

UCLA

Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies

Title

The Reader's Eye: Studies in Didactic Literary Theory from Dante to Tasso (review)

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/81x0v4rc>

Journal

Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 11(1)

ISSN

0069-6412

Author

Desmet, Christy

Publication Date

1980-10-01

Peer reviewed

responsive to selected criticisms of the first edition: several corrections have been made, overlooked numbers have been filled, and a few important entries which were lacking in the original edition have been added.

I was bothered by the so-called "1980 Supplement" because the entries do not appear with any degree of completeness after 1977. My second objection is rather a disappointment, for a listing of inclusive studies is not found for all of the *Festschriften*, but only one of them. Naturally, these comments cannot in any way detract from the usefulness of this monumental item, an indispensable tool for the scholar attempting to understand "*musica* . . . as discipline, philosophy, and mathematical science, as well as craft and performing art." As the best bibliography of medieval music literature published to date, it not only supercedes the earlier edition, but will certainly find its way into every library on its own accord.

Jonathan Couchman
University of California
Los Angeles

Robert L. Montgomery, *The Reader's Eye: Studies in Didactic Literary Theory from Dante to Tasso*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), pp. 185, notes, bibliography, index, \$12.50. ISBN: 0-520-03700-6.

Exactly what status did poetic imagination enjoy in the sixteenth century? The question, a vexing one for Renaissance literary theorists, also troubles modern scholars of the period, and many, eager to distinguish Renaissance from Romantic attitudes, regard the imagination with Platonic distrust. Robert Montgomery corrects this critical myopia, offering an optimistic but balanced study of imagination's role in the apology for poetry. He traces chronologically a strand of didactic literary theory which explicitly defends imaginative fictions in terms of their influence over readers' moral behavior, discussing in depth five writers: Dante, Fracastoro, Barbaro, Sir Phillip Sidney, and Tasso. What unites them, besides a common belief in poetry's moral function, is their reliance on Aristotelian faculty psychology to explain the reader's response to poetry.

In his first chapter, Montgomery summarizes the opposed psychologies of Aristotle and Plato and shows their influence on later writers through

Aquinas and Augustine. Aristotle, unlike Plato, allows some validity to particular objects and actions and so believes that images of them transmitted through the eyes to the imagination are at least accurate transcriptions of phenomenal reality. The appetites and passions, which are stimulated by the imagination's pictures and then move the reason and will, act on correct information and can therefore induce the viewer to behave reasonably and morally.

Although Aristotle insists that the intellect must participate for action to be right action, the movement from vision to behavior hinges on the imagination's pictures and the appetites. Apologists for poetry using this psychology emphasize the importance of vivid pictorial fictions (to stimulate the imagination) and those qualities of language that arouse strong feelings. The defense of poetry becomes a defense of its sensual and ornamental qualities.

Montgomery follows his theme through its variations in the individual authors. From episodes in *Vita Nuova* and the *Commedia* where Dante (as literary character) engages with dreams, art works and visions, he extracts a theory which exonerates imagination as a clarifying and morally instructive faculty that disciplines the appetites. But Montgomery constructs Dante's theory purely by inference from poetic action. The fact that he barely mentions the explicitly theoretical "Letter to Can Grande" highlights a curious weakness of the book. Of Montgomery's five authors, only Sidney and Tasso devote much energy to formal literary theorizing. And even Sidney, whose deference to "popular judgments" makes him the keystone in Montgomery's argument, says little about the actual mechanism of audience response, forcing Montgomery to cite the first sonnet from *Astrophel and Stella* as proof that Sidney did subscribe to faculty psychology. Thus, Montgomery must draw together quite heterogeneous materials—poems and philosophical dialogues in addition to critical works—to unite a psychology of audience response with literary theory.

However, Montgomery does add an important contribution to Sidney studies by placing *An Apology for Poetry* where it belongs—in a context of contemporary Italian criticism. And his emphasis on audience response resolves the apparent clash between Aristotelian and neoplatonic sentiments in Sidney's thought. Sidney, like Fracastoro, concentrates on poetry's moral ends, adding to the now-familiar faculty psychology a neoplatonic notion that pictorial images can convey universals or Ideas. Approaching the neoplatonic "*Idea* or fore-conceit" and pictorial mimesis as related elements that work to manipulate the reader's behavior, Montgomery shows how Sidney's potpourri of critical terms coalesces into theory.

Treating thoroughly a few theorists, Montgomery's book complements the more diffuse histories of Renaissance criticism. He deliberately avoids historical and social issues, since he believes that the audience posited by faculty psychology is "common and largely undifferentiated by culture and historical period" (p. 170). But the absence of context can lead unwary readers astray. For instance, Montgomery capitalizes on Sidney's description of the poet as "popular philosopher"; yet Sidney's contempt for his own rioting Arcadians and contemporary aristocratic distaste for street poets (E. K.'s "rakehelllye route of our ragged rymers" in the *Epistle to The Shepheard's Calender*) indicate that Sidney doesn't really envision a vulgar audience for poetry. Here Montgomery's narrow focus results in a misreading.

Philosophers and scholars of the Italian Renaissance will find little new in *The Reader's Eye*. Montgomery's treatments of faculty psychology and of Fracastoro are derivative, and he acknowledges only a small part of the Dante criticism. But the student of English literature will appreciate his lucid and succinct presentations of both Greeks and Italians, particularly since most works he discusses appear in English translation. Beginner and Sidney specialist alike will enjoy this book as an introduction or companion to standard works like Joel Spingarn's *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (New York, 1925) and Bernard Weinberg's *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago, 1961).

Christy Desmet
University of California
Los Angeles