

JOHN CLAIBORNE ISBELL



AN OUTLINE OF  
ROMANTICISM  
IN THE WEST



<https://www.openbookpublishers.com>



© 2022 John Claiborne Isbell

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). This license allows you to share, copy, distribute and transmit the text; to adapt the text for non-commercial purposes of the text providing attribution is made to the authors (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). Attribution should include the following information:

John Claiborne Isbell, *An Outline of Romanticism in the West*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0302>

In order to access detailed and updated information on the license, please visit, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0302#copyright>

Further details about the Creative Commons licenses are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at <https://archive.org/web>

Updated digital material and resources associated with this volume are available at <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0302#resources>

ISBN Paperback: 9781800647428

ISBN Hardback: 9781800647435

ISBN Digital (PDF): 9781800647442

ISBN Digital ebook (EPUB): 9781800647459

ISBN Digital ebook (AZW3): 9781800647466

ISBN XML: 9781800647473

Digital ebook (HTML): 9781800647480

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0302

Cover image: Théodore Géricault, *The Raft of the Medusa* (1818–1819), [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Th%C3%A9odore\\_g%C3%A9ricault,\\_la\\_zattera\\_della\\_medusa,\\_1819,\\_07.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Th%C3%A9odore_g%C3%A9ricault,_la_zattera_della_medusa,_1819,_07.jpg)

Cover design by Katy Saunders

# 4. *Racine et Shakespeare's* Sleeping Partners: The Return of the Repressed

---

J'écris comme on fume un cigare, pour passer le temps.  
Stendhal<sup>1</sup>

New entrepreneurs need venture capital to supplement their limited credit, and a silent partner can help them, fronting capital and contacts while remaining invisible. *Racine et Shakespeare* (1823–1825) has maintained that borrowed invisibility very well; homage to the treatise has been little troubled by precedents for its precedent-setting, though Stendhal published after a decade of polemic which his contemporaries could not ignore. What pushes us to present Stendhal, and not his foreign bedfellows, among the fathers of French Romantic theory? Ideology, in large part; a paradigm set up over a century ago dates Romanticism from the *bataille d'Hernani*: ergo, 1820s texts seem first-generation.<sup>2</sup> But if Stendhal writes after a decade of public debate, not to mention twenty years of personal meditation, then we might consider a new paradigm, placing this manifesto not before but *after* a fierce and long Romantic controversy. We may then find new meaning to its

---

1 "I write as one smokes a cigar, to pass the time." Stendhal, *Racine et Shakespeare*, ed. Pierre Martino, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1925), [henceforth *RS*], I, p. 78. Page numbers alone in the text refer to this volume; other Stendhal texts cite the Henri Martineau edition at Paris: Le Divan, unless otherwise indicated. The second half of this article's title, and some excellent advice here, I owe to my former colleague Gil Chaitin. All translations in this chapter are my own.

2 *Hernani*: for instance, Théophile Gautier in *Les Jeunes France*, ed. René Jasinski (Paris: Flammarion, 1974). Romanticism before *Racine et Shakespeare*: Edmond Eggli and Pierre Martino, *Le Débat romantique en France, 1813–1830, I, 1813–1816* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1933).

erotics—the games it plays—and to its place in history: failing which, we have only another imitation cited by a national ideology as original. Stendhal's dance around Romantics like Schlegel, Staël, and the Italians, whose discourse frames his argument, will help make this complexity apparent. Interpreting that dance means looking at his life before 1823; by looking at that past, in a sort of *étude génétique*, the subtle brilliance of his Parisian pamphlets may emerge. This review thus splits into three, situating *Racine et Shakespeare* at the end of twenty years' debate.

### 1. Private Life and Empire: Henri Beyle, 1803–1814

Here del Litto's review remains precious. In 1802–1803, aged twenty, Beyle discovers Shakespeare, seeing the Ducis *Hamlet*, reading *Othello* and, he notes, "*César, le king Lear, Hamlet; Coriolan; Macbeth; Cymbeline; La Tempête; Roméo et Juliette*, les tragédies historiques."<sup>3</sup> Le Tourneur, whose translation the schoolboy studied in 1796, already stresses Shakespeare's *naturel*, but without Beyle's conclusion, repeated twice in 1805: "C'est pour mon coeur le plus grand poète qui ait existé."<sup>4</sup> Shakespeare offers an antidote to the "fausse délicatesse" of the French stage; this view echoes Staël's *De la littérature*, which Beyle annotates in 1803, neglecting her talk of climate and perfectibility but copying passages on tyranny and affectation, and Staël's explicit contrast of Shakespeare with Racine, who is, she writes, less suited to "une nation devenue libre" after a civil war.<sup>5</sup> Beyle notes on that passage, "Ce n'est plus au Français de Louis XIV que nous voulons plaire, mais à celui de 1803"—*Racine et Shakespeare* in a nutshell, twenty years before the *Muse française*.<sup>6</sup>

3 "Julius Caesar, King Lear, Hamlet; Coriolanus; Macbeth; Cymbeline; The Tempest; Romeo and Juliet, the historical tragedies." *Hamlet*: 12.iv.1803, in Stendhal, *Pensées*, 2 vols (1931) [henceforth *Pensées*], I, p. 88. *Othello*: 29.v.1803, in Stendhal, *Journal*, 5 vols (1937), I, p. 70. See Victor del Litto, *La Vie intellectuelle de Stendhal. Genèse et évolution de ses idées (1802–1821)* (Paris: P.U.F., 1962) [henceforth *Vie*], pp. 70–71, 221. *César*: 24.ix.1803, in Stendhal, *Molière. Shakespeare. La Comédie et le rire*, 1930 [henceforth *Molière*], p. 196.

4 "He is for my heart the greatest poet who ever existed."

5 "false delicacy;" "a nation become free." *Grand poète*: 11.ii.1805, *antidote*: 26.vii.1805; *Journal*, in Stendhal, *Oeuvres intimes*, 2 vols, ed. Victor del Litto (Paris: Gallimard, 1981) [henceforth *OI*], I, pp. 208, 105. Mme de Staël, *De la littérature*, ed. Gérard Gengembre and Jean Goldzink (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1991), p. 217.

6 "It is no longer the Frenchman of Louis XIV's age that we wish to please, but that of 1803." Louis XIV: *Pensées*, I, p. 150.

France and England—Beyle's attacks on Racine parallel his early taste for Shakespeare. In 1803, he writes of "petits hommes" [little men] who prefer Racine to Corneille, a Napoleonic topos which Geoffroy and others repeat.<sup>7</sup> After 1804, Beyle reads Fénelon on *Phèdre* and Clément's *Lettres à Voltaire*, reinforcing his doubts on Racine.<sup>8</sup> Like *Britannicus*, *Andromaque* seems to him "bavarde. Ce défaut est surtout choquant dans les confidants."<sup>9</sup> He likes *Phèdre* despite the descriptions; *Mithridate*'s plot is dull, the characters vulgar and affected; he despises *Iphigénie*, mediocre like those who admire it.<sup>10</sup> By this period, 1804–1805, Beyle already considers Marmontel an "anti-poète," though *Racine et Shakespeare*'s manuscripts cite Marmontel on mimetic illusion.<sup>11</sup> Beyle may still see merits in Racine, Corneille, and Molière, but his break with French *criticism* is made by 1804, calling La Harpe a *nigaud* [fool] as he sets to work to "délaharpiser son goût."<sup>12</sup>

Whence this opposition? As del Litto argues, "L'éloignement pour Racine tient en grande partie à la théorie de la perfectibilité."<sup>13</sup> Beyle cites Staël's famous theme in May-June 1804, arguing as she does that post-Revolutionary France needs a different tragedy than Racine's. Comparing Fabre with Molière, Beyle concludes that "nous pouvons mettre en scène une mélancolie plus touchante" than Racine can offer.<sup>14</sup> Six days earlier, he says the same of Molière, concluding: "c'est ce qui fait dire avec ridicule, mais peut-être vérité, à Mme de Staël que la littérature a fait des progrès."<sup>15</sup> If perfectibility forms for Beyle "l'essentiel de son *credo* romantique," it emerges in this early dialogue with Staël, a dialogue which Molière, Racine, and Shakespeare already

7 Corneille: *Pensées*, I, p. 130. Geoffroy: *Journal des Débats*, 12 nivôse XIII/12.i.1805.

8 Fénelon: 24.iv.1804, *OI*, I, p. 67. Clément: *Pensées*, I, pp. 95–6.

9 "talkative. This defect is especially shocking in the confidants." *Britannicus*: 29.iii.1805; *OI*, I, p. 305. *Andromaque*: *Vie*, p. 232.

10 *Phèdre*: 22.iv.1805; *OI*, I, p. 319. *Mithridate*: 17.i.1805; *OI*, I, p. 188. *Iphigénie*: 1.v.1804; *OI*, I, p. 71.

11 *Anti-poète*: Victor del Litto, *En marge des manuscrits de Stendhal. Compléments et fragments inédits (1803–1820). Suivis d'un courrier italien* (Paris: P.U.F., 1955) [henceforth *Compléments*], pp. 113, 136–137. Illusion: *RS*, II, pp. 21–22.

12 "de-La Harpify his taste." *Nigaud*: letter to Pauline Beyle, 20.vi.1804, in Stendhal, *Correspondance*, ed. Henri Martineau and Victor del Litto (Paris: Gallimard, 1981) [henceforth *CSten*], I, p. 109. *Délaharpiser*: 21.xi.1804, *OI*, I, p. 152.

13 "The distaste for Racine stems in great part from the theory of perfectibility."

14 "we can put a more touching melancholy on stage." Fabre: 21.i.1805; *OI*, I, p. 192.

15 "this is what makes Mme de Staël say ridiculously, but perhaps truly, that literature has made progress." *progrès*: 15.i.1805; *OI*, I, p. 183.

frame.<sup>16</sup> Echoes in *Racine et Shakespeare* stretch to the exempla: writing in 1805 of how to paint things without their effect, Beyle argues that Staël's *Delphine* "a absolument besoin de moments de repos."<sup>17</sup> For a counter-example, he already cites the passage in *Macbeth* on the beauty of the castle "où le martinet vient faire son nid."<sup>18</sup> Del Litto's stress on Staël's influence thus seems apt.

While thoughts on tragedy move quickly, we often hear that until Beyle reads A.W. Schlegel in 1814, Molière and comedy remain largely synonymous for him.<sup>19</sup> Yet Staël's *Corinne ou l'Italie* offers Beyle not only a series of Italian topoi he later echoes, but also Carlo Gozzi's fantastic comedy, a radical alternative to Molière he discovers through her by 1808.<sup>20</sup> For *Corinne*, "le vrai caractère de la gaieté italienne, ce n'est pas la moquerie, c'est l'imagination"—another central distinction in *Racine et Shakespeare*.<sup>21</sup> Beyle's long Paris stay of 1810–1811 thus marks the end of a long maturation. For entertainment, he chooses Mozart and Gozzian *opera buffa* over classical tragedy at the Théâtre-Français, and confesses, "Je suis obligé de me forcer pour lire Corneille et Racine."<sup>22</sup> Again, Beyle is not alone, echoed by Geoffroy, who writes of Classical *froideur* and *ennui*.<sup>23</sup> Even the Institut calls, in 1810, for non-Classical subject matter, "plus conforme à notre manière de voir et de sentir."<sup>24</sup> The year 1809 sees Constant's *Wallstein* appear in print, and performances of the Ducis *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello* at the Théâtre-Français, alongside Lemercier's Shakespearean *Christophe Colomb* at the Odéon, a concerted Romantic offensive which Napoleon ends by pulping Staël's *De*

16 "the essential part of his Romantic credo." See *Vie*, pp. 233 (*perfectibilité*), 235 and note (credo, Molière).

17 "absolutely needs moments of rest." *Delphine* and *Macbeth*: 5.ii.1805; *OI*, I, p. 201. Compare *RS*, II, p. 218.

18 "where the swift comes to make its nest."

19 Molière and Schlegel: *Vie*, pp. 73, 454.

20 Gozzi: Mme de Staël, *Corinne ou l'Italie* (Paris: Folio, 1985), p. 182; also Stendhal to Pauline Beyle, 26.iii.1808; *CSten*, I, p. 442.

21 "the true character of Italian gaiety is not mockery, it is imagination."

22 "I am obliged to force myself to read Corneille and Racine." *Forcer*: 11.v.1810; *OI*, I, p. 582.

23 Geoffroy: *Journal de l'Empire*, 24.iv.1809.

24 "more in conformity with our manner of seeing and feeling." See *Vie*, pp. 343–345 (Gozzi), 394–396 (Institut, 1809 events).

*l'Allemagne* in 1810. Reviewing and translating Shakespeare with Louis Crozet in 1811, Beyle is oddly silent on this whole polemic.<sup>25</sup>

So, is Beyle a Romantic yet? His praise of *naturel* and attack on *bienséances* may seem precritical, an anti-Classical reaction uncertain of its alternatives; indeed, he notes in 1812 that “mes maxims sur les arts ne sont pas le fruit d’un système.”<sup>26</sup> But the same year, Beyle makes his distinction European, contrasting “the French school” in theater with the Italians, Germans, and English who value expression above noble style.<sup>27</sup> In 1813, as Napoleon falls, Sismondi, Schlegel, and Staël—a *Confédération romantique*—publish from Coppet their great Romantic treatises: *De la littérature du Midi de l’Europe*, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, *De l’Allemagne*.<sup>28</sup> Beyle is critical in *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817*: “Sismondi est tirillé par deux systèmes opposés: admirera-t-il Racine ou Shakespeare?”<sup>29</sup> Yet a series of Sismondian echoes soon recur, in Beyle’s first letter on Metastasio, in his parallel between Alfieri and Schiller, his link between Alfieri’s defects and his late education, and his talk of Goldoni’s baseness. A.W. Schlegel’s immediate impact seems even greater, despite the silence in Beyle’s journal and correspondence. Del Litto stresses a chapter of Beyle’s *Traité de l’art de la comédie*, “Sur le comique romantique,” written on 17 December 1813, seven days after the *Cours* went on sale. Schlegel calls old Greek comedy “un jeu fantastique, une vision aérienne et riante;” Beyle writes of “quelque chose d’aérien, de fantastique dans le comique.”<sup>30</sup> Beyle then mentions music, echoing his revelation from 1812—that he likes *opera buffa* because

25 Stendhal and Crozet: *Molière*, pp. 199–216, with Stendhal’s superb Romantic misreading: “Toute la grandeur de Shakespeare apparaît à ces mots de César: *Let me have men about me that are flat*” (207). Shakespeare says *fat*, after “Yon Cassius hath a lean and hungry look.”

26 “my maxims on the arts are not the fruit of a system.” *Système: Molière*, p. 220.

27 French school: Stendhal, *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, ed. Paul Arbelet, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1924), II, p. 379.

28 Coppet: John Isbell, “Le Groupe de Coppet ou la Confédération romantique,” in *Le Groupe de Coppet et l’Europe*, ed. Kurt Kloocke (Lausanne et Paris: Touzot, 1994) [henceforth *Confédération*], pp. 309–329.

29 “Sismondi is tugged by two opposing systems: will he admire Racine or Shakespeare?” *Tirillé*: Stendhal, *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817 suivi de L’Italie en 1818*, 1956 [henceforth *RNF*], p. 168.

30 “a fantastic game, an airy and laughing vision;” “something airy, fantastic in comedy.” Greek comedy, *but écarté*: A.W. Schlegel, *Cours de littérature dramatique* (Geneva: Paschoud, 1814), I, pp. 351, 298. *Aérien: Molière*, p. 264.

it gives him “la sensation de la perfection idéale de la comédie.”<sup>31</sup> This comic liberation echoes Kantian *art pour l’art*; Schlegel writes that “La gaiété [...] ne peut exister que lorsque tout but est écarté.”<sup>32</sup> Beyle finds Schlegel so inspiring that he drafts a newspaper review on 18 December, the day after his new chapter. The review opens with an entertaining portrait, the middle-aged Schlegel as a Wertherian young man of wit and reverie with an “air sauvage et sombre.”<sup>33</sup> It then moves on to Schlegel’s Classical-Romantic distinction. Facing Greece and France, writes Beyle, are Shakespeare, Calderon, Schiller, and Goethe, “du genre romantique. A la bonne heure [...] j’admets la littérature romantique.”<sup>34</sup>

And yet, as so often with Beyle, public and private discourse differ; his marginalia on Schlegel open with the words: “Collection de faussetés.”<sup>35</sup> Beyle’s private quibble is with religion, continuing, “dans un siècle, aucun Français sachant lire ne croira au christianisme.”<sup>36</sup> He regrets Schlegel’s lack of Tracy’s empiricism. A note on the translator’s disagreeable style is dated March 1814, but a nearby comment on Schlegel, *mystique* and an “être triste” [sad being], is dated August 1816, and other comments are undated, though 1816 suggests itself. Alongside Beyle’s objections—“Déraison complète,” “téméraire, ridicule, mal écrit”—stand other notes—“Très bon,” “This is true,” even “Sublimement vrai,” next to a passage on the public—and new observations.<sup>37</sup> Schlegel describes social cultures which imitate the ancients, and Beyle notes: “Les courtisans de Louis XIV.”<sup>38</sup> In the end, the negatives win out; in 1819, Beyle reopens the book for the first time since 1816, adding, “alors

31 “the sensation of comedy’s ideal perfection.” Buffa: to Pauline Beyle, 2.x.1812; *CSten*, I, pp. 659–60.

32 “Gaiety [...] can only exist when every goal is set aside.”

33 “a wild and somber air.” Schlegel review: Stendhal, *Mélanges de littérature*, 3 vols, 1933 [henceforth *Mélanges*], III, pp. 137–141. See *Vie*, pp. 462–463 (Sismondi details), 464–466 (Schlegel).

34 “of the *romantic* genre. Well then [...] I admit *romantic* literature.”

35 “Collection of falsehoods.” Schlegel: Stendhal, *Mélanges intimes et marginalia*, 2 vols, 1936 [henceforth *Marginalia*], I, p. 311–326. As with us all, reading often merely confirms Beyle’s beliefs; reading Constant’s *De l’esprit de conquête*, 22.iii.1814, he notes another central theme of *Racine et Shakespeare*: “La liberté antique ennemie de la comédie suivant un principe vu depuis longtemps par Dominique [i.e., Beyle];” *OI*, I, p. 904.

36 “in a century, no Frenchman who can read will believe in Christianity.”

37 “Complete unreason;” “rash, ridiculous, badly written;” “Very good;” “Sublimely true.”

38 “The courtiers of Louis XIV.”



pas de livre plus impatientant pour moi."<sup>39</sup> Nor is it clear that Beyle really grasps Schlegel's vision of ideal comedy, despite his new chapter. "Gaîté de jeunes filles et non comique of Hobbes," he notes; "L'Auteur prend toujours le fou pour le *Comique*," concluding: "Toujours la même erreur, délire aimable [...] et non production du *Rire*, du comique."<sup>40</sup> In 1821, he reopens the book once more to note: "Cet auteur m'est antipathique au souverain degré."<sup>41</sup> He adds Voltaire, Staël, and Buffon in listing his antipathies. Beyle's reaction to Schlegel is evidently mixed from the outset, though his public retraction arrives only in 1816.

The *Vies de Haydn, de Mozart et de Métastase*, composed in May-June 1814, allow the new Beyle to transform his sources as he loves to do, rendering Carpani's word *romanzesca*, for Haydn, with "imagination romantique" [romantic imagination], and putting Carpani's Virgil-Ariosto opposition for Haydn's art in new terms as one between Racine, Ariosto, and Shakespeare.<sup>42</sup> The *Vie de Mozart* even talks of a "lutte du genre classique et du genre romantique" and calls the alexandrine a "cache-sottise."<sup>43</sup> This echoes *Des mœurs* on "la pompe des alexandrins" as an obstacle.<sup>44</sup> Another remark, later crucial to *Racine et Shakespeare*, echoes Staël's *De la littérature*: "la nation française a changé de manière d'être depuis trente ans. Rien de moins ressemblant à ce que nous étions en 1780, qu'un jeune Français de 1814."<sup>45</sup> Yet Beyle's explicit mentions of *De l'Allemagne* in 1814 are less flattering: "Malgré une enflure exécration, il y a des idées, surtout sur les mœurs des dames allemandes."<sup>46</sup> Volume Three, on German philosophy, seems especially bad to him; Beyle has served Napoleon from Brunswick to Moscow, and despite his views on

---

39 "then no book was more irritating for me."

40 "Young girls' gaiety and not the comic of Hobbes;" "The author always takes the mad for the *Comic*;" "Always the same mistake, amiable delirium [...] and not the production of *Laughter*, of the comic."

41 "This author is repellent to me to a sovereign degree."

42 *Vies de Haydn, de Mozart et de Métastase*, 1928, pp. 59–60 (*romantique*, Racine and Shakespeare), 317 and note (*lutte, cache-sottise*), 213 (1780 and 1814).

43 "struggle between the classic genre and the romantic genre;" "stupidity-hider."

44 "the pomp of alexandrines." *Alexandrins*: Mme de Staël, *De l'Allemagne*, ed. comtesse Jean de Pange and Simone Balayé, 5 vols (Paris: Hachette, 1958–1960) [henceforth *De l'Allemagne*], II, p. 248.

45 "the French nation has changed its mode of being in thirty years. Nothing less resembles what we were in 1780, than a young Frenchman of 1814."

46 "Despite an execrable exaggeration, there are ideas, especially on the customs of German ladies." *Enflure*, German philosophy: to Pauline Beyle, 23.v.1814, *CSten*, I, p. 773.

theater, his new adhesion to Coppet's 'Romantic school' is provisional. In 1814, the Allies enter Paris and Beyle leaves for exile in Austrian Milan.

## 2. The Birth of Stendhal: Romantic Milan, 1814–1818

Beyle returns to his beloved Milan in August 1814, avoiding destitution by publishing under pseudonyms his first books, two compilations on music and art, in 1815 and 1817: the *Lettres sur Haydn* and the *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*. As we have seen, a Romantic discourse transforms Beyle's sources; the *Histoire de la peinture* argues, like Staël or Schlegel, both that the "beau antique" [antique beauty] is incompatible with modern sentiments, and that we moderns are "formés par les romans de chevalerie et la religion."<sup>47</sup> The *Edinburgh Review* calls this theory "metaphysical obscurity," while the *Journal de Paris* remarks of Beyle, "Son but paraît toujours de louer Shakespeare et Schiller et de toujours blâmer Racine."<sup>48</sup> But the book also contains an attack on Schlegel which marks a watershed in Beyle's thought: Romanticism without the Germans. In September 1816, Beyle writes to Crozet that four or five eminent Englishmen "m'ont illuminé;" they showed him the *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh* reviews.<sup>49</sup> He translates twenty-three pages from the reviews, on Greece, Byron, and *De l'Allemagne*, intended for the *Histoire de la peinture*. Crozet may counsel rejecting Beyle's extracts, but he heeds Beyle's call in the same letter for a stop-press note attacking Schlegel's authority: "La note sur le romantique [...] est bien mauvaise. Ces plats Allemands toujours bêtes et emphatiques se sont emparés du système romantique, lui ont donné un nom et l'ont gâté," Beyle writes: on the other hand, the *different* Romantic system practised by Byron and the

47 "formed by romances of chivalry and religion." *Formés*: Stendhal, *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, ed. Henri Martineau, 2 vols (Paris: Le Divan, 1929) [henceforth *HPI*], II, pp. 231–232; *beau antique*, Books 4–5.

48 "His goal seems always to praise Shakespeare and Schiller and always to blame Racine." Metaphysical obscurity: *Edinburgh Review* 23/64, October 1819 (p. 334). *Son but*: *Journal de Paris*, 12.xi.1817.

49 "illuminated me." *Illuminé*, repeats: to Crozet, 28.ix.1816, 20.x.1816; *CSten*, I, pp. 819, 835. This letter mentions the *Edinburgh Review* 23/45, April 1814 (pp. 198–229), with Jeffrey on Byron's *Corsair* and *Bride of Abydos*, translated in October. Three weeks earlier, on 7–8.ix.1816, Stendhal translates fifteen pages on Greece from the *Quarterly Review* 10/20, January 1814 (pp. 437–475); on 15.ix.1816, two pages on *De l'Allemagne* (pp. 335–409), published in 1928 as *Sur les unités* (see *Vie*, pp. 511–519, on Crozet and Stendhal's extracts).

*Edinburgh Review* "est sûr d'entraîner le genre humain."<sup>50</sup> Schlegel, Beyle adds, "reste un pédant ridicule," who wishes French literature had just one head to be chopped (not true): "Il faut bien séparer cette cause de la théorie romantique de celle de ce pauvre et triste pédant Schlegel."<sup>51</sup> Beyle repeats his head story in October, glad not to appear "dans le régiment de ce La Harpe."<sup>52</sup> It is ironic, then, that Schlegel's other alleged insult which Beyle repudiates, "Schiller n'est qu'un élève de Shakespeare," will resurface in Beyle's diary, in *Qu'est-ce que le romanticisme?* and even in *Racine et Shakespeare*: "Schiller a copié Shakespeare et sa rhétorique" (47).<sup>53</sup>

What changed Beyle's mind? The *Edinburgh Review* becomes his bible; del Litto notes four debts in the *Histoire de la peinture* to a single Hazlitt review of Sismondi, hidden behind Beyle's usual playful masks—he translates Hazlitt extracts back into French rather than reopening Sismondi, and attributes what Hazlitt says of Dante to Michelangelo.<sup>54</sup> He signs the same Hazlitt extract "Biography of the A.," but "Mémoires de Holcroft" for the frontispiece to *Rome, Naples et Florence*. Yet does Beyle's new distinction of two Romanticisms, good and bad, English and German, depend on reading the *Edinburgh Review*? In October 1816, Beyle apparently knows only the Byron article, thus rejecting Schlegel before reading Hazlitt's guarded Schlegel review. In Romantic Milan, speech will supplement writing, and the hub of this activity is Ludovico di Breme, who knows both Byron and Schlegel personally and dislikes the latter. Beyle meets Breme in July; in September, he writes to Crozet: "il y a depuis deux mois révolution dans mes idées."<sup>55</sup> Breme pulls Beyle from his isolation, introducing him not only to other

50 "The note on the romantic [...] is very bad. Those insipid Germans always stupid and emphatic took hold of the romantic system, gave it a name and spoiled it;" "is sure to carry away humanity." Schlegel attack: *HPI*, II, p. 54; compare *RS*, II, pp. 3–4, 269–270.

51 "remains a ridiculous pedant;" "One must separate this cause of romantic theory from that of this poor and sad pedant Schlegel."

52 "in the regiment of this La Harpe."

53 "Schiller is only a pupil of Shakespeare's." "Schiller copied Shakespeare and his rhetoric." Schiller insult: 18.xii.1820; *OI*, II, p. 49; also *RS*, II, p. 28.

54 Hazlitt: *Edinburgh Review* 23/49, June 1815 (pp. 31–63), on Sismondi, *De la littérature du Midi de l'Europe*.

55 "in the past two months there has been a revolution in my ideas." See *Vie*, pp. 508–510 (Breme's circle), 528–33 (Hazlitt), 536–539 (Schlegel). *Révolution*: to Crozet, 28.ix.1816; *CSten*, I, p. 821.

Milan Romantics—Monti, Pellico, Borsieri, and Berchet—but also to the Whigs Byron, Hobhouse, Lansdowne, and Brougham, as well as to Dumont and Saint-Aulaire from Geneva and Paris—in short, to a European matrix Breme himself acquires by visiting Staël at Coppet. The *Edinburgh Review* is the organ of this European liberal elite. Beyle's gift list for the *Histoire de la peinture* reflects this matrix in its turn; from Coppet's ambit, it features Staël, her friends Constant and Barante, her son-in-law the duc de Broglie, Saint-Aulaire, even Staël's cousin Mme Necker de Saussure, A.W. Schlegel's French translator.<sup>56</sup>

This is the peak of Beyle's commitment to any Romantic movement. Italian Romantic debate, 1816–1818, is largely a war of pamphlets, opening in January 1816 with Staël's thoughts on translation in the *Biblioteca italiana*. Its center is Breme's box at La Scala, and this is Beyle's world after July. Breme's, Borsieri's, and Berchet's 1816 pamphlets all leave clear traces in Beyle's work, starting in September 1817 with *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817*, signed for the first time "M. de Stendhal." Martineau traces Stendhal copying Borsieri, in particular, word for word.<sup>57</sup> Several themes of *Racine et Shakespeare* also surface here for the first time: Viganò's ballet, "romantique par excellence," whereas Shakespeare himself lacks music; Alfieri, Corneille, and other dramatists treating their tragedies "comme un poème" [like a poem], while Shakespeare focuses on human character and passion to touch his public; the public's "disposition à l'illusion" and Alfieri's long tirades which prevent it.<sup>58</sup> Deep in the Breme circle, Stendhal also echoes Staël's still-manuscript *Considérations sur la Révolution française*, ironically or not, on the Old Regime and "les ilotes de cette monarchie qui avaient fait la terreur," and on the egotist Bonaparte who "leva le masque et marcha au despotisme"—"je pense," writes Stendhal unexpectedly and using Chateaubriand's u, "que Buonaparte n'avait nul talent politique."<sup>59</sup>

---

56 List: to Didot, 5.iii.1817; *CSten*, I, pp. 856–860. On Coppet and Milan, 1816–1818, see Isbell, "Staël and the Italians." Compare George M. Rosa, "Stendhal raconteur: a partly unpublished record of reminiscences and anecdotes," *Studi francesi* 65–66 (1978), p. 358: "upon reading Stendhal's *Lord Byron en Italie* in 1830, Hobhouse denounced the essay as a tissue of distortions and lies and its author as a scoundrel." Stendhal later copied Hobhouse for about 100 pages of his *Vie de Napoléon*.

57 *RNF*, pp. 386–387, 420 (Borsieri debts).

58 "disposition to illusion." *RNF*, pp. 49–50 (Viganò), 113 (Alfieri).

59 "the helots of this monarchy who had made the Terror;" "lifted the mask and marched to despotism;" "I think that Buonaparte had no political talent." *RNF*,

Ten pages later stands his famous passage on Staël and Coppet, “les états généraux de l’opinion européenne.”<sup>60</sup> In December 1816, Stendhal writes to Crozet of “the work of Mme de Staël which I know”—eighteen months before publication, thanks to Breme. Her work spurs Stendhal to return to his *Vie de Napoléon*, his major project in 1817–1818.

Meanwhile, Milan’s pamphlet war continues, and Stendhal looks to intervene. In January 1818, Breme publishes two important articles on Rossi’s translation of Byron.<sup>61</sup> Stendhal reworks Jeffrey’s Byron article to supply a Romantic alternative to Schlegel, stressing the Classical-Romantic opposition, before *Racine et Shakespeare*, as that between pedantry and emotion. From 5–9 March 1818, Stendhal drafts his first pamphlet on theater, *Qu’est-ce que le romantisme?* He raids Marmontel, A.W. Schlegel, and Samuel Johnson on dramatic illusion, with echoes of Sismondi, and Jeffrey also. “Il faut,” he writes in persona as an Italian nationalist, “que chaque peuple ait une littérature particulière [...] nous renverserons Shakespeare et son élève Schiller.”<sup>62</sup> Yet this pamphlet remains unprinted and unpublished, like Stendhal’s other projects between 1818–1820: *L’Italie en 1818*, his reworking of *Rome, Naples et Florence*; the article *Du romantisme dans les beaux-arts*, 1819, and his treatise *De l’amour*, 1819–1820, first published in 1822. On 5 June 1818, Stendhal receives Staël’s *Considérations sur la Révolution française*. That day, he notes that “Mme de Staël n’est que puérile” in stressing Napoleon’s dependence on “l’argent des conquêtes.”<sup>63</sup> He then repeats her charge himself, much as he reuses the insult to Schiller. Twelve days later, he submits a refutation of Staël to Pellico, busy launching the famous *Conciliatore*—but Pellico, who admires Staël’s analysis of Napoleon,

---

pp. 172–173 (Buonaparte). François-René de Chateaubriand, *De Buonaparte, des Bourbons, et de la nécessité de se rallier à nos princes légitimes* [...] (1814).

60 “the Estates General of European opinion.” *RNF*, p. 186 (Coppet; compare pp. 214–217 for Stendhal’s profound ambivalence). *I know*: to Crozet, 26.xii.1816; *CSten*, I, p. 844. See *Vie*, pp. 542–543 and notes (pamphlet details).

61 “Il Giurro... Osservazioni di Lodovico di Breme,” *Il Spettatore*, January-February 1818 (pp. 46–58, 113–114).

62 “Each people must have their own literature [...] we will overthrow Shakespeare and his pupil Schiller.” *Il faut*: *RS*, II, p. 28.

63 “Mme de Staël is only puerile;” “the money of conquest.” *Puérile*: 5.vi.1818; *Compléments*, p. 337. Stendhal cites Staël’s credit thesis on a copy of Constant’s *Principes de politique*: “Grande erreur de Napoléon, qui en cela avait porté sur le trône les préjugés d’un sous-lieutenant;” *Marginalia*, p. 367.

refuses it.<sup>64</sup> Undeterred, in September Stendhal submits a manuscript pamphlet on Monti, *Des périls de la langue italienne*.<sup>65</sup> Pellico rejects that too. Yet Breme's Monti articles in the *Conciliatore* echo Stendhal's themes, even citing "l'immortel Tracy;" a small public trace of Stendhal's contribution to Milan debates.<sup>66</sup> After 1818, Stendhal's Milan ties grow problematic. Along with Pellico's refusals comes distance from Breme, begun once again by Staël's *Considérations*. Breme's *Conciliatore* review of her book calls Napoleon an *immortale facinoroso* (criminal). Noting the word, Stendhal remarks: "Tomber sur cette canaille."<sup>67</sup> Stendhal notes that Breme liked him less after his comment that Staël has only one book, *L'Esprit des lois de la société*—a play on Montesquieu's famous 1748 treatise, *De l'Esprit des lois*, and also a remark he repeats about Sismondi in *Rome, Naples et Florence*. In 1820, Stendhal has a moment of injustice for Breme, saying he died "de rage de n'être rien et d'une fluxion de poitrine."<sup>68</sup> Pellico, Borsieri, and Breme would have every reason to feel slighted by their invisibility in *Racine et Shakespeare*—eclipsed by Manzoni and Visconti, whom Stendhal knew later and less well.

### 3. Paris 1823–1825: *Racine et Shakespeare*

*Racine et Shakespeare* begins in October 1822 with Stendhal's article for the *Paris Monthly Review* on an incongruity. In August, Penley's troupe playing Shakespeare in English was booed off the stage by young liberals, calling Shakespeare "un aide de camp de Wellington" (141).<sup>69</sup> Citing the incident, Stendhal calls instead for a liberal-Romantic alliance, as at Coppet or in Milan. That article becomes a first chapter. A January article forms the second, with a third chapter in February. *Racine et Shakespeare* I appears on 8 March 1823, in 300 copies. Over two thirds of the first

64 Refutation: 17.vi.1818; *Mélanges*, III, pp. 179–182, 193. Pellico, Monti: *Vie*, pp. 577–579, 596–599.

65 Stendhal's *Des périls* adds two new digs at Staël: *RS*, II, pp. 59–60.

66 "the immortal Tracy."

67 "Fall on this rabble." *Canaille*, Stendhal on Sismondi: *RNF*, pp. 313, 168; *Mélanges*, III, pp. 260–261.

68 "of rage of being nothing and phthisis." *Fluxion*: to Mareste, 30.viii.1820; *CSten*, I, p. 1036. See *Vie*, pp. 608–610 (March 1818), 612 (Stendhal's persona).

69 "an aide de camp of Wellington." Penley's troupe, publication dates: *RS*, I pp. xcv–xcvi; lxxvi, xcvi–ci.

chapter copies Visconti's *Dialogo delle unità* (1819).<sup>70</sup> I have shown elsewhere how Visconti reuses Schlegel, Staël, and the Milan Romantics; what matters is Stendhal's choice of the mediocre Visconti over his many predecessors and Stendhal's own unpublished pamphlets. His own manuscript *Qu'est-ce que le romanticisme?* would have served better, and with less plagiarism. The new pamphlet mocks the concept of 'illusion parfaite' [perfect illusion] with an 1822 news item, the Baltimore soldier who shot Othello on stage. Sadly, this contradicts Visconti's bizarre claim that moments of 'illusion parfaite' define a drama's quality (16–18). In thus copying Visconti, Stendhal flouts a truth repeated since Johnson, reworked in Coleridge's "suspension of disbelief" idea and used by Stendhal on the facing page.<sup>71</sup> Moreover, on 15 March, Fauriel's Manzoni translation—*Carmagnola* and *Adelchi*—appears in Paris with Manzoni's *Lettre à M. Chauvet* and Visconti's *Dialogo*. Caught on the hop, Stendhal adds an ambiguous stop-press credit, "Dialogue d'Hermès Visconti dans le *Conciliatore*, Milan, 1818;" yet in fact he copies the 1819 dialogue, not the 1818 one (10).<sup>72</sup>

What benefits outweigh these drawbacks? Perhaps Visconti's appeal to Viganò and music, which Stendhal admired—though Viganò vanishes in the French. Stendhal also enjoys playing with sources, in fruitful dialogue: Visconti's four real characters become two abstract symbols, "l'académicien" and "le romantique," and Stendhal resituates the dialogue at the rue Chantereine, whither Penley's hissed-at Shakespearians had moved in 1822 (22). Like Carpani on Haydn, Visconti seems in fact the weakest thing in this chapter, despite

70 Visconti and Manzoni debts: *Il Conciliatore. Foglio scientifico-letterario*, ed. Vittore Branca, 2 vols (Florence: Le Monnier, 1965), II, pp. 95–102, and *RS*, I, pp. lxxiv–lxxvi. On Visconti's two dialogues and their borrowings, see Isbell, "Staël and the Italians."

71 On disbelief, contrast Stendhal's own *Qu'est-ce que le romanticisme?*, which opens with seven pages copied directly from Johnson's *Preface to Shakspeare* (1768): "*Il est faux qu'aucune représentation soit jamais prise pour la réalité*" (*RS*, II, 16). Coleridge: *Biographia litteraria*, ed. James Engell and Walter Jackson Bate, 2 vols (Princeton: Bollingen, 1983), II, p. 6. Stendhal's irony makes judging his position tricky, but Johnson, Schlegel, and Coleridge make a strong case for disbelief.

72 "Dialogue of Hermes Visconti in the *Conciliatore*, Milan, 1818." Pietro Paolo Trompeo, *Nell'Italia romantica sulle orme di Stendhal* (Roma: Leonardo da Vinci, 1924) [henceforth *Trompeo*], p. 110, is struck by Stendhal's Visconti note: "in quel primo capitolo la nota in cui è nominato il Visconti, in perfetta contraddizione col testo, fu evidentemente aggiunta da Beyle quando s'accorse, grazie a Fauriel di non poter più appropriarsi un lavoro italiano ch'egli credeva noto a lui solo e a' suoi intimi."

Stendhal's improvements. Before, with bold talk of Scott's novels as Romantic tragedies, and of current French theater as epic or perhaps ode, but not drama, comes Stendhal's stirring appeal: "Je m'adresse sans crainte à cette jeunesse égarée qui a cru faire du patriotisme [...] en sifflant Shakespeare" (9).<sup>73</sup> Amid Visconti, Stendhal adds his own talk of "despotes gâtés par deux siècles de flatterie," and his superb summation that Racine's glory is imperishable, but art moves on: "Tout ce que nous prétendons, c'est que si César revenait au monde, son premier soin serait d'avoir des canons dans son armée" (12, 30).<sup>74</sup> After Visconti, the curtain rises for Stendhal's final barb: to read our own heart above the noise of habit, "il faut n'avoir pas quarante ans;" wry, since the author turned forty in January, but splendid propaganda for him, rewriting a war on 'foreign' art as one between generations (22).<sup>75</sup> "A bas les perruques" [Down with the wigs] was the cry at the 1830 *bataille d'Hernani*. These strong lines—trusting our hearts, artistic and political despotism, and Romantic perfectibility—Stendhal owes ultimately to Staël and her Coppet group.

By the second article in January, Penley's débâcle is old news. Stendhal's goal and public, however, remain unchanged: converting France's young liberals to his own *romanticisme*. An authorial 'je' is center stage, taking notes during Molière, reading the liberal *Miroir*, mocking the royalist *Bonnes Lettres*, and calling Louis XIV "le dieu de cette religion" (31–36).<sup>76</sup> Politics is thus already up front in *Racine et Shakespeare I*. With "Le Rire," Bergson *in ovo*, we pass from tragedy to Classical comedy, called "an epistle" (35). The chapter opens with Staëlian stress on German *sérieux*, here ironized. Stendhal quickly tours Europe, quoting Hobbes, picturing a Parisian dandy in the mud, and describing Didot visiting Parma (25–28). His core is A.W. Schlegel's fantastic comedy, discovered in 1814, "une imagination folle qui me fasse rire comme un enfant," but which Molière's ridicule prevents (32).<sup>77</sup> Stendhal compares this to music—his *opera buffa* theme—and his terms

73 "I speak without fear to those misled youths who felt [...] that whistling Shakespeare was being patriotic."

74 "despots spoiled by two centuries of flattery;" "We simply claim that if Caesar returned to Earth, his first concern would be to have cannon in his army."

75 "one must not be forty."

76 "the god of this religion."

77 "a mad imagination that makes me laugh like a child."



are those of his old Schlegel marginalia. The text admits, “la lecture de Schlegel et de Dennis m’a porté au mépris des critiques français,” though as we know Stendhal never read Dennis and he despised La Harpe a decade before reading Schlegel.<sup>78</sup> This is perhaps less propaganda than a private joke (32, 176). Certainly, Stendhal is rarely more Schlegelian—“Molière est inférieur à Aristophane,” he writes, while French critics are “impuissants à créer.”<sup>79</sup> Voltaire and Molière don’t make us laugh, Stendhal tells his readers—“si j’en ai;” watching *Tartuffe*, the public laughed just twice (31, 34).<sup>80</sup> Stendhal closes, after a dig at Byron, with *bonheur*, and the sullen English merchant at Tortoni’s that he, like Baudelaire, imagines when Coppet thinkers say the future belongs to Protestant republican virtue (35–36).

Chapter Three deftly opens on maximum pleasure, respectively, for us and for our great-grandparents: Romantic and Classical art. Sophocles, Euripides, and Racine were all Romantic, giving the maximum pleasure to their age, as Bentham demands, and with the courage to dare the new. Imitating them today, however, is Classical (39). Visconti calls this vision *ilichianistic*. Lord Byron “n’est point du tout le chef des romantiques,” Stendhal now determines.<sup>81</sup> He rejects Scott, Nodier, Legouvé, and Schiller, who “a copié Shakespeare et sa rhétorique” (41–42, 47).<sup>82</sup> More rigorous than *Staël* on the pleasure criterion, Stendhal defines value here not by the happy few, but by public success alone—thus, Pigault-Lebrun, Béranger, and the vaudeville. He mocks alexandrines, using *hyménée* for the rhyme, unable to say “la poule au pot.”<sup>83</sup> How can Delille please someone who saw Moscow burn, as Stendhal in fact did in 1812? No people changed more totally than the French from 1780–1823, and art must change to match it—*Staël*’s great theme (42–45). If we must use Shakespeare, Stendhal writes, just as *Staël* had, let us transform him. Stendhal’s preface closely echoes this chapter: on Louis XIV and “pâles imitateurs;” on the alexandrine as a *cache-sottise*; on David and “la veille

78 “reading Schlegel and Dennis brought me to despise French critics.”

79 “Molière is inferior to Aristophanes;” “impotent to create.”

80 “if I have any.”

81 “is not at all the leader of the romantics.”

82 “copied Shakespeare and his rhetoric.”

83 “chicken in the pot”—what Henri IV wanted for the French. Stendhal, *Souvenirs d’égotisme*, in *OL*, II, p. 497, conceals a self-referential alexandrine on this subject: “l’abominable chant du vers alexandrin.”

d'une révolution semblable en poésie."<sup>84</sup> To close, after "le galimatias allemand, que beaucoup de gens appellent romantique aujourd'hui," Stendhal uses two Schlegel themes to reject the unities: conspirators plotting in emperors' cabinets and character development limited to thirty-six hours.<sup>85</sup> His remark on Othello's development, weak if done too quickly, more precisely echoes Manzoni's *Lettre à M. Fauriel*—hence perhaps the earlier footnote praising Pellico's and Manzoni's tragedies (47–48, 42).<sup>86</sup> Stendhal almost certainly saw Manzoni's *Lettre* in manuscript at Fauriel's, where he saw *Adelchi* by July 1822; the *Lettre* appeared a week after his pamphlet, on 15 March. He also uses it that year to answer Lamartine, and three articles, 1822–1823, express his ambivalence about Manzoni's theater. The *Vie de Rossini* also quotes seven stanzas of Manzoni's Napoleon ode, *Il cinque maggio*.<sup>87</sup>

*Racine et Shakespeare* I's 300 copies did not sell, but *La Muse française*, after July 1823, pushed 'establishment' *romantisme* toward controversy. 1824 is a watershed; despite Romantic praise for Charles X, Church, Academy, and State now align to condemn the movement, calling it "le protestantisme en littérature," and the *romantique=la droite* equation is broken, as Stendhal had desired.<sup>88</sup> In April, Auger at the *Académie* attacks Romanticism; in June, *La Muse française* folds as its editor Soumet joins the *Académie*, then Bishop Frayssinous condemns Romanticism for the Church. In September 1824, *Le Globe* is founded, linking Romantics

84 "pale imitators;" "the eve of a similar revolution in poetry."

85 "the German nonsense, that many people call romantic today." Schlegel themes: Isbell, *Confédération*, p. 315.

86 Alessandro Manzoni, *Tutte le opere*, ed. Mario Martelli, 2 vols (Florence: Sansoni, 1973), II, pp. 1681–1682, has a long, fine passage on *Othello* and Voltaire's *Zaïre*. Using Manzoni: RS, II, p. 259; *Vie de Rossini*, 2 vols, 1929, II, pp. 226–227.

87 Three articles: Stendhal, *Courrier anglais*, 5 vols, 1935, I, pp. 305–316 (April 1822), 337–349 (July 1822), 362–366 (April 1823). See pp. 315–316, 339–340 which cites the manuscript *Adelgizia (Adelchi)*, though Manzoni "ne l'a pas encore publiée," and 366, announcing Fauriel's volume, conveniently, in April. *Trompeo*, 108–109, cites Mary Clarke to Fauriel on his friend Beyle: "Vous êtes un homme qu'il aime beaucoup à exploiter [...] je ne puis souffrir qu'il vous voie, car pour sûr il tirera toutes choses de vous." Stendhal in *De l'amour* published uncredited an Arab detail from Fauriel's own research.

88 Protestantism in literature." *Protestantisme: Mémorial catholique, March 1824* (in Jean-Jacques Goblot, *La Jeune France libérale. Le Globe et son groupe littéraire, 1824–1830* (Paris: Plon, 1995), p. 619). René Bray, *Chronologie du romantisme (1804–1830)* (Paris: Boivin, 1932), also remains useful.

and liberals.<sup>89</sup> During this period, Stendhal writes and rejects no less than seven draft chapters toward a new pamphlet. *Racine et Shakespeare II* eventually appears in March 1825, with both new goals and market. From the full title onward, Stendhal hangs this pamphlet on Auger—"Ni M. Auger ni moi ne sommes connus"—and on the *Académie* (53–55).<sup>90</sup> In the preface—a heavy satire which misrepresents Auger's call for national tragedy—Stendhal credits Staël and Schlegel, for once, as founders of Romanticism, along with Johnson (!) and Visconti, but in the mouth of their enemy Auger (59–60). Pragmatic propaganda here matches Stendhal's personal antipathies; if we want results, 'foreign enemies' like these will need concealment from a nationalist Parisian audience.

Part Two is over twice as long as the first pamphlet, but far less cosmopolitan—with less use of outside sources, fewer new ideas on literature, and less overall use even of Shakespeare, whom Beyle had loved since 1802. This again is pragmatic propaganda, and a careful double battle: Shakespeare for impact in the now-misleading title, which Stendhal keeps instead of finding a new one as we might expect, and French references in the text for Parisian sensibilities. This time, we are firmly based in Paris throughout. Stendhal has learnt from his initial failure, as his rejected chapters reveal. Several Shakespeare plays are named: *Richard III*, *Roméo et Juliette*, *Lear*, and *Othello* with its word *mouchoir* (81, 91, 144, 97). Stendhal's Classic cites *Macbeth*'s barbarity and public failure, though his final letter ends praising Hotspur (74–75, 150). The Romantic suggests "*Macbeth* en prose [...] abrégé d'un tiers"—Staël's theme—and asks, "Que deviendront vos tragédies, le jour où l'on jouera *Macbeth* et *Othello*, traduits par Mme Belloc?" (106, 116).<sup>91</sup> Twenty-eight million people love *Macbeth*, he argues, but critics will answer that the English have no "poésie vraiment admirable" (92).<sup>92</sup> Just one paragraph says the Classical-Romantic battle is "entre Racine et Shakespeare," but it also cites "*La Tempête* [...], toute médiocre qu'elle soit" (96).<sup>93</sup> A

89 *Le Globe* is founded on 14.ix.1824, *Racine et Shakespeare II* appears on 19.iii.1825: RS, I, p. cxxii.

90 "Neither Mr. Auger nor I is known."

91 "*Macbeth* in prose [...] shortened by a third;" "What will become of our tragedies, the day they perform *Macbeth* and *Othello*, translated by Mme Belloc?"

92 "truly admirable poetry."

93 "between Racine and Shakespeare;" "*The Tempest* [...] mediocre though it is."

cosmopolitan passage stands out: an ignorant critic thinks Shakespeare's Falstaff is a lord; others judge Shakespeare and Schiller "sans les avoir lus," Staël's theme again; the "jeunes libéraux" boo Shakespeare and the English, old history by now (139–141, 148).<sup>94</sup> But a long note follows, calling *Coriolan* a comedy; reviewing English Puritanism, their *cant*, their "bonne foi naïve et un peu bête;" and concluding, "il faut donc s'écarter beaucoup de la manière de Shakespeare" (144–146).<sup>95</sup> "The table is full, s'écrie Macbeth," the note adds in rejecting verse, but since Shakespeare is far indeed from prose, the very predicate of *Racine et Shakespeare* is thrown into question. Shakespeare serves Stendhal well against the unities; he serves for *mélange des genres*, but Stendhal rejects that—"Le mélange de ces deux intérêts me semble fort difficile;" he does not serve Stendhal's call for prose (144).<sup>96</sup> Stendhal has thus chosen another doubtful ally in his battles. To complicate matters, this is not the *Paris Monthly Review*, where Part One appeared, and Stendhal now makes special use of nationalist rhetoric. His new play suggestions include *Charles VII et les Anglais*, and *Jeanne d'Arc et les Anglais*, not once but twice, probably thanks to Barante's *Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne*, and his Napoleon play features a drunken English spy (125, 105–122, 152). Mentioning "la Transfiguration de Raphaël au Musée," Stendhal adds "Elle y reviendra," a patent sop to national outrage when Napoleon's pillaged paintings went back to their European owners (87).<sup>97</sup> America parallels England, in Stendhal's old Bonapartist shopkeeper theme. Philadelphia cares only for dollars—in these sad republics, "le rire est une plante exotique importée d'Europe" (118).<sup>98</sup>

The preface at the *Académie* mentions foreign Romantics. The Classic's first letter famously praises Staël—"Je ne vois réellement que *Corinne* qui ait acquis une gloire impérissable sans se modeler sur les anciens"—but other credits are less overt (74).<sup>99</sup> Lanfranc, who intrigues "avec toute la maladresse du génie," echoes Staël on Tasso; calling love a sentiment unknown to the age of Sophocles is a central topos at Coppet (82,

94 "without having read them;" "young liberals." Judging unread: *De l'Allemagne* II.i, "Pourquoi les Français ne rendent-ils pas justice à la littérature allemande?"

95 "naïve and somewhat stupid good faith;" "one must then distance oneself considerably from Shakespeare's manner."

96 "The mixture of these two interests seems to me very difficult."

97 "She will return there."

98 "laughter is an exotic plant imported from Europe."

99 "Really I see only *Corinne* which has acquired an imperishable glory without modeling itself on the ancients."

126).<sup>100</sup> The stage's 'fourth wall,' removed by the "baguette magique de Melpomène," is Schlegel's idea, as is the claim that the tragedy *Le Retour de l'île d'Elbe* would have "un seul événement" (147, 153).<sup>101</sup> Napoleon returning to despotism—not a common Stendhal theme—echoes Staël's 1818 *Considérations*, like the earlier comparison of France to England after 1660 (152, 107). Stendhal borrows *De l'Allemagne's* objection to Gloucester's blinding on stage in *Lear*, but hides his source, changing Gloucester to "de petits enfants" (144).<sup>102</sup> Concealment thus causes error. Letters V and VIII have special debts to Coppet: Britannicus as "un peu niais et un peu plat" echoes Schlegel; Classical dramatists "chargés de fers," so agile that we think chains useful, rewrites Staël once more, as does the contrast of Classical talent and Romantic pleasure at the theater (103–104, 95–99).<sup>103</sup> The link here of comedy with despotism is an eighteenth-century topos dear to the Coppet group, with its correlative that liberty does not need art: "si jamais nous avons la liberté complète, qui songera à faire des chefs-d'oeuvre?" (119).<sup>104</sup> As a matter of fact, Stendhal's whole call for national tragedy dates from Coppet's three 1813 manifestos, but influence like that is too global to pinpoint, unlike more idiosyncratic details. Stendhal's rejected chapters reveal his labors, inviting an *étude génétique*: Schlegel's Louis XIV as a wiggged Hercules will become an arch in 1825 (100, II 235).<sup>105</sup> The *baguette magique* survives in print; an attack on Racine, Schiller, and Manzoni goes, along with another on Staël, Chateaubriand, and d'Arlincourt; Manzoni's *Andromaque* passage departs, along with a note admitting the debt; gone are the Staëlian chapter titles on conversation, on Molière and society.<sup>106</sup> The Coppet topos, Molière the courtesan writing for a

100 "with all the gaucherie of genius." Tasso: *De l'Allemagne*, III, pp. 55–64. Love: see Edmond Eggli, *L'Érotique comparée de Charles de Villers*. 1806 (Paris: Gamber, 1927), the text which launched this topos; especially pp. 119–138, on Coppet authors.

101 "the magic wand of Melpomene;" "a single event." Schlegel, Melpomene and action: Isbell, *Confédération*, pp. 314–315; compare RS, II, p. 244.

102 "little children." Gloucester: Staël, *De l'Allemagne*, II, p. 222.

103 "a little foolish and a little insipid;" "loaded with irons." Racine: Schlegel, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, II, p. 199: "comment se figurer le parricide Oreste sous l'image d'un amant soumis et dédaigné?" Pleasure: *De l'Allemagne*, II, p. 134: "La poésie des anciens est plus pure comme art, celle des modernes fait verser plus de larmes."

104 "if ever we have complete liberty, who will think of producing masterpieces?"

105 Wiggged Hercules: *De l'Allemagne*, III, p. 348 resumes Schlegel: "Dans les tableaux et les bas-reliefs où Louis XIV est peint, tantôt en Jupiter, tantôt en Hercule, il est représenté nu [...] mais avec sa grande perruque sur sa tête."

106 Attacks, Manzoni: RS, II, pp. 246–248, 259. Dorothee Christesco, *La Fortune d'Alexandre Manzoni en France. Origines du théâtre et du roman romantiques* (Paris:

despot aiming to “éteindre le courage civil,” is condensed, losing the long passage on exceptional women, while ridiculing despotism and enthusiasm—all the center of Staël’s work—with its footnote reference to Staël’s *Considérations* as “puéril,” and to writing as a lance of Achilles which alone heals the wounds it causes.<sup>107</sup> That is *De l’Allemagne*’s metaphor, as Stendhal’s ambivalent game with Staël continues. Closing, Stendhal pointedly dedicates this whole passage to Mme Roland.<sup>108</sup>

As leaving Staël and Schegel to Auger reveals, Stendhal is redrawing the road map of Romantic debate. His treatment of French news is equally manipulative. With his claim that “le romantisme a fait d’immenses progrès depuis un an,” dated April 1824, we expect some mention of the *Muse française* or *Ladvocat* (124).<sup>109</sup> We get neither. As if the *Muse* did not exist, Stendhal talks of 1821’s *Société des Bonnes Lettres*, “les moins redoutables des ennemis,” citing Chateaubriand and Montmorency, no youngsters, and including Lamartine alone amid his list of liberal replacements for the *Académie* (125–127, 131).<sup>110</sup> Stendhal cites Chateaubriand, on religion as *jolie*; he talks of “tout ce qui est lugubre et niais, comme la séduction d’Eloa par Satan” (109, 99).<sup>111</sup> These Romantic fragments mark a censorship underscored by his brusque reply to the Classic: “personne en France n’a travaillé d’après le système romantique, et les bonhommes Guiraud et compagnie moins que personne” (76).<sup>112</sup> Guiraud edited the *Muse française*, whose authors the Classic of all people had put center stage, listing “Nodier, Lamartine, Guiraud, Hugo, de Vigny et consorts” alongside d’Arlincourt, the “vicomte *inversif*” (73–75).<sup>113</sup> Stendhal thus sidesteps rival *romantiques*, rather than confronting them; the Classic also talks of “des champions qui déshonorent la cause qu’ils prétendent servir”

---

Editions Balzac, 1943), pp. 49–50, collates Stendhal’s Manzoni plagiarisms.

107 “extinguish civil courage.” Molière the courtesan: *RS*, II, pp. 165–173, 187–207; 199 (*courage civil*). Achilles: Staël, *De l’Allemagne*, IV, p. 404: “le savoir, comme la lance d’Achille, doit guérir les blessures qu’il a faites.”

108 *RS*, II, pp. 200–206, which ends, rather oddly: “Sous le nom de madame Roland, je m’indique à moi-même le nom de femmes d’un génie supérieur qui vivent encore.” Staël had died in 1817.

109 “romanticism has made immense progress over the past year.”

110 “the least fearsome of enemies.”

111 “all that is lugubrious and foolish, like the seduction of Eloa by Satan.”

112 “nobody in France has worked after the romantic system, and those fellows Guiraud and company less than anyone.”

113 “*inversive* viscount.”

(73).<sup>114</sup> On the Left, *Ladvoct*'s massive 25-volume *Chefs-d'oeuvre des théâtres étrangers*, which Stendhal had praised in 1822, shows up in one footnote, an odd deletion of a high-profile enterprise whose aim was to provide that very "tragédie nationale en prose" whose absence is Stendhal's alleged reason for writing (81, 138).<sup>115</sup> "Faites, monsieur, faites," writes the Classic (102).<sup>116</sup> This pamphlet makes two opposite judgements of at least three established liberal or Doctrinaire authors—Barante, Lemercier, Jouy—but hiding *Ladvoct*'s liberal contributors in a footnote on the reactionary *Villemain*'s stupidity is even stranger (72–93, 76–136, 127–144). We might observe that *Ladvoct*, like *Didot* who is also ridiculed here, had, like *Breme* in Milan, declined Stendhal's offer to publish with him.<sup>117</sup> *Le Globe*, founded in September 1824 and still more explicit in linking Romantics and liberals as Stendhal desires, appears briefly in a letter dated—curiously—April 1824, disproving Stendhal's old argument that young liberals and the journals they favor will attack any Romantic innovation. The immense majority of this youth, he admits, has been converted to Romanticism by *Cousin* and the *Globe* (123). Stendhal dismisses his contradiction here, remarking that *Cousin*'s class was banned. True, but the *Globe* was not. He thus fabricates controversy by inventing an opponent.

If Stendhal's allies get short shrift, his enemies may fare better. Indeed, Classical-Romantic dialogue structures the second pamphlet, as it had Chapter One of the first, as Stendhal rejects the monologic pronouncement the *Académie* favors. But this 'dialogue' means three letters in ten for the Classics, or five pages out of fifty, and *Auger*'s opinions are libeled. Classicism is presented as part of the State's ideological apparatus; true when *Staël* said it of Napoleon, rather less true in 1825. "La dispute entre Shakespeare et Racine," says *De l'amour* in 1822, "n'est qu'une des formes de la dispute entre Louis XIV et la

---

114 "champions who dishonor the cause they claim to serve."

115 "national tragedy in prose." *Ladvoct*: *Paris Monthly Review*, April 1822, in *Courrier anglais*, 5 vols, 1935, I, pp. 305–316.

116 "Do so, Sir, do so."

117 Publishers: to *Didot*, 5.iii.1817; to *Mareste*, 26.iv.1824; *CSten*, I 856–860, II, pp. 27–28.

Charte."<sup>118</sup> Stendhal's approach is both astute and entertaining, two central merits of a political pamphlet. Let us not call it virtue.<sup>119</sup>

Meanwhile, Stendhal's own position is reinforced, part of a larger market strategy for his agenda. After a plug for Part One, still in stock, and for the new *Vie de Rossini*, he displays his liberal credentials to his target public (75, 78).<sup>120</sup> Even the brief *Avertissement* mentions Stendhal's taste for American political theories, amid Lafayette's huge U.S. tour.<sup>121</sup> Liberal shibboleths dot the text: a Jesuit in the *Académie*; Greek independence, twice; the Revolution, its children, and the retreat from Moscow; the *Miroir's* *bonhomme* joke for the *Bonnes Lettres* members, twice; *Tartufe*; public opinion; Béranger, Courier, Cousin, those liberal lions; Constant and the Doctrinaires' claim that "la vie privée des citoyens doit être murée" (60, 115–145, 79–89, 72–126, 93, 132, 123–131, 153–155).<sup>122</sup> Stendhal adds liberal jokes: the list of new members for the *Académie*, the *Globe's* favorite part of this pamphlet, and the phrase "Girondins de la réaction royaliste" [Girondins of royalist reaction] for the *Débats* (131, 136).<sup>123</sup> His two play sketches are heavily political, from Lanfranc in prison to Napoleon poisoned by the English (82–83, 153). Stendhal's long passage on censorship is pure politics and deeply ironic, not least his misunderstood remark that politics in literature is "un coup de pistolet au milieu d'un concert" (106–120, 107).<sup>124</sup> France's young generation is overwhelmingly liberal, Stendhal repeats in 1825 in the teeth of some evidence, also repeating that the liberal press shapes their opinions (122, 140–141). Even the metaphors link political and artistic despotism, as they once had for Staël; Stendhal talks of bayonets and the "pouvoir despotique" [despotic power] of habit, and of chains borne by the Classical tragedians (88–89, 103). He even borrows Staël's

---

118 "The dispute between Shakespeare and Racine is just one form of the dispute between Louis XIV and the Charte." Stendhal, *De l'amour*, Cercle du Bibliophile, I, p. 234; cited in Emile Talbot, "Le romantique et le/la politique: autour de Racine et Shakespeare," *Stendhal Club* 98, 15.i.1983, p. 228.

119 Dialogue: Michel Crouzet, "Polémique et politesse ou Stendhal pamphlétaire," *Stendhal Club* 89, 15.x.1980, p. 60.

120 Still in stock: *Racine et Shakespeare*, ed. Henri Martineau (Paris: Le Divan, 1938), p. xx.

121 Lafayette's U.S. tour: July 1824–September 1825.

122 "the private life of citizens must be walled off."

123 The *Globe*: Pierre Trahard, *Le Romantisme défini par 'Le Globe'* (Paris: Presses françaises, 1924), p. 40.

124 "a pistol shot in the middle of a concert."



voguish link of Romantics and Protestants, comparing Romantics and the *Académie* with Luther and the Inquisition, and calling Romanticism “la réforme littéraire” (53–55).<sup>125</sup> His draft review of Werner’s *Luther*, a play made famous by *De l’Allemagne*, continues this Protestant theme (148). To appropriate Staël’s Genevan attack on Classical despotism, in Restoration Paris in 1825, shows touching faith in her continued appeal.

The main beauty of Stendhal’s pamphlet may then be dance and realignment. What new ideas does he bring? He is perhaps at his finest in dialogue with others, but some novelties do surface. His generational theme is striking; even the cover puts *Vieillard* and *Jeune homme* in dialogue to define the century.<sup>126</sup> Art, Stendhal says, should suit the Revolution’s children, that old Staëlian argument. Meeting a man who prefers *Iphigénie* to Schiller’s *Wilhelm Tell*, Stendhal simply asks how old his son is, a new twist; he reworks Visconti’s ilchiastic topos, “tous les grands écrivains ont été romantiques de leur temps” (88, 92).<sup>127</sup> Classicism is sterile imitation of the dead—a Coppet topos—as is the following: Classicism, like feudalism, “a eu son moment où il était utile et naturel” (93).<sup>128</sup> Little interested in philosophies of history, Stendhal values brilliance above consistency; but is each young generation Romantic, or did a Classical period exist? Even the Romans were Romantic, he suggests (100). Like Staël and the Italians, Stendhal wants modern art for a modern world. Unlike most Romantics, Stendhal focuses resolutely on what today’s public likes. For unity of time and place, Stendhal substitutes multiplicity of time and place, a world of relativity. Is this relativism absolute? He trades, in fact, one problem for another, marked by his talk of taste; we may end up “inintelligibles les uns pour les autres” (90).<sup>129</sup> “On a toujours raison,” notes his *Réponse* to Lamartine, “de sentir comme on sent et de trouver beau ce qui donne

125 “the literary reformation.” *Luther*: RS, II, pp. 223–228; *De l’Allemagne*, III, pp. 132–141.

126 Cover: RS, I, p. 51: “Le Vieillard.—‘Continuons.’ Le Jeune Homme.—‘Examinons.’ Voilà tout le dix-neuvième siècle.”

127 “all great writers were romantic in their time.”

128 “had its moment when it was useful and natural.” Imitation: *Corinne ou l’Italie*, p. 177: “l’imitation est une espèce de mort.” Feudalism: *De la littérature*, p. 145: “La chevalerie [...] dut être considérée comme un mal funeste, dès qu’elle cessa d’être un remède indispensable.”

129 “unintelligible to each other.”

du plaisir."<sup>130</sup> Rather than argue, Stendhal asks a doubter of Raphaël's beauty how stocks are doing (87). Habit's despotism can blind us to twenty-eight million admirers of *Macbeth*. It can make us find Lekain ridiculous without a wig, and Talma ridiculous with it (22). If the rules required monosyllables throughout, or acting with a limp, our habits would adjust: "Tout ridicule inaperçu n'existe pas dans les arts," he writes incisively (97–98).<sup>131</sup> The converse is what bores the public: *ennui*. Leaving the *Académie*, where "tout dormait," Stendhal remarks: "j'endors le lecteur. Allons chez Tortoni" (55, 67).<sup>132</sup> His 1823 *Réponse* echoes this relativity, with a remark normally misread as a simple bow to Cuvier: tender souls will find in the Jardin des Plantes amphitheater the refutation of Plato's system "sur l'identité du beau idéal chez tous les hommes."<sup>133</sup> Stendhal is actually referring to Sartje, the *Vénus Hottentot* dissected by Cuvier in 1817, and whose stuffed body, after her death, remained on public display in Paris until the 1970s. "Je n'ose," he writes, "conduire le lecteur à l'amphithéâtre."<sup>134</sup>

Thus, we end with the public, who stars in this pamphlet. "Le public s'obstinera," the short *Avertissement* says twice.<sup>135</sup> The Romantic admits the gulf between himself and the writers "en possession de l'admiration publique" (78).<sup>136</sup> Being Romantic, he claims, means "offrir au public les impressions dont il a besoin" (96).<sup>137</sup> As with boredom, proof is incontrovertible; Paris mocked the *roman historique* for twenty years, until Scott made Ballantyne a millionaire (122). The infallible people's voice is a prerevolutionary theme dear to the Groupe de Coppet, who thereby link art, politics, and economics. Stendhal once echoes this political slant; when Napoleon "trompe cette nation, il tombe" (153).<sup>138</sup> Elsewhere, his argument is market-driven, and justifies his praise for vaudeville (112). Success eludes Stendhal, however, despite this

---

130 "One is always right to feel as one feels and to find beautiful that which gives pleasure." *Réponse*: RS, II, p. 258.

131 "Any unseen ridicule does not exist in the arts."

132 "everything was sleeping;" "I am putting the reader to sleep. Let's go to Tortoni's."

133 "on the identity of ideal beauty among all men." Jardin des Plantes: RS, II, pp. 239–240.

134 "I dare not lead the reader to the amphitheater."

135 "The public will insist."

136 "in possession of public admiration."

137 "offer the public the impressions it needs."

138 "deceives this nation, he falls." Coppet's interest in public credit begins with Staël's father Necker and his *Compte rendu au Roi*, 1781—France's first public budget.

praise of it, and the motto to Part One, *Intelligenti pauca*, shows that his views are already ambivalent. French Romantic tragedy did not exist in 1825, and Stendhal could not know that his fight for prose drama was doomed. But it was certainly lonely, on Left and Right alike, and he can sound desperate—pamphlets are the comedies of today; forget “haine impuissante” and moaning “niaisement;” write your plays now, and perhaps in 1834, 1845, 1864 they will be stageable (83, 108, 112–114, 151).<sup>139</sup> The 1854 edition, in fact, adds a long footnote with a bizarre claim: “L’emphase de l’alexandrin convient à des protestants, à des Anglais” (215).<sup>140</sup> On a page which returns from the censor “toute barbouillée de la fatale encre rouge,” Stendhal notes: “transformez vos comédies en romans et imprimez à Paris” (117).<sup>141</sup> Which, in the end, is exactly what he did.

## 4. Conclusion

Tout ce qu’il y a dans cette brochure est traduit de l’allemand ou de l’anglais.  
Stendhal<sup>142</sup>

Recalling Stendhal’s many debts may seem ungracious. But without them, we miss both the nature of his joke and his place within European Romantic debates; we lie to ourselves as we blindly cite propaganda. This pamphlet completes a dialogue begun twenty years earlier, binding cosmopolitan sources in an indissoluble mix—a mix ideology has preferred to call French, in 1823 and since. Stendhal repeatedly echoes Staël the Genevan on enthusiasm, dramatic interest, pleasure, exteriority, imitation, and Germany. A series of examples echo *De l’Allemagne*, and

139 “impotent hatred;” “foolishly.” In 1834, Stendhal wrote this, rather tellingly, in the margin of a copy of *Le Rouge et le noir*: “Depuis que la démocratie a peuplé les théâtres de gens grossiers, incapables de comprendre les choses fines, je regarde le roman comme la comédie du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle;” quoted in *Racine et Shakespeare*, ed. Roger Fayolle (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1970), p. 43.

140 “The alexandrine’s emphasis suits Protestants, Englishmen.”

141 “all covered in fatal red ink;” “transform your comedies into novels and print in Paris.”

142 “Everything there is in this brochure is translated from the German or the English.” *Qu’est-ce que le romantisme*, author’s note: RS, II, p. 31. Jean-Jacques Hamm, “Stendhal et l’autre du plagiat,” *Stendhal Club* 91, 15.iv.1981, p. 206 quotes the *Vie de Haydn*: “Au reste, il n’y a peut-être pas une seule phrase dans cette brochure qui ne soit traduite de quelque ouvrage étranger.” His fine analysis traces Stendhal the plagiarist’s desire to be caught.

the text conceals them; for instance, changing Gloucester's blinding to blinded *infants* in Shakespeare. He cites *Corinne* and the "puéril" *Considérations* instead. A.W. Schlegel is also manipulated, attacked explicitly while providing a framework for Stendhal's whole Romantic esthetics. Stendhal borrows Schlegel's objections to Molière and Racine, but also his complex theories of dramatic unity, of illusion and mimesis, of the mixing of genres and its function—the framework of his thought. This debt is marked in manuscript by repeating Schlegel's very examples from 1813: for instance, Louis XIV as Hercules in a wig. Schlegel reaches Stendhal in French translation; through Hazlitt's review; and through Manzoni's use of him in the brilliant *Lettre à M. Chauvet*; German, English, French, and Italian polyphony, a stew only a bold cook would try to separate. Stendhal also combines Manzoni, Visconti (to whom both refer), and the Berchet-Breme-Borsieri pamphlets preceding all three. In fitting irony, Stendhal's sources Staël, Schlegel, and Manzoni, traditionally backstaged in histories of French Romanticism, were in fact published in French, and in Paris: *language* evidently does not make a citizen, in the new age of nationalism which these four Romantics helped to found.<sup>143</sup>

Any fool can borrow good ideas from others. What matter here are Stendhal's reasons, his methods, and his results. From this chapter emerge, to begin with, Stendhal's pragmatic concessions and personal ambivalence, two friends of inconsistency. Part Two is a very different pamphlet from Part One, despite his move to link them, but they follow one pragmatic line: cosmopolitan references bid for sales in 1823, then yield to a nationalist framework two years later; personal contacts and (fabricated) originality guarantee the author's value, while wit and liberal shibboleths speak to his market; allies and enemies are manipulated as Stendhal redraws the Romantic map, trading real battles for fictional ones. Turning a foreign war into a generational one is particularly fine propaganda, but Part One does not succeed, and Stendhal must regroup. In 1825, Letter VIII's long footnote marks this retreat from Part One's Romantic ambitions, surrendering, in order:

---

143 Schlegel themes: *Confédération*, pp. 314–318; Chetana Nagavajara, *August Wilhelm Schlegel in Frankreich. Sein Anteil an der französischen Literaturkritik 1807–1835* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1966), pp. 229–240 (Manzoni and Fauriel), 263–265 (Stendhal). Staël themes: John Isbell, *The Birth of European Romanticism: Truth and Propaganda in Staël's De l'Allemagne* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

horror on stage; Classical language, which was André Chénier's topos; *mélange des genres*; a bizarre unity of time, with a one-year limit on action; admission of Shakespeare's English barbarity; verse for everything but historical tragedy (144–148). The footnoted sentence begins: "Je voudrais foudroyer les intolérants classiques ou romantiques."<sup>144</sup>

Ironically, that same note talks of failure "dès l'instant qu'il y a une concession apparente au public," and throughout the pamphlet, Stendhal signposts his own private failures (148). Art is useless for those over forty, he writes; this dialogue comes from Visconti; my readers, if I have any; Auger and I are equally unknown. Stendhal's opposite verdicts on the liberals his public admires may be less accidental than the signposts of a private game, like his plagiarism or his love for pseudonyms. How can a pseudonym plagiarize? runs an old defense of Stendhal, and the two concepts are indeed linked. In *Quelques idées italiennes*, Stendhal is equally happy to fill out his co-author's reminiscences in the same first person; he gives as readily as he takes. In the republic of letters, words, like ideas, are evidently common property, though I'm sure Stendhal smiled as he rewrote his borrowings or reminisced in his co-author's stead. This polyphony traces Stendhal's complex game of perspective—his dialogue with his own manuscripts; with the Italians, with Staël, Schlegel, and Geneva; with Paris liberals, Paris Romantics, and the establishment; with the British, his initial paying public; with Shakespeare and Racine.<sup>145</sup> Success and failure, Stendhal's twin poles.

Part Two suggests keeping Classical tragedy four days a week at the Théâtre-Français. That would be a parliamentary majority, and it is a remark rarely quoted (105). The man who writes, in 1818, "je suis un romantique furieux," then in 1824 calls Delacroix's *Scène des massacres de Scio* "médiocre par la déraison," has a personal history and agenda, but his case is also paradigmatic.<sup>146</sup> Romantics throughout Europe and

---

144 "I would like to blast intolerant classics and romantics with a thunderbolt." Language: *RS*, II, p. 250. Chénier's "Sur des pensées nouveaux faisons des vers antiques" was echoed in almost every French statement on Romanticism before 1830.

145 "the moment there is apparent concession to the public." Sandra Teroni's critical edition of *Quelques idées italiennes* should establish this detail.

146 "I am a furious romantic;" "mediocre through unreason." *Furieux*: to Mareste, 14.iv.1818; *CSten*, I, p. 909. *Déraison*: Stendhal, *Salon de 1824*, cited in Francis Claudon, "Stendhal et le néo-classicisme," *Stendhal et le romantisme*, ed. Victor del Litto and Kurt Ringger (Aran: Editions du Grand-Chêne, 1984), p. 197.

America use the Romantic label as a flag of convenience, and not one major figure commits to the label throughout their career. Fittingly, success and novelty stand for Stendhal in inverse proportion; Part Two benefits not only from the favorable *conjoncture*, but from Stendhal's pragmatic concessions. Yet despite these efforts, success remains relative—as Champfleury recalls, “Balzac se vendait médiocrement, Stendhal pas du tout”—and Stendhal abandons Romantic drama to Dumas, Hugo, and the *emphase* he detests.<sup>147</sup> Should we then adopt Stendhal's advice, turning for a moment from his pamphlet to what the people actually read—to Béranger, to Scribe, to Dumas? A bold populist suggestion, today, as when Stendhal first made it in 1823.

---

<sup>147</sup> “Balzac sold poorly, Stendhal not at all.” Balzac: J.F.F. Champfleury, *Souvenirs et portraits de jeunesse* (Paris: Dentu, 1872), p. 78.