim where the presence of a feature is problematic (Ricks' claim about the 'subterranean idea'); factors which decide whether or not we accept the claim. 105

Comparison of the relationship between the 'subterranean idea' and our response with the relationship between the rhyme scheme and our response. Cause and target. Moral dimension of our response to the 'subterranean idea'. 107

Danger of inflation of a feature in critics' description of it; general danger of over-reading and 'creative' criticism. 113

<i>Chapter Four</i>	<i>Are there any necessary conditions of excellence in art?</i>	115
	Are there any necessary conditions of excellence in a particular genus, drama? Unities of time and place, credibility, and unity of action, considered (and rejected). Reasons for difficulty of finding such necessary conditions.	115
	Are there any 'local' necessary conditions of excellence within a particular species of genus? Funniness in comedy considered; not a formal notion, so it leaves room for disagreement, and is too close to being tautological to be useful as a criterion.	123
	Connection between a work's being a good one of its species, a good one of its genus, and a good work of art.	123
	Are there any necessary conditions of excellence in works of art? Skill and originality considered. Reply to the objection that they are irrelevant because they are 'genetic' qualities. Too close to being tautological to be useful as criteria.	125
	Are there any more substantial criteria? Clive Bell's 'significant form' considered (and rejected).	129
	Monroe Beardsley's definition of objective reasons; objections to his exclusion of genetic, moral and cognitive qualities. His canons of complexity, unity and intensity, are supported by his definition of aesthetic experience. This definition is both too exclusive and not sufficiently particular. Problems of subsuming particular qualities of works under the canons; disagreement always possible. The danger of 'freewheeling rationalisations'.	131
	Conclusion that it is unlikely that there are any criteria of excellence in works of art. Thesis that aesthetic objects and judgements lack an essence.	138
<i>Chapter Five</i>	<i>Reasons, causes and targets.</i>	141
	A detailed critique of two opposed monolithic views of criticism (Beardsley's that critical reasons must be general; Isenberg's that critical remarks are logically singular.)	141
	The work is characteristically both the cause and the target of our response.	147
	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	159
	<i>Notes to the Text</i>	161
	<i>Index</i>	177