

## The Amorous Dynamics of Romanticism

Naji B. Oueijan  
Notre Dame University

**Abstract:** *If a poet writes a poem, it is because he/she loves poetry; and if he/she loves poetry, it is because he/she loves the elements that warrant poetic experience. These elements, including the poet himself and all that constitutes a poem (the subject matter, poetic diction and form), act intimately one upon the other to produce poetic experiences. The agent that activates the interaction of all of these elements is amour; it is a love liaison, which in Romanticism, is principally invigorated by spontaneous powerful feelings. In this work, I claim that in Romanticism an affaire d'amour takes place between the self and the other, the poet and the poem; this culminates with amorous moments (ecstatic poetic experiences), which Wordsworth would call "spots of time" and Shelley, "visitations of the divinity". The dynamics of amour are motor forces that seem to embrace, exalt, and serve the poet-lover.*

Romantic poets are poet-lovers preoccupied with the amorous poet-poem relationship. For if a Romantic poet writes a poem, it is because he/she loves poetry; and if he/she loves poetry, it is because he/she idealizes the elements that warrant poetic experience. The elements that constitute a poem (the subject matter, poetic diction and prosody), act intimately one upon the other in the mind of the poet to produce poetic experiences. And the agent, which activates the interaction of all of these elements, is *amour*; it is a love liaison principally invigorated by the poet's spontaneous passionate feelings. Particularly in Romanticism an affaire d'amour takes place between the Self and the Other, the poet and the amorous other; this culminates with *amorous moments* (ecstatic poetic experiences) whereas Self fuses with Other, thus rendering poet and poem one. Wordsworth calls such moments "spots of time" and Shelley, "visitations of the divinity". The dynamics of amour are motor forces that seem to embrace, exalt, and serve the poet-lover. At their basis lies an *amorous yearning* (force stirring passion and attraction) for all that elevates poetic experiences. This is succeeded by *amorous contemplation* (force invigorating sensibility and perceptiveness), which sets the self's strong passions and thoughts on an amorous quest, whose basic goal is to create a text, a poem, which should carry the contemplated attributes of the other. Then, the physical world of amour becomes the text of a poem through which the poet's self exercises an *amorous dialogue* (force

suspending bridges and stimulating fusion) with that which is outside itself, with Man and Nature, and with the text of the poem. This fashions an *amorous incantation* comprised of elevated *amorous moments*. Thus Self and Other, the poet and the object of contemplation, become one just as an amorous pair (two selves and two others) yearn for and think of each other and then exchange amorous emotions and messages before they spiritually and physically merge into each other.

To moralistic poets like Chaucer, Sidney, Milton, Dryden, and Pope, poetry embodies the highest form of instruction: the poet commissions himself the task of a teacher, and the poem becomes the textbook, which is indicative of the poet's scholarship. In his *An Apologie for Poetrie*, Sidney makes it clear that poetry has two ultimate goals: to teach and to delight (190–232). These ultimate goals prevailed in English literature up until the end of the eighteenth century, when Romanticism reacted sharply against poetic traditions. To traditional poets, Self is above Other, as it assumes the role of maker of texts. Thus text and poet cannot meet. And the poet's subjective experiences are minor, because his basic concern is to objectively observe, study, and comment on the object of his observation. The text becomes more like a magnifier reflecting images of man and nature, images which the poet chooses to observe and imitate. And the elements constituting a poem are determined by the poet's choice and craftsmanship and not by his imaginative sensibility. Furthermore, although the poet is the creator of the poem, he is detached from his creation, because the poet's central point is not how Self appears in the text; rather, it is how Other appears, or how the poet wants this Other to appear. Here the poet depends less on emotive appeals and more on rational signs; the poet's heart is at ease when his wit is at full gear. Such poetry depends more on the poet's craftsmanship than on his/her imaginative sensibility. Thus, self-education and self-formation are overshadowed by the education and the formation of the self of the other.

On the other hand, in Romantic poetry "self-making and text-making imply and implicate each other. They play off against each other and do much to determine each other's modes of being" (Garber:1988, ix). And the relation between the poet and the text represents the relationship between a lover and his beloved. The text carries in its elements various attributes of this beloved, images which signify the self's passionate inter-relationships with the self and the other. To the Romantic poet, the self's passionate poetic experience is foremost. It represents a quest for personal knowledge, which when explored by a reader becomes his/her source of

edification and satisfaction. And the aesthetic experience is generated by the fusion of Self, be it the poet's or the reader's, with the elements that constitute the text. The poet and the reader are no more detached observers of or commentators on a work of art, they are lovers and participants in the creation of the aesthetic artistic experience, though each according to his personal context. In Romanticism art making, or text making, is an act of love and devotion.

The Romantics suggest, as had Dante, that love was the route by which the time-bound individual might learn a vision of ultimate truth, a glimpse of that world which stands behind or above our meager existences. Hence love was a state of being that was eagerly to be coveted, not for purposes of physical satisfaction, but rather because the attraction of one soul for another was a guarantee that the entire universe was permeated with similar energy and spirit, says Howard E. Hugo (1975:8–9). Thus, amour is the Romantics' "route" to experience visions of ultimate truth, which they recreated in poetry. Wordsworth makes it clear in his "Preface" that the object of poetry is truth, "not individual and local, but general, and operative; not standing upon external testimony, but carried alive into the heart of passion. ... Poetry is the image of man and nature" (325).<sup>1</sup> He goes on to assert that poetry is

an acknowledgement of the beauty of the universe, an acknowledgement the more sincere, because it is not formal, but indirect; it is a task light and easy to him who looks at the world in the spirit of love (325).

To the Romantics, the medium for the search for Truth is Love; and the traditional proverb, "Love is blind," may apply to traditional poets, but not to the Romantics, who would strongly agree with Roland Barthes's claim that Love opens the eyes wide and that it "produces clear-sightedness" (229).<sup>2</sup> Shelley confirms: "The great secret of morals is Love; or a going out of our own nature, and an identification of ourselves with the beautiful which exists in thought, action, or person, not our own" (1076). Both the artist's passions and intellect are, then, instrumental to the production of a work of art, which represents an idealization of aesthetic moments involving revelations of Beauty and Truth. Wordsworth ends his *Prelude* emphasizing the significance of imagination and love:

By love subsists  
All lasting grandeur, by pervading love;

That gone, we are but dust.  
(XIV, 168–170)

In the act of making poetry, the poet's soul is in need for a medium for aesthetic expressions; it needs a text that would carry within its components signs or elements representing those idealized moments of intensity and awareness. The poet needs a body, which may justly carry the beauty and truth of his/her aesthetic experience. The act of poeticizing, then, needs a text; and what is text but a limited set of linguistic signs signifying expressions or images which are produced by the amorous interaction between the poet's soul and the signs playing one upon the other to produce these expressions and images. Creation of poem, then, is creation of an idealized text; it is creation of Beauty and Truth in a text; it is creation or recreation of an amorous experience. Therefore, it should not surprise us to know that the Romantic poet idealizes his poem much as a lover idealizes his beloved. Here, the "relational-model theories" applied in psychoanalysis could help explain the amorous relation between poet and text. Stephen Mitchell (1988) maintains that an individual cannot be studied as a separate entity whose desires clash with an external reality, but an interactional field within which the individual arises and struggles to make contact and to articulate himself. *Desire* is experienced always *in the context of relatedness*, and it is that context which defines its meaning. Mind is composed of relational configurations" (3).

Wordsworth asserts that the poet is someone capable of conversing with nature with pleasure and passion, and Lord Byron writes, "poetry is the expression of *excited passion* (326).<sup>3</sup> The Romantic poet is packed with passions and desires in need of contact and articulation. Similarly, the text of a poem is packed with the poet's passions and desires "*in the context of relatedness*." But passions and desires are invigorated by amour, which itself facilitates the creation of "an interactional field," an amorous spectrum of interconnection and relationship, a text of a poem, within which the poet is capable of achieving an aesthetic amours liaison. This poetic experience, however, is unrealized until a poem is experienced; i.e., placed "*in the context of relatedness*." Contextual relatedness is, thus, an amorous spectrum of communication. The text talks amorously to the poet and the reader, and the poet and the reader respond, just as lovers talk to their beloved or visa versa. This process of communication, I call *amorous dialogue*, which I will discuss further later in this work. In this respect, an incommunicable poem lacks the dynamics of amour, it may be

admired, but it cannot be loved; and consequently, it cannot be experienced. Besides, if the self is both creator and creation and self shapes and is shaped by its relational matrix, as Mitchell (ibid) believes, then the poet is poet and poem, lover and beloved. Discussing Shelley, Wasserman (1971) notes: “the poet writes himself” (417).<sup>4</sup> I believe that the poet does so only when he merges into the terrain of the other and builds up a matrix of communication, which when reproached by the poet, he can perceive his true self. I even dare say that once the poem is experienced by a reader—Wordsworth declares “poets do not write for poets alone, but for men” (327).—the spectrum of amorous communication becomes larger, embracing the poet, poem, and reader. Here the reader joins the triangular terrain of amour, and the *dialogue* becomes a *trialogue*. The Romantic poetic experience, which synthesizes all involved in its creation, has at its basis the ultimate goal of fusing all in a harmonious amorous interrelationship. In his “Lectures on Shakespeare,” Coleridge(1979) confirms that

the power of so carrying on the eye of the reader as to make him almost lose the consciousness of words—to make him *see* everything—and this without exciting any painful or laborious attention is possessed only by great poets (407).

This fusion of “each into each” and into all is only possible by what Coleridge refers to as “the synthetic and magical power to which we have exclusively appropriated the name of imagination” (*Biographia Literaria*, XV, 455).

The Romantic poetic experience, this terrain of amour, I believe, is first prompted by *amorous yearning*, an involuntary process stirring attraction and interest, just like love at first sight, which according to Roland Barthes (1978:189), has the scholarly name, “*enamoration*” . Outside sensory physical or spiritual attributes of an object act upon the poet’s inner self to produce automatic amouristic impulses towards these attributes. Not only human beings but also humble objects and events with modest degrees of beauty and dignity, like meeting a peddler, or seeing a daffodil or a bird, could stimulate the poet’s passions, “For the human mind is capable of being excited without the application of gross and violent stimulants,” says Wordsworth (Preface 322). Besides, it does not matter whether the attributes of the object generate inner agreeable or disagreeable impulses: true love involves both joy and sorrow, and the self may be attracted by joy as much as it may be enraptured by sorrow; it

may indeed enjoy sorrow as much as it may enjoy joy. In his essay "On Love," Shelley defines love as

that powerful attraction towards all we conceive, or fear, or hope beyond ourselves, when we find within our own thoughts the chasm of an insufficient void, and seek to awaken in all things that are, a community with what we experience within ourselves. ... This is love. This is the bond and the sanction which connects not only man with man, but with everything which exists (1070).

"Ode to the West Wind" is a perfect model of this amorous attraction mixing fear with hope. And in his "Defence of Poetry," Shelley affirms, "The pleasure that is in sorrow is sweeter than the pleasure of pleasure itself" (1083). Furthermore, Coleridge exalts sorrow and illness which have always sapped his poetic passions in his "Dejection: An Ode"; and in "Ode to a Nightingale," Keats enjoys the aches of his heart and the numbness of his "sense" at hearing the bird's song, which lifts him high on the "viewless wings of Poesy." These automatic amouristic impulses convert the poet's feelings and thoughts onto the domain of these sensory or spiritual attributes. At this early stage, Self is still separated from Other; it is in a state of strong attraction and a desire to approach the other to start a dialogue through which the self seeks knowledge about this other. This desire for building up communication with the other, which Hegel believes represents a longing for *self-consciousness*,<sup>5</sup> if maintained by the interplay between the self and the attributes of the other, may mature to a state of passionate contemplation, which is a force invigorating sensibility and perceptiveness. Observation, which is voluntary and peripheral, then turns into automatic reflection, and this induces the spontaneous creation or recreation of these attributes in a text, a poem, or else they are lost forever.

In Romantic poetry *amorous contemplation* produces ideas and words, which come along inadvertently at the same time to create a poetic text. The lover's discourse "exists only in outbursts of language," says Roland Barthes (197:3). This explains why the poetic language of love is, as Julia Kristeva (1987, 1-2) maintains,

impossible, inadequate, immediately allusive when one would like it to be most straightforward; it is a flight of metaphors—it is literature; .....in the rapture of love, the limits of one's identity vanish, at the same time that the precision of reference and meaning becomes blurred in love's discourse.

And since the poetic language of the Romantics is the language of deep love, devotion and passion, it must come forth in an automatic, amorous flow. In psychoanalytical views, passionate feelings and thoughts are rather disorganized, but they are beautiful and represent “an infinite quest for rebirths through the experience of love” (ibid:1). The Romantics have uttered this view earlier. Poetry represents “the perfect coincidence of the image and the words with the feelings,” as Hazlitt asserts, or a disorganized “overflow of powerful feelings,” as Wordsworth believes (qtd. Abram , 1953:59; see Preface 321 and 328). “If poetry comes not as naturally as the Leaves to a tree,” says John Keats, “it had better not come at all” (1212). Along the same line, Wordsworth also writes:

I have said that poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings: it takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquility: the emotion is contemplated till by a species of reaction the tranquility gradually disappears, and an emotion, kindred by 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, ... the mind will upon the whole be in a state of enjoyment (Preface 328).

Impressions, feelings, and ideas, then, spontaneously choose their own text. This text is made of words, which flow together in an amorous stream to form images, metaphors, and sounds appearing at suitable places and carrying the poet’s aesthetic poetic experience. Discussing the naturalness of Shakespeare’s images, Coleridge (1979:407) writes: “How many images and feelings are here brought together without effort and without discord.” And in his “Defence of Poetry,” Shelley maintains that a poet

cannot say, “I will compose poetry.” The greatest poet even cannot say it; for the mind in creation is as a fading coal, which some invisible influence, like an inconstant wind, awakens to transitory brightness; this power arises from within, like the color of a flower which fades and changes as it is developed, and the conscious portions of our natures are unprophetic either of its approach or its departure (1084).

Thus ideas, words, and sounds do not come by deliberate effort on the part of the poet, as was the case with traditional moralistic poetry. Romantic images, metaphors, and sounds speak the depth and intensity of the poet’s visions and feelings. They are not intended to embellish poetry or even to add effect—although quite frequently they do; rather, they

convey the deeply felt aesthetic feelings of the poet who has little choice in their creation as they amorously flow together to form a poetic text. Coleridge (1979), however, believes that whenever the poet is “strongly affected by joy, grief, or anger,” and “whatever generalizations of truth or experience the heat of passion may produce, yet the terms of their conveyance must have pre-existed in his former conversations, and are only collected and crowded together by the unusual stimulation” (464). Then the act of creating a poetic text depends upon the poet’s personal experiences and linguistic skills. And only when the poet does not find the appropriate term to express his aesthetic experience that he invents new terms.<sup>6</sup> It follows that poetic sounds—produced by rhythm, rhyme, alliteration, and repetition—convey the general mood of the poetic experience. Thus the poet’s contemplation of the attributes of the other renders amorous reflection communication; and communication, a poetic text.<sup>7</sup> Here, it must not be forgotten that amour is the motor force that induces the whole process of creating a text, a poem.

It is particularly interesting here to note that in Romantic poetry *amorous contemplation* renders the attributes of the other lovelier via the power of the poet’s imagination, which transcends the physical into the spiritual. Besides, contemplation, augmented by imagination, renders the self’s reflection a movement into the inner concealed attributes of the other, a quest for the Beauty and Truth of the other, which in many ways mirror the Beauty and Truth of the self. Using words, imagination sheds its light onto areas of the contemplated object that the physical eye of the poet cannot see. And just as stage-lightening effects render the stage setting and scene more attractive and beautiful, so does the light of the poet’s imagination; it turns the actual object into a lovelier and more beautiful representation than it actual is. Language is used here as a mirror which reflects the beautified attributes of the other. Exhilarated by amour, imagination reconstructs the attributes of the other and the self’s impressions of them in a set of metaphors, which turn abstract thoughts and feelings into concrete text. That is to say that attributes and feelings, which in the self communicate in abstraction, are concretized in a text via the power of the self’s imagination. Sir Walter Scott makes it clear that “It is the artist’s object, ... to communicate, as well as colours and words can do, the same sublime sensations which had dictated his own composition” (310). And the poet’s imagination chooses spontaneously and amorously the appropriate words and metaphors which reflect these thoughts and feelings. Thus poetic diction becomes this *Mirror*, and the poet’s imagination becomes *the Lamp* that sheds its light to make the



reflection possible—in this manner I interpret M. H. Abram's (1953) title, *The Mirror and the Lamp*.

The light of poetry is not only a direct but also a perfect light, that while it shews us the object, throws a sparkling radiance on all around it...(52).

This reflection becomes more beautiful than the original via the radiance of the lamp, the light of the imagination, the light of love. Richard Gravil (1974: 237-238) believes that

It is misleading of Christensen to call Intellectual Love the 'second' theme of *The Prelude*, since it is precisely Wordsworth's point that he never speaks of love without implying imagination, or imagination without implying love. Imagination and Love are manifested in the same power.<sup>8</sup>

The quester, the poet, employs this lamp, representing love and imagination, to direct him along his pilgrimage in the world of amour, the text of a poem. Then to the Romantic poet, the personal, actual experience has its own aesthetic value, but it is not a poetic experience until the light of the imagination directs its path and renders the actual experience lovelier than it really is. Shelley goes as far as asserting: "Poetry is a mirror which makes beautiful that which is distorted" (1075).

This beautified Other, then, becomes a text, a poem, through which the poet's self exercises an *amorous dialogue*, a force which suspends bridges with that which is outside the self.<sup>9</sup> At this stage contemplation does not limit itself to meditation, or reflection, or speculation, or deliberation; rather, it involves all of the above in an incessant interplay between these amouristic impulses implied in the text and the poet's self. Wordsworth meets the peddler, Coleridge hears the Eolian Harp, Byron visits Waterloo, Shelley witnesses a strong western gale, and Keats hears a nightingale singing every time they read the text they created, the text which mirrors their fusion with the object of contemplation. They all are driven into *amorous contemplative stages* every time they read the poem. Here, the object of contemplation is no more a detached object. The poet contemplates and creates; and what the poet creates becomes the object of his/her contemplation every time he/she reads the poem, thus poet becomes poet and text, contemplator and contemplated. To the poet the object of *amorous dialogue* becomes the subject—self-addressing self—since self and text become one. In this case *amorous dialogue* becomes an

interplay between poet and text, poet and poem, or between reader and text, or reader and poet and text. Romantic poems are thus amorous texts talking to both their creators and to their readers, who in turn respond in an amorous manner. It is this communication that produces the Romantic poetic experience, which is dependent on the dynamics of amour. And the real poem is not the text but the experience stimulated by its *amorous dialogue* with the poet and reader. This process of amorous interplay fashions, what Kristeva (1987) calls, *amorous incantation*, which she defines as an amorous dialogue, a “tension and jouissance, repetition and infinity; not as communication but as *incantation*. Song dialogue. *Invocation*”; she goes on to explain the process of such a dialogue, when discussing the amorous dialogue of the Song of Songs, by saying that the first notion

amounts to the following: through love, *I* posit myself as subject for the speech of the one who subdues me—the Master. The subjection is amorous, it supposes a reciprocity, even a priority for the sovereign’s love.... At the same time, and this is the second motion, in amorous dialogue *I* open up to the other, I welcome him in my loving swoon, or else I absorb him in my exaltation, I identify with him. With those two motions, the premises of *ecstasy* (of one’s going out of oneself) and *incarnation*, insofar as it is the ideal becoming body, are set within the amorous incantation of the Song of Songs (*Tales of Love* 93–94).

The amorous experience, made of elevated *amorous moments*, represents moments of distilled love; in other words, moments of higher communication, when communicator, or communicators (when a reader is involved) and communicated become one. Here normal language has no power of expression; it is replaced by the language of metaphor; then, poet, reader, and poem “are all subjects of the metaphor,” which carries the incommunicable to the level of an illuminating mental image. R. W. Gibbs, Jr. and S. B. Nascimento (1996) claim that, “Speaking of love seems to stretch the limits of language,” the reason why “We praise writers such as Neruda for their creative genius to think and express themselves figuratively” (291–292).<sup>10</sup> It is also true that speaking with love and passion has the same impact on language expansion. For the creation of images, or figures, “we require neither more nor less than this guide: amorous feeling,” says Barthes (1978: 4). Such a metaphor could be best described as a moment of self-illumination. Kristeva (1987:268) defines “metaphor” as a “*conveyance of meaning*, the economy that modifies language when subject and object of the utterance act muddle their borders” ; here language becomes, to use Barthes phrase, “*too much*

*and too little, excessive and impoverished,”* because, as Diderot claims, “The word is not the thing, but a flash in whose light we perceive the thing.”<sup>11</sup> But, when borders are muddled, they disappear, and utterance of subject becomes utterance of object, and *visa versa*. And if we accept the Narcissusian definition, which I believe is a Romantic definition, of the term “love” as “the luminous radiation, the gleaming reflection of the One, which the soul watches and loves” (ibid: 111), then love becomes the source and end of this utterance, this amorouristic poetic experience, which is embodied in an image, a metaphor, a poetic text. Thus when the Romantics describe their elevated poetic experiences as moments of illumination, associated with the light of wisdom and knowledge, they describe images, figures and metaphors carrying language into the realm of elevated amorouistic discourses. Through love, metaphoric language draws more than images of Beauty and Truth, it creates an emotional, spiritual, and intellectual aura for the moments of the self’s discourse with Beauty and Truth. The mind and the soul of the poet and/or reader fuse amorouistically with the object of contemplation and with the universe.

No one explains the effect of Romantic amorouistic moments on the poet or reader-contemplator better than Barthes (ibid), who draws the following image:

A Romantic painting shows a heap of icy debris in a polar light; no man, no object inhabits this desolate space; but for this very reason, provided I am suffering an amorous sadness, this void requires that I fling myself into it; I project myself there as a tiny figure, seated on a block of ice, abandoned forever. “I’m cold,” the lover says, “let’s go back”; but there is no road, no way, the boat is wrecked (133).

This image, recalling Coleridge’s image of “Kubla Khan” or Wordsworth’s image of the desert and the Arab Bedouin, Barthes calls, “force,” which makes the lover an artist (133). The image captures the beholder, and for brief moments there is no way out of it. The beholder becomes one with the beheld; self merges into the domain of the other; and they both become one. Such is the effect of the amorous poetic experience on both the poet and the reader. For the Romantic poet lover, the object of contemplation captures the self in the aura of amour. Through the power of the poet’s imagination, the aura of amour is recollected and recreated in a metaphoric text, which whenever visited by the poet or the reader, captures both poet and reader within its amorouistic

domain, the terrain of incantation, which liberates the self from the limitations of space and time.

The dynamics of amour, then, constitute the backbone of Romantic poetic experiences. To the Romantic artist the most that would stimulate passion and attraction are Beauty and Truth. When the poet lover creates a text, a poem, he creates poetry, which Leigh Hunt defines as “imaginative passion” for truth, beauty, and power embodied in a combination of expressions and images, which triumph over space and time (711). And to the Romantics, the only agent capable of defying space and time to reach the stage of *amorous incantation* is amour.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Wordsworth’s “Preface To the Second Edition of *The Lyrical Ballads*,” *English Romantic Writers*. Ed. by David Perkins (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, INC., 1967). All quotations by Romantic poets are taken from this edition unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>2</sup> Here I must confess that my work owes much to Barthes (1978) and, particularly, to Julia Kristeva (1987)); several of the terminology I use in this article I borrow from Kristeva. I also owe much to M. H. Abrams (1953), who makes the most scholarly discussion of the role of love, passion, and the imagination in the making of Romantic poetry.

<sup>3</sup> See *The Works of Lord Byron: Letters and Journals*, vol. V, ed. Rowland E. Prothero (New York: The Octagon Books, INC, 1966), p. 318.

<sup>4</sup> Earl Schulze (198:192) notes that in *Epipsychidion* Shelley presents “love as progression and relationship versus love as possession and identity”

<sup>5</sup> Julia Kristeva (1984 : 133-164) refers to Hegel’s concept of desire and discusses desire from a psychoanalytical point of view in detail.

<sup>6</sup> For an excellent discussion of this subject, see Najwa Nasr (1996: 68-107).

<sup>7</sup> Elder Olson (1952: 25-47) writes that “the broad theory underlying Empson’s method seems to be as follows: Poetry uses language, and language is meaningful and communicative; hence poetry is communicative.

<sup>8</sup> Gravil (1974: 232) starts his article asserting that “Wordsworth promises, in the *Recluse* fragment, that his philosophic poem will celebrate in ‘spousal verse’ the wedding of mind and world in love and holy passion”; See Francis Christensen’s (1965: 69–75). Another critic interested in Wordsworth’s concept of love is Francis King (1987: 12–18).

<sup>9</sup> I borrow the phrase “amorous dialogue,” from Julia Kristeva (1987: 93-94)), who defines the term in “Dialogue

<sup>10</sup> Gibbs and Nascimento (1966:294) discuss “Love” as a “Journey” and “the person in love, they say, “is a traveler, the goal of ultimate love is a destination, the means for achieving love are routes, the difficulties one experiences in love are obstacle to travel, and the progress in a love relationship is the distance traveled”

<sup>11</sup> Barthes (1978): 99) uses this phrase to describe the language of the inexpressible love; Barthes quotes Diderot on p. 201.

## References

- Abrams, M. H. (1953). *The Mirror and The Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barthes, Roland. (1978). *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Byron, George G. (1966). *The Works of Lord Byron: Letters and Journals*. Vol. V. Ed. Rowland E. Prothero. New York: The Octagon Books, INC.
- Christensen, Francis. (1965). “Intellectual Love: The Second Theme of The Prelude”. *PMLA*, 80:1, pp. 69–75.
- Coleridge, Samuel. (1979). “Lectures on Shakespeare”. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. M. H. Abrams et. al., vol. II, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, p. 407.
- Garber, Frederick. (1988). *Self, Text, and Romantic Irony*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. and Nascimento, Solange B. (1996). “How We Talk When We Talk About Love: Metaphorical Concepts and Understanding Love Poetry”. *Empirical Approaches to Literature and Aesthetics*. Ed. by Roger J. Kreuz and Mary Sue MacNealy. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation, pp. 291–292.
- Gravil, Richard. (1974). “Wordsworth's Ontology of Love in ‘The Prelude’”. *The Critical Quarterly*, 16:3, pp. 237–238.
- Hugo, Howard E. (ed.) (1975). *The Portable Romantic Reader* New York: The Viking Press.
- Hunt, Leigh. (1967). “What is Poetry”. *English Romantic Writers*. Ed. by David Perkins. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, INC., p. 711.
- King, Francis. (1987). “Love and Landscape in Wordsworth”. *Wordsworth Circle*, 13:1, pp. 12–18.
- Kristeva, Julia. (1984). *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1987). *Tales of Love*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Mitchell, Stephen. (1988). *Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis: An Integration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nasr, Najwa. (1996). *Linguistics and Poetry*. 2 vols. Beirut: The Lebanese University Publications Department.
- Olson, Elder. (1952). "William Empson, Contemporary Criticism, and Poetic Diction". *Critics and Criticism*. Ed. S. R. Crane. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Perkins, David. (ed.) (1967). *English Romantic Writers*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, INC.
- Schulze, Earl. (1982) "The Dantean Quest of Epipsychidion". *Studies in Romanticism*, 21:2, pp. 191–216.
- Scott, Sir Walter. (1834–1836). "Essay on the Drama". *The Prose Works*. Edinburgh and London: n.p. VI, p. 310.
- Sidney, Phillipe. (1932). "An Apologie for Poetrie". *The Great Critics: An Anthology of Literary Criticism*. Ed. James Harry Smith and Edd Winfield Parks. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, pp. 190–232.
- Smith, James H. and Parks, Edd W. (ed.) (1932). *The Great Critics: An Anthology of Literary Criticism*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Wasserman, E. R. (1971). *Shelley: A Critical Reading*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wordsworth, William. (1967). "Preface To the Second Edition of The Lyrical Ballads". *English Romantic Writers*. Ed. by David Perkins. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, INC.