



Gerd Hurm: Rewriting the Vernacular Mark Twain

Moss, Maria

Published in:
Anglia

DOI:
[10.1515/ANGL.2005.104](https://doi.org/10.1515/ANGL.2005.104)

Publication date:
2005

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for pulished version (APA):

Moss, M. (2005). Gerd Hurm: Rewriting the Vernacular Mark Twain: The Aesthetics and Politics of Orality in Samuel Clemens's Fictions. *Anglia*, 123(1), 181-184. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ANGL.2005.104>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

BESPRECHUNGEN

Horst Weinstock. *Kleine Schriften: Ausgewählte Studien zur alt-, mittel- und frühneuenglischen Sprache und Literatur*. Anglistische Forschungen 328. Heidelberg: Winter, 2003, xii + 348 S., € 48,00.

Mit seinen *Kleinen Schriften* legt der langjährige Aachener Sprachhistoriker und Mediävist die Summe eines Schaffens vor, das durch seine thematische Spannweite ebenso beeindruckt wie durch detaillierte Kenntnis selbst auf entlegenen Gebieten. Die Sammlung beginnt mit vier Beiträgen zur Geschichte des Alphabets und der Benennung unserer Buchstaben. Es folgen 13 Aufsätze, die Aspekte der englischen Sprach-, Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zur frühneuenglischen Zeit behandeln. Daran schließen sich zwei Nachrufe an – auf Otto Funke (1885–1973) und Martin Lehnert (1910–92). Den Abschluß bildet eine bisher ungedruckte Betrachtung über “Geist und Sprache, Raum und Zeit” mit sehr persönlichen Gedanken und Bekennnissen, deren Diskussion in einer wissenschaftlichen Rezension nicht angemessen wäre. Der Band wird ergänzt durch Quellennachweise der Textauswahl und durch zwei Register.

Die hier versammelten Arbeiten stellen natürlich nur eine kleine Auswahl aus Weinstocks Produktion dar. Nach seinen eigenen Worten (xi) hat er das “bloß gewissenhaft Abgeschlossene” ausgeschieden zugunsten des “durchweg mit Herzblut Verfaßten”, das “rückblickend Entbehrliche” zugunsten des “Dauer- und Wesenhaften”. Angesichts solcher Kriterien fällt Widerspruch schwer und läuft Gefahr, herzlos zu klingen. Dennoch möchte ich bekennen, daß ich den vollständigen Abdruck von Weinstocks Arbeiten zur Alphabetgeschichte begrüßt hätte. Dieser Gegenstand ermöglicht – ebenso wie die Geschichte der Zahlwörter, der ein weiterer Aufsatz gewidmet ist – einen tiefen Einblick in die Kulturgeschichte unseres Abstraktionsvermögens, und Weinstock ist wohl der beste anglistische Kenner der Materie. Es wäre nützlich gewesen, alle diesbezüglichen Arbeiten zwischen zwei Buchdeckeln vereinigt zu sehen, zumal die nicht berücksichtigten Aufsätze an recht entlegener Stelle veröffentlicht wurden und in den Anmerkungen des vorliegenden Bandes nur durch unvollständige bibliographische Angaben vertreten sind (1 u. 18). Allzu große Bescheidenheit hindert den Autor daran, sich selbst im Personenregister aufzuführen, so daß die fraglichen Titel auch von dort her nicht erschließbar sind.

Demgegenüber fiele es leichter, auf einige locker assoziierende Gelegenheitsarbeiten zu verzichten, die ihre Entstehung den Rahmenthemen von Ringvor-

lesungen, Kolloquien und ähnlichen akademischen Anlässen verdanken. Allzu oft schaffen solche Themen ein doppeltes Prokrustesbett, das für die untergebrachten Beiträge gleichzeitig zu weit und zu eng ist. Da kann es geschehen, daß "Gespielte Welt im englischen Mittelalter" nur zum kleineren Teil vom mittelalterlichen Drama handelt, überdies einen veralteten Kenntnisstand referiert und in allzu geraffter Darstellung mißverständlich formuliert. Gleichwohl besitzen viele dieser Beiträge einen erheblichen, dem Autor eigentümlichen Charme. Die Interpretation eines "Chaucer-Sonetts", d. h. einer Montage aus 13 Chaucer-Versen und einem Skelton-Vers, ist ein philologischer Leckerbissen. Ganz nebenbei erhalten wir hier einen Überblick über jüdische und christliche Biblexegese, wie er Anglisten selten so konzentriert, unterhaltsam und informativ geboten wird. Und wenn die Musterung römischer Zahlenzeichen den Nachweis erbringt, daß ein 65-jähriger *Festschriftee* ebenso gut als 35-jähriger passieren könnte, dann ist solche Argumentationsakrobatik eine willkommene Abwechslung im Ernst des wissenschaftlichen Alltags. Dieser Aufsatz über englische Zahlwörter enthält zudem eine vom Verfasser "impressionistisch" genannte Beobachtung, die zu vertieftem Nachdenken und umfassenden Vergleichen anregt: der Wandel vom Typus "one-and-twenty" zu "twenty-one" setzte offenbar "oben" bei den 90ern und 80ern ein und breitete sich von dort nach "unten" zu den 20ern und 30ern aus (143).¹

Aufsatzsammlungen wie diese enthalten mitunter wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Dokumente, die ernüchternd wirken können. Ein solches ist Weinstocks Vortrag auf dem 1974 von Bror Danielsson einberufenen Symposium, das die Grundlagen für ein *Dictionary of Early Modern English Pronunciation 1500–1800 (DEMPEP)* legen sollte. Geworden ist aus dem Vorhaben nichts – trotz des hochkarätigen Herausgebergremiums und obwohl es schon 1923 von Wilhelm Horn als wichtiges Desiderat bezeichnet wurde. In einem Postskriptum nennt Weinstock mögliche Gründe des Scheiterns, doch vielleicht sollte man auch an die Worte von Roger Lass erinnern: "[I]f the 'history of

¹ Dank dem Fortschritt der Online-Lexika läßt sich Weinstocks etwa fünf Jahre alte Impression jetzt erhärten. Eine Durchsuchung des *Middle English Dictionary* <<http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/>> ergab: von 23 *ninety*-Komposita waren nur 2 vom Typus *one-and-ninety*, von 70 untersuchten *twenty*-Komposita nur 3 vom Typ *twenty-one* (website aufgesucht 23. und 24. 11. 2004). Bedingungen für "individual trial use" sowie Password und Username <<http://www.press.umich.edu/webhome/mec/individual.html>>. Ein dem Englischen vergleichbarer Prozess spielt sich heute im Norwegischen ab: 1951 beschloß der Storting ein Gesetz zur "Zahlwortreform", das die Umstellung vom gewohnten "einundzwanzig" auf "zwanzig-eins" verfügte. In der gesprochenen Sprache existieren nun natürlich beide Systeme nebeneinander. Für Norweger klingt die Mitteilung "Meine Oma ist neunzig-sechs." mehr nach einem Rechenergebnis als nach unmittelbar präsentem Wissen. Diese Informationen verdanke ich Herrn Kollegen Heinz H. Menge vom Germanistischen Institut der Ruhr-Universität Bochum. Sie könnten einen Ansatz zur Erklärung der Beobachtung Weinstocks bieten.

English' existed in any reasonably complete form [...] DEMEP would have a much lower priority than it has."² Inzwischen haben wir die sechsbändige *Cambridge History of the English Language*, mit zwei Phonologie-Kapiteln von Lass.

Auch die beiden Nachrufe bieten ein Stück Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Weinstocks Worte am Grabe Martin Lehnerts sind ein feinfühliges Zeugnis einer wissenschaftlichen Freundschaft in der Zeit der deutschen Teilung, das die westdeutsche Perspektive weder verabsolutiert noch verleugnet. Der Nachruf auf Otto Funke läßt die Dankbarkeit des späten Schülers erkennen, der – schon Assistent Wolfgang Clemens – durch Funkes Münchner Gastprofessur 1957 einen neuen, philosophisch fundierten Zugang zur Sprachwissenschaft fand. Funke hat Weinstock offensichtlich stark beeinflusst. Bei der Lektüre des Nachrufs ist man beeindruckt von der intellektuellen Unabhängigkeit dieses universal gebildeten Anglisten, der nach Prager Anfängen eine Professur in Bern erhielt und so auch in die Nähe von 'Genf' geriet. Sprachgeschichtler, der er in erster Linie war, konnte er Impulse beider Strukturalismen aufnehmen, ohne sich einer Richtung zu unterwerfen. Manche seiner Ideen erscheinen wie eine Vorwegnahme des *variationism*, der heute eine Brücke zwischen Soziolinguistik und Sprachgeschichte schlägt, indem er das Augenmerk auf die Ko-Präsenz älterer und jüngerer Varianten in jedem Sprachzustand richtet.

Wendet man diese Unterscheidung auf Weinstocks eigene Sprache und auf seinen Denkstil an, so wird man vieles entdecken, das auf sympathische Weise 'altmodisch' ist. Er neigt zu metaphorischer, oft auch umständlicher Ausdrucksweise, die das Verstehen nicht immer erleichtert. Auch in seinem methodischen Habitus ist er eher dem Überkommenen zugewandt. Mit deutlicher Zustimmung zitiert er die exegetische Maxime Rabbi Ibn Esras, wonach "von zwei gleichermaßen möglichen Textauslegungen der traditionalistischen zu folgen" sei (294). Eine solche Haltung ist nicht dazu angetan, Aufmerksamkeit auf dem heutigen Wissenschaftsmarkt zu erregen. Doch sie ist ein Teil jener *humilitas* und Selbstlosigkeit, die Weinstock stets ausgezeichnet haben. Die deutschsprachige Anglistik verdankt es diesen Tugenden, daß er bis heute, weit über seine Emeritierung hinaus, als Herausgeber der *English and American Studies in German* fungiert. Auch mit dieser entsagungsvollen Tätigkeit hat Weinstock sich um unser Fach verdient gemacht.

BOCHUM

HANS-JÜRGEN DILLER

² DEMEP, *English Pronunciation: 1500–1800; Report Based on the DEMEP Symposium and Editorial Meeting at Edinburgh, 23–26 October 1974* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1976) 85.

Hans-Dieter Gelfert. *Englisch mit Aha! Die etwas andere Einführung in die englische Sprache*. Beck'sche Reihe 1528. München: C. H. Beck, 2003, 224 S., € 9,90.

Englisch mit Aha! provides an introductory overview of the English language with the principal aim of deepening the readers' *cognitive comprehension* of its linguistic structures and interconnections (8). By discussing the historical development of English and pointing out many of its interrelations with German, Hans-Dieter Gelfert attempts to establish a tight network of facts which can help beginners but also more advanced learners to understand the language more thoroughly. Written in a personal and light tone, the book highlights various practical aspects of English coupled with technical explanations of relevant linguistic terms and concepts.

In the preface, Gelfert deplores that the average university graduate of English has only a shallow knowledge of the (logical) structures of the language: "Vielen, die sich in den kompliziertesten linguistischen Theorien auskennen, sind noch nicht einmal die einfachsten Lautentwicklungen aufgegangen" (8). He rightly emphasizes that teachers of English should have some kind of deeper knowledge from which pupils can arguably benefit greatly. The book proceeds with a brief account of the historical and linguistic development of English, a three-page overview of the major events and influences. This particular section might have been more detailed, as it is the only self-contained chapter on history, though Gelfert keeps introducing historical facts and references throughout the entire book. The subsequent short discussion of English sounds and intonation illustrates the main differences to German, showing common sources of error for learners of English. Another brief chapter is dedicated to the history of sounds, again focusing on similarities between the two aforementioned languages. On this and a few other occasions, Gelfert includes long, if not lengthy, lists of English-German equivalents which might have been shortened as they interfere with the flow of reading.

After a few notes on orthography, Gelfert turns to his next main issue, the "archeology of the English lexis". The author deals with the major foreign influences on the English language, discussing terms of Latin, Scandinavian and French origin. Linguists are likely to sniff at the etymological explanation of terms denoting the meat of animals: "So wurden für die lebenden Tiere die germanischen Namen beibehalten, während für ihr Fleisch die französischen Wörter übernommen wurden, was dafür spricht, daß die französische Küche schon damals dominierte" (53). Gelfert's semi-ironic thesis neglects the sociolinguistic fact that the people who could afford to consume meat often spoke French, thus introducing or maintaining their own terminology.

The chapter on English word-formation lists the most important processes but has some deficiencies as regards choice of terminology and comprehensiveness. Acronyms, for example, are misleadingly called *abbreviations* (71), and an explanation of clipping as well as some other less central types of word-formation is missing. The short chapter on the dissociation of the lexicon once more explains major differences between English and German, illustrating that in the English language semantically related terms often differ

in form. “Im Deutschen heißen die Behausungen von [Tieren] *Stall*; im Englischen heißen sie *pigsty*, *cow-shed*, *horse-stable*, *sheep-fold* und *hen-house*” (75). Another few pages in this chapter are dedicated to cultural peculiarities, again with a focus on etymologies.

In the next main chapter on “the birth of a modern grammar”, Gelfert explains the loss of inflexional endings in English and depicts the role of articles and cases. The discussion of tenses and aspects concentrates on the problematic present perfect, followed by some comments on the expression of futurity. In the section on conditionals, it is stated that the so-called *type 2 conditionals* have *should* in the *if*-part, which is only rather seldom the case (136 f.). Other topics in this chapter include adverbials, relative clauses, indirect speech, prepositional phrases as well as false friends. Within the following pages on usage, Gelfert discusses peculiarities of English discourse markers, idioms, puns and even curses. After a few notes on regional English varieties and American English, the author briefly deals with sociolinguistic issues, e. g. upper-class register.

The last main chapter focuses on stylistic features of the English language, also including a comparison with German literary style. Gelfert explains some important linguistic terms in the appendix, which also contains book recommendations and an index.

Altogether, *Englisch mit Aba!* is an enjoyable but nonetheless reliable introduction to the English language, never boring and written in a remarkably light tone. Gelfert has generally achieved his aim of providing revealing insights into the language which other authors fail to give so explicitly, perhaps being afraid of appearing to state the obvious. It can definitely be recommended to students of the English language, with only a few reservations. The book is, for example, not well-suited – nor intended – as a study aid, as it is sometimes unsystematic and has a few important omissions. The author has occasionally stressed the German language more than the book title would suggest, English translations of German technical terms are generally missing, and there are no references to scholarly literature in the text. This makes the book, on the other hand, all the more readable, a classic example of edutainment.

INNSBRUCK

REINHARD HEUBERGER

The Politics of English as a World Language: New Horizons in Postcolonial Cultural Studies. Ed. Christian Mair. ASNEL Papers 7. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003, xxi + 497 pp., € 110,00 hb./€ 55,00 pb.

The book under review includes a selection of papers that were read at the joint meeting of the annual conference of the Association for the Study of the New Literatures in English (ASNEL) and the conference on research into the Major Varieties of English (MAVEN) in Freiburg in June 2001. This 500-page volume is thus an impressive documentation of one of the rare occasions

when linguists interested in (native and non-native) varieties of English on the one hand and literary scholars approaching the new postcolonial literatures on the other meet in order to discuss the phenomenon of English as a world language. Given that in the postcolonial cultural context the emergence of new Englishes and the development of new English literatures are intricately intertwined, it is in fact high time, as Mair correctly points out in the Introduction, “to see to what extent the two fields have taken notice of each other’s traditions, terminologies and concerns and have begun to engage in a productive cross-disciplinary dialogue” (xi). What renders *The Politics of English as a World Language* (PEWL) particularly insightful are the multi-dimensional perspectives on postcolonial cultural studies that it offers.

Lack of space forbids a detailed review of all individual papers and, thus, of all the dimensions of research into postcolonial cultural studies that they cover. Suffice it to say that of all dimensions the regional dimension figures most prominently: PEWL covers aspects of English language and literature in the Caribbean and the African diaspora in America and Britain (Darroch, Devonish, Meyer, Simmons-McDonald, Tournay), Africa (Chiavetta, Deuber/Oloko, Frank, Kamwangamalu, Kembo-Sure, Mafu, Ramsey-Kurz, Samin), Asia (V. Alexander, Goonetilleke, Manarpaac, Paul, Tan, Vogt-William, Wijesinha), Canada (Hasebe-Ludt, Knopf) and New Zealand (Holmes/Stubbe/Marra, Keown, Marsden).

The distinction of these regions correlates, *grosso modo*, with the grouping of 25 of the 35 essays into thematic sections. For each of the regions, different research foci seem to emerge. For example, in many papers on English in Africa (e. g., South Africa and Tanzania) and Asia (e. g., the Philippines, Sri Lanka) issues of language policy and the role of the English language in education are, unsurprisingly, particularly pressing. In the New Zealand papers, on the other hand, the relationship between Maoris and Pakehas (i. e., New Zealanders of European origin), including linguistic differences between the two speech communities, is of central concern (e. g., with regard to humour and ethnic marking in language use).

Ten of the 35 papers – arranged in a separate section “Resisting (in) English: globalization and its counter-discourses” – address general questions of English as a world language that are not restricted to a specific region. This section assembles programmatic position statements on the status and role of English in the world (R. J. Alexander, Mühlhäusler, Pennycook, Phillipson, Skutnabb-Kangas and Toolan) and papers on the implications of the emergence of English as a world language for various fields of application: the documentation of varieties of English in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (Price), teaching norms for English as a lingua franca (Seidlhofer/Jenkins), the use of languages in science and the humanities (Mühleisen) and the modelling of progression and regression instigated by the globalisation of the English language (Lysandrou/Lysandrou).

PEWL provides an exemplary overview of various topics that are central to the description and analysis of English as a world language in linguistics and in literary studies. For example, a recurrent topic in many essays is speakers’ and writers’ attitudes towards the English language in general and

localised forms of English in non-native contexts in particular. Among other papers, Mafu's analysis of the change in attitudes towards English in Tanzania and Manarpaac's comments on the situation in the Philippines are indicative of how language policies that do not take into account language users' desire to acquire English in an increasingly English-speaking world are bound to fail. The fact that many postcolonial writers like Arundhati Roy and Patricia Grace do not provide any translations or explanations of the many indigenous words that they use makes it clear that these authors claim their individual use of English to be an idiolect of the same status as any native speaker's usage. In their writing, English has developed into a genuinely Indian and Maori language: everyone that uses English owns it. In the light of Vogt-William's and Keown's essays on Arundhati Roy's and Patricia Grace's use of English, Mühlhäusler's thesis that English is an "exotic language" (i. e., ill-adapted to new socio-cultural contexts and environments) appears to be on shaky ground, although his paper offers interesting observations on the use of English on Pitcairn Island.

Another all-pervading topic, which is linked to the issues of attitudes and ownership, is the assessment of the positive and/or negative effects of the global spread of English. It is quite clear that many questions that are addressed in this context (e. g., whether countries in the outer circle should keep English as second and/or official language) are highly controversial and invite extreme and conflicting points of view. However, most papers are designed to provide a balanced view (compare, for example, R. J. Alexander's comments on the dialectics of English as a global language that is at the same time oppressing and liberating) and to focus on the emergence of entirely new kinds of Englishes and their creative potential and partial autonomy (see, for example, Paul's analysis of the Indianisation in Indian authors' fiction writing in English).

Some papers zoom in on various – mostly subtle – ways in which language may be abused or manipulated in specific contexts in order to perpetuate socio-cultural inequality and political oppression. Frank's essay, for example, illustrates how the English language has been used in South African drama as a device by means of which racist attitudes are encoded.

As far as the evaluation of the role of English as the dominant world language is concerned, there is only one paper which, in my view, should not have been included in the volume, namely Skutnabb-Kangas's polemical propagation of her ecolinguistically motivated thesis that English is a "killer language".¹ Not only is the overall analogy that she draws between biodiversity (which is no doubt worth preserving) and linguistic diversity (seemingly threatened by English), at best, speculative and questionable, but it is also the underlying metaphor of languages as living creatures which renders her argumentation fundamentally flawed and completely out of touch with

¹ On the other hand, it could also be viewed as the editor's wise decision to include this extremist position statement in order to cover the entire range of critical assessments of the global spread of English.

reality. As Lucko (2003) pointedly notes, “languages are not creatures with lives of their own, which can be deserted and left alone in the dark, where they are stalked and murdered by killer languages like English.”² The English-as-a-killer-language position reveals the amazing extent to which the discussion of the politics of English as a world language may at times be ideologically biased and unscientific (as also other publications in this field show). It is therefore pleasant to note that all the other papers in PEWL provide rational approaches to issues and problems related to the global spread of English – both in the linguistic and in the literary contributions.

From the formal point of view, PEWL is free from any major blunders. Only very few pieces of *quisquilia* have caught my eye, e.g., superfluous hyphens on pp. 67 and 121 (in *communicating* and *including* respectively), a new section heading without text at the bottom of p. 91 and a full stop in lieu of a comma on p. 337. Otherwise, the proof-reading is perfect.

All in all, PEWL provides an immensely enjoyable collection of essays. It gives a comprehensive and interdisciplinary overview of topics and arguments as well as sample analyses and interpretations in linguistic and literary approaches to English as a world language and the conditions, tensions and conflicts it creates. To add yet another – refreshingly fatalistic – literary voice to the many already referred to in PEWL:³ “One must have a native tongue / in which to make love – is said / to be *echt, realpolitik*. Yes, / I have only English to make do. / What else will help anyway?”

GIESSEN

JOYBRATO MUKHERJEE

Beate Hampe. *Superlative Verbs: A Corpus-Based Study of Semantic Redundancy in English Verb-Particle Constructions*. Language in Performance 24. Tübingen: Narr, 2002, 274 pp., € 48,00.

The present study, a doctoral thesis written at the University of Jena, investigates a subgroup of English multi-word verbs hardly discussed as yet by linguistic research into phrasal verbs and the meaning of their particles. The author's aim is to show that particles in multi-word verbs such as *start out*, *finish up*, *fall down* or *lift up*, where the adverbs seem redundant, on the contrary fulfil various semantic and pragmatic functions.

The title “Superlative Verbs” is catchy and doubtless original, employing a semantico-grammatical feature of adjectives for the description of verb-particle constructions (VPCs). However, with this “quasi-metaphorical” (153)

² Peter Lucko, “Is English a ‘Killer Language’?”, *Studies in African Varieties of English*, ed. Peter Lucko, Lothar Peter and Hans-Georg Wolf (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003) 152.

³ Alamgir Hashmi, “To My Love in Another Town”, *Sun and Moon and Other Poems*, by Alamgir Hashmi (Islamabad: Indus Books, 1992) 47.

comparison of adjectives and verbs, the question arises whether – according to the threefold adjectival distinction – there are ‘comparative verbs’ among the VPCs as well. The author herself seems to argue along these lines by using the comparative form of the underlying adjectives in order to paraphrase the meanings of corresponding deadjectival phrasal verbs: “Thus, *brighten up* at least involves making brighter, *tighten up* involves making tighter, *sweeten up* involves making sweeter” (190). Hence, it appears that traditional terms such as ‘emphatic’ or the aspect-related label ‘completive’ might be more appropriate.

As the subtitle points out, the analyses are based on electronic corpora, mainly the LLC, LOB, SEC, MCA (Microconcord Corpus Collection A), and CO (Collins Online), so that a sufficient number of authentic sample sentences and text extracts is guaranteed. The book, which consists of five chapters plus a preface and a conclusion, is clearly structured, proceeding from preconceptions and working definitions to in-depth analyses. It is especially praiseworthy for the study to discuss the issue of phrasal verbs from the viewpoints of three different theoretical backgrounds, i. e. semantics (chapter III), pragmatics (chapter IV) and Cognitive Linguistics (chapter V), with increasing length and detail. The respective sections, which fruitfully complement each other and throw light on the issue from various angles, mostly contain a favourable combination of theoretical preliminaries and practical applications.

In the introductory chapter I (15–32) the author judiciously defines the VPC with the help of a considerable number of relevant bibliographic references from the disciplines of syntax, semantics, and word-formation. It is, however, somewhat surprising that the landmark dictionary of idiomatic English by Cowie and Mackin (1975) is not mentioned at all. Hampe reaches the plausible conclusion that the phrasal verb is a fuzzy category with a syntactically restricted and idiomatic prototype at the centre and free combinations at the periphery, which allows her to subsume virtually all verb-adverb collocations under the category of the VPC.

Chapter II (33–61), which initially offers a wide selection of relevant phrasal verbs, meticulously discusses the problem of semantic redundancy by applying different methods: a) asking native speakers to fill in questionnaires (tables: 42–44), b) consulting lexicography (tables: 48–51), and c) collecting corpus data (tables: 56–58). Owing to the methodological variety, the results are lucid and convincing: the so-called ‘redundant’ VPCs show more specialized meanings than their usually polysemous counterparts without particles, often of a metaphorical, abstract or aspectual kind. Regrettably, the role of collocations and contexts for the disambiguation of verbal polysemy is dealt with only marginally (cf. Moon 1998, 187–92).

In chapter III (63–90) truth-based semantics is used to investigate the symbolic (or denotational) aspect of ‘redundant’ VPCs. With the application of various test frames to numerous well-chosen sample sentences, the hypothesis is corroborated that apparently superfluous particles do indeed cause propositional changes, so that the term ‘redundancy’ cannot justifiably be used for their semantic description. Hampe provides evidence that the use of

particles typically suggests a telic/completive interpretation of the verb meaning (e. g. *tidy up*, *cover up*, and *empty out*), using a graphic figure to illustrate the deviating truth values of VPCs and simple verbs (88).

Chapter IV (91–153) focuses on the expressive function of VPCs, i. e. their ability to indicate a speaker's emotional involvement. The theoretical considerations are reasonably complemented by corpus data in informative tables (119–24) which demonstrate that 'redundant' VPCs occur most frequently in the spoken medium and in types of discourse with a high degree of informality (e. g. face-to-face conversations). Moreover, Hampe manages to establish a link between the emotive component of 'redundant' phrasal verbs and their evaluative and persuasive functions. Conscientiously, she concedes and discusses methodological problems such as the impossibility of comparing 'redundant' phrasal verbs with other groups of VPCs and the undesirable influence of text contents on the occurrence of VPCs with certain meanings (e. g. *queue up*). She correctly puts emphasis on the contexts here, therefore investigating the functions of phrasal verbs in longer stretches of text. It is particularly laudable for the author to scrutinize a lively passage from a detective novel of two pages, by which she manages to establish a link between character focalization and phrasal verb expressivity (144–46).

In chapter V (155–251) the methods of Cognitive Semantics (CS) are carefully applied to 'redundant' VPCs. It is the most extensive chapter, as CS is especially appropriate for the issue, deconstructing dispensable boundaries between grammar and meaning. After a comparatively lengthy summary of Cognitive Linguistics, the author presents four fastidious case studies of phrasal verbs with the adverbs *up*, *down*, *out*, and *off*. Since these are particles with an originally local meaning, some graphic figures could have illustrated the relationships between landmark and trajector (image schemas) as they are described here. Nevertheless, the case studies contain many illuminating examples and provide very instructive and multi-faceted views of the literal and metaphorical meanings conveyed by the adverbs. Conclusively, redundancy is sensibly defined as a "form of *conceptual overlap*" (246) between verb and particle, whereby the particle profiles the *resultant* state of the event expressed by the verb. Hampe particularly highlights the fact that although this semantic contribution of particles to VPCs is usually not predictable from their literal meanings, it is by no means arbitrary, but can be explained in terms of metaphorical extensions.

Since the study comprises summaries at the end of each chapter, a list of abbreviations, and an index, readers can easily find their way through the chain of arguments. An additional list of tables with page numbers might have facilitated access to the corpus data. Occasional repetitions of arguments and cross-references do not only serve as mnemonic devices, but also cause a tight and coherent texture. Although it is a book for specialists, the language used is clear, and obscure formulations are avoided. As the survey of the five chapters showed, the study hardly leaves any questions on 'redundant' phrasal verbs unanswered, so that it is indubitably a worthwhile read for anyone interested in the semantics of multi-word verbs.

Works Cited

- Cowie, Anthony P., and Ronald Mackin. 1975. *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English*, vol. 1: *Verbs with Prepositions & Particles*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Moon, Rosamund. 1998. *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English: A Corpus-Based Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon.

WÜRZBURG

CHRISTOPH SCHUBERT

Miran Ahn. *Wortartenzugehörigkeit der Kardinalzahlwörter im Sprachvergleich*. Europäische Hochschulschriften 262. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 2003, 203 S., € 39,00.

The morphosyntactic properties of cardinal numerals are generally described with reference to the categories ‘noun’ and ‘adjective’. Corbett (1978, 363), modifying Hurford’s (1975, 51) description, proposed the following bipartite generalisation: “(1) The syntactic behaviour of cardinal numerals will always fall between that of adjectives and nouns. [...] (2) if the simple cardinal numerals of a given language vary in their syntactic behaviour, the numerals showing nounier behaviour will denote higher numerals than those with less nouny behaviour.” Although this generalisation has found common acceptance, it was intended only as a very general starting point for a more detailed cross-linguistic description of the properties of cardinal numerals. Hence, a comparative study of the word-class character of cardinal numerals has long been due and should be most welcome. Miran Ahn, in her 2002 dissertation from the University of Kiel, has made an attempt at such a cross-linguistic examination of cardinal numerals.

The reader will appreciate the clear structure of the book: framed by two initial chapters – a short introduction and a theoretical outline – and a final discussion in a tenth chapter, each of the seven central chapters of the study is devoted to one of the sample languages Finnish, Biblical Hebrew, German, Ainu, Korean, Krongo and Samoan. Within each of these chapters the first section is devoted to a general grammatical description of the respective language, the second part gives a sketch of the respective inflectional and syntactic properties of the numerals, and a summary rounds off each of these seven chapters. As far as possible, the internal structures of the respective chapters parallel each other. Where there are deviations from this pattern, they are due to particular typological differences among the relevant languages.

The grammatical descriptions of the respective sample languages include additional details on the particular languages – such as e.g. tables showing all inflectional affixes of any noun and adjective paradigm in German (88–9), a discussion of the different theories on the genetic classification of the Korean language, including information on the history of the Korean writing system (108), or a list of the Korean classifiers with their respective

semantic classes (121) including a frequency count of the various classifiers (122) – not all of which contribute considerably to the subject matter. The second part in each of the main chapters then contains a description of the respective morphosyntactic features of cardinal numerals. The data provided in these sections are taken from grammar books on the respective languages, as are almost all the corresponding examples. Apparently, the parallels between nouns, adjectives, and verbs on the one hand and numerals on the other have also been responsible for the order in which the seven languages are presented: in Finnish and Hebrew (Chapters 3 and 4, respectively) numerals are claimed to be nouns, in German, Korean and Ainu (Chapters 5 to 7) they are adjectives, and in Krongo (Chapter 8) they are classed as verbs. Finally, in Samoan numerals are classed as ‘multifunctional’ (Chapter 9).

The approach to first define cardinal numerals as a semantic class (13) and then, on the basis of this definition, examine the morphosyntactic strategies attested for the relevant expressions in a sample of languages is both reasonable and promising. However, instead of providing the reader with a clear definition of the semantic scope and functions of cardinal numerals, Ahn offers a list of all kinds of facts and features of numerals from various sources and perspectives, none of them exclusively from the domain of semantics. The key semantic feature of cardinal numerals, i. e. the specification of the cardinality of a set, is mentioned only once in this section in a rather cursory way (14). A clear theoretical starting point is therefore missing. It is, of course, tempting to assume the apparent connection with positive integers as an evident and sufficient definition of the ‘semantic’ scope of cardinal numerals. But as soon as it comes to varying syntactic properties of numerals within one language, i. e. if we speak about numerals as ‘nouns’ and as ‘adjectives’ in different construction types, it would be useful to know in which different ways the referent of a phrase might be modified by a cardinal numeral in the respective constructions.

The second chapter deals predominantly with criteria for the classification of the principal parts of speech. In order to find language-independent criteria for defining the notions ‘noun’, ‘adjective’ and ‘verb’, Ahn demands a strict separation of semantic and grammatical (i. e. morphological and syntactic) features. Her basic assumption is that ‘object words’ (“Dingwörter”), ‘property words’ (“Eigenschaftswörter”), and ‘action words’ (“Tätigkeitswörter”) are language-independent semantic categories. The morphosyntactic features prototypically displayed by the respective semantic classes in a given language will then form the basis for determining the members of the respective grammatical classes, ‘noun’, ‘adjective’ and ‘verb’ in each individual language separately (27–34). Pronouns, determiners and numerically un-specific quantifiers are subsumed under the category ‘adjective’, basically because all these expressions are syntactically in an attributive position to the head noun (33).

The most useful part of the book is the concluding discussion in Chapter 10. While the descriptions up to this point of the study have been language-specific, Ahn now proposes a typology of possible word-class distinctions in the sample languages. In addition to the results of the previous seven chap-

ters, she now also employs data from another 30 languages. She proposes a range of grammatical categories between the poles ‘noun’ (exclusively used in argument function, morphological marking for case and number) and ‘verb’ (exclusively used in predicative function, morphological marking for tense and aspect). This grammatical range is now compared with the following range of semantic classes: ‘object words’ → ‘numerals’ (at least at this point the notion ‘cardinality words’ for the semantic class would be perhaps be more suitable) → ‘property words’ → ‘action words’. If in a given language a semantic class is expressed prototypically as a noun, then any class to its left on the semantic range is also expressed as a noun. If in a given language a semantic class is expressed prototypically as a verb, then any class to its right on the range is also expressed as a verb.

At this point, Ahn appropriately refers to Seiler’s (e. g. 2000, 44 and 148) of adnominal modifiers from most indicative (extensional) to most predicative (intensional) noun modifiers (167). Particularly because Seiler’s description is a most useful theoretical framework for an analysis of the syntactic functions of cardinal numerals, it would have been interesting, if not essential, to include other typically adnominal categories into this final discussion at least. The conceptual and morphosyntactic characteristics of demonstratives, pronouns and numerically unspecific quantifiers (e. g. *some*, *all*, *many*) cannot always be separated from the syntactic functions of cardinal numerals. In this context, it may suffice to refer to the difficult distinction between the numeral ‘1’ and the indefinite marker in many languages. Ahn admits this implicitly at the very end of her summary by adding demonstratives into the range of semantic classes, claiming that demonstratives and numerals take about the same position in the argument-to-predicate range (167).

Of course, Ahn’s results have to be taken as preliminary unless they find support in a future study based on not only a much larger sample of languages, but also on a sample with a much higher typological diversity. The only criterion Ahn has employed for the choice of languages for her sample is that they are genetically unrelated. The result is that six of the seven languages of her core sample are either inflecting or agglutinating languages. To include English, for instance, in the core sample would have been desirable not only because the data would have been familiar to virtually all linguists – regardless of whether the English language is in the focus of their research interests. Furthermore, the inclusion of English as an analytical language would have reduced the predominance of synthetic languages at least slightly. Accepting these shortcomings of the sample and the respective data as due to the limited scope of a PhD thesis, we can say that Ahn’s most important results are the confirmation of both Corbett’s generalisation and Seiler’s range of indicativity. Confirmation of the latter occurs because the range of possible lexical classes from more referring to more predicating expressions could convincingly be shown in the context of cardinal numerals.

Corbett’s generalisation is confirmed in two ways. First of all, Ahn’s description shows that, whenever there is a class of adnominal attributes in a given language, numerals are most similar to these in terms of their morphosyntactic properties. Second, in those languages in which the morphosyn-

tactic behaviour of cardinal numerals is inconsistent, it is generally the case that high valued base numerals behave more like nouns than other numerals. Ahn's attempt to reject Corbett's generalisation merely because of the existence of verb-like numerals (27 and 171) is therefore not tenable – neither according to the data she presents, nor according to her own method of analysis, i. e. taking the semantic class as a starting point from which to explore the morphosyntactic similarities of particular classes of lexemes. If, in a language, the property of a referent is prototypically expressed by a verb, this is the case simply because there is no (or only very limited) adnominal modification in that language. (Ahn states this herself at one point: 163). In Krongo, for instance, a cardinality cannot be expressed by an adjective (in the sense of an attributive modifier), simply because there is generally no adnominal modification in this language. However, a cardinality may still be expressed in the same or in a similar way as properties are. Or, to put it more simply, where numerals are verbs, adjectives are verbs, too – at least according to the data Ahn presents. Hence, the fact that in Krongo the specification of a cardinality is encoded in the same way as the specification of a property of a referent, i. e. predicatively, generally confirms rather than disproves Corbett's universal (at least if we remain faithful to Ahn's methodology and take the semantic category as the basis for our line of argument).

Yet, even if Ahn's rejection of Corbett's generalisation is not compatible with her own approach, she has a point in so far as Corbett's universal is indeed not entirely satisfactory. Corbett's statement simply implies that cardinal numerals borrow their morphosyntactic features (e.g. inflectional affixes, head-modifier agreement, position within a complex phrase, etc.), from other categories, most of all from adjectives or nouns. But what does this reveal about the inherent properties of cardinal numerals? If there are cross-linguistic similarities in the morphosyntactic behaviour of cardinal numerals – which Ahn's data suggest – then the constituting and inherent grammatical properties which cross-linguistically underlie the concept of 'cardinality' cannot be brought to light by simply referring to surface parallels between numerals and other parts-of-speech. From this perspective, Ahn's study may be taken as a starting point for a cross-linguistic exploration of morphosyntactic properties of cardinal numerals.

Works Cited

- Corbett, G[reville] G. 1978. "Universals in the Syntax of Cardinal Numerals". *Lingua* 46: 355–68.
- Hurford, James R[aymond]. 1975. *The Linguistic Theory of Numerals*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 16. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 2000. *Language Universals Research: A Synthesis*. Language Universals Series 8. Tübingen: Narr.

Insights into Late Modern English. Ed. Marina Dossena and Charles Jones. Linguistic Insights. Studies in Language and Communication 7. Bern: Peter Lang, 2003, 378 pp., € 56,00.

The history of English from 1700 to 1900, the period often referred to as Late Modern English, was neglected by linguistic research for a long time – the two centuries at issue have even been called “the Cinderellas of English historical linguistic studies” (Jones 1989, 279). The book under review, a selection of papers presented at the First International Conference on Late Modern English at the University of Edinburgh in 2001 and organised by Charles Jones, reflects the new and recently growing linguistic interest in the 18th and 19th centuries, which are neither as static nor as close to the present as many of us seem to have thought only ten years ago. So far, only a few monographs, such as Bailey 1996 and Görlach 1999 and 2001, have been presented. Dossena’s and Jones’ collection of papers should therefore be welcomed as a further step in the right direction.

The book comprises, apart from the editors’ informative introductory survey, fifteen papers, thematically arranged in three sections: (1) The Late Modern English Grammatical Tradition, (2) The Syntax of Late Modern English, and (3) Language and Context in the Late Modern English Period. On closer inspection it becomes clear that the discussion of the history of grammar, rather than the discussion of grammatical issues as such, dominates even in the second thematic section, where only two papers, namely those by Vosberg and Posse, are primarily concerned with structural linguistic issues. Given that the six papers of the third section focus on partly very specific varieties of English in the 18th or 19th century, essentially linguistic questions on language systems of English from the classicist period to the Victorian Age have hardly been raised.

The first paper, by Bailey, is an example of this somewhat evasive approach. The title is misleading: “The Ideology of English in the Long Eighteenth Century”. This poorly-structured introduction basically deals with the attitude of 17th to 19th century authors, letter-writers, essayists and dictionary-makers towards the structure and value of the English language, with an overemphasis on the Restoration period’s ideological relevance to the image of the English language not only in the 18th and 19th centuries, but in fact down to George Orwell (1946: “the English language is in a bad way”, 41). It is true, the self-reflective discussion of what English is worth compared with Latin and other languages has been a topos of English cultural history over the last 350 years or more. But Bailey does not, as the editors suggest (8), provide “the general theoretical and historical background” for the two centuries at issue in that he overemphasises the relevance of individual contemporary opinion at the cost of other conditioning factors (historical, cultural, economic, social). In particular, some sociological and sociolectal features should have played a role in his calculus – in view of their importance in some of the papers of the third section (“Language and Context”). Bailey avoids abstraction and all -isms, revealing an understanding of history which is too much the work of individuals. But there were indeed movements, general trends, epochs, historical caesuras!

The other three papers of the first thematic section are solid detailed analyses. Carol Percy depicts a grammar written by “a lady” (identified as Ellin Devis by a reviewer) and published anonymously in 1775 (“The Accidence [...] for [...] Young Ladies”). Percy shows that Devis had in mind young middle-class women as prospective readers of her grammar and that “she exploited the period’s preoccupation with linguistic competence as a symbol of social status” (75). Similarly, Joan Beal traces ideological stances in John Walker’s works (“John Walker: Prescriptivist or Linguistic Innovator?”), rather tending to defend the author’s prescriptivism and allegedly conservative phonetic transcription in the *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary*. Finally, Linda Mugglestone throws light on the “Making of the Oxford English Dictionary”, using the unpublished and generally non-accessible proof sheets of the original version of the OED (now stored mainly by Oxford UP); on that basis she reconstructs the laborious process of giving the dictionary entries their final shape, with Murray, Bradley, Henry Hucks Gibbs, director of the Bank of England, and a few others, including Edouard (= Eduard!) Sievers, as the leading lights.

The five papers of the second section are concerned with central modal verbs (Maurizio Gotti), aspect distinctions (Ilse Wischer), the “pleonastic” perfect infinitive, particularly in counterfactual constructions (“he would have had nothing . . . to have done”) (Rafał Molencki), the establishment of *-ing* constructions with retrospective verbs (such as *to remember, to regret*) (Uwe Vosberg) and the codification of indefinite agents by impersonal passives and impersonal subjects (such as *one*) (Elena Seoane Posse). Vosberg’s contribution deserves particular praise, because his discussion, which is corpus-based, focusses on a subtle linguistic problem, namely that of the distribution of finite and non-finite constructions after retrospective verbs; it also combines a well-founded detailed analysis with ambitious theoretical concepts which plausibly explain the longer survival of infinitival complements in certain, namely extracted, constructions (cf. 216–218).

The six papers of the third section of the book under review (“Language and Context”) are all case studies which demonstrate the role of pragmatic or sociolectal features. Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade provides a subtle analysis of Lowth’s language as it appears in his private correspondence and as opposed to the language of his grammar of 1762. Focussing on just one aspect of his language, that of spelling, she can show that Lowth practised a kind of code switching, being motivated by social ambition, and that his language can be regarded as a vernacular style in the sense defined by Labov. Tony Fairman’s study also concentrates on spelling, but with a focus on (handwritten) pauper letters of the early 19th century. The author throws fascinating light on the social and educational conditions of the working-class letter-writers concerned. It is interesting to see that they avoided dialect spellings, but were, depending on their varying degrees of literacy, subject to all kinds of other “mistakes”.

The following papers by Dossena (“Modality and Argumentative Discourse in the Darien Pamphlets”), McColl Millar (on the “Rhetoric of Improvement” in the first *Statistical Account*) and by Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (concerning “Diaries of Two Women in Early New England”) underline the impression

that Late Modern English linguistics has many questions to offer, but structurally the two first-mentioned papers reveal a rather weak sense of purpose. Dossena tries to show that modality plays a crucial role for the deployment of persuasive strategies, and McColl Millar's paper suffers from too many long quotations at the cost of argumentative stringency.

The final paper, by Raymond Hickey, raises the question of "How and Why Supraregional Varieties Arise". On the basis of his own *Sound Atlas of Irish English* (in preparation) the author discusses phonological and lexical features of supraregional varieties, which are distant from RP yet have lost any traits of marked localisation. Supraregionalisation is motivated by social pre-tension and the striving for social advancement. Hickey underlines that it should be kept apart from both *koinéisation* and dialect levelling.

While the book under review makes us aware of the many issues available in Late Modern English, the central topics concerning the structural development of English in the 18th and 19th centuries – sounds and syllables, lexis and word formation, syntax, semantics – have widely escaped attention. The evasive discussion of linguistic history and the tendency to raise questions within very narrow niches is not untypical of much that has been written on Late Modern English to date. For example, Görlach's two books mentioned above, with all their merits as pioneering introductions, reveal such tendencies (cf. Markus 2001).¹ Obviously, the fact that historical grammars are not necessarily the best and definitely not the only testimonies of the language of their time is not seen by everybody. And trying to come to terms with the basic descriptive parameters of 18th and 19th century English is obviously still in an initial and tentative stage.

Yet, thanks to its detailed analyses, the book contains more valid information – mostly well-edited² – than this review can reveal. Unfortunately, no indexes, either of names or of subjects, have been provided. Nevertheless the book encourages further research and helps deepen our "insights into Late Modern English". In line with its title, which promises neither more nor less, Dossena and Jones have fulfilled their promise.

Works Cited

- Bailey, Richard W. 1996. *Nineteenth-Century English*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P.
 Görlach, Manfred. 1999. *English in Nineteenth-Century England: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

¹ Cf. my review of Görlach 1999 in Markus 2001.

² I have found only a handful of (minor) mistakes: p. 23, 5th line from bottom: comma missing after *Evelyn*; 83/104: Görlach misspelt as *Gorlach*; 132, l. 2: *Podauf*, change to *Poldauf*; 179, l. 1: *quoted from* (not *after*); 280, 7th line from bottom: *therefore*; books are occasionally referred to as *titled* rather than *entitled*.

Görlach, Manfred. 2001. *Eighteenth-Century English*. Heidelberg: Winter.
 Jones, Charles. 1989. *A History of English Phonology*. London: Longman.
 Markus, Manfred. 2001. Review of Görlach 1999, in *Anglia* 119: 483–485.

INNSBRUCK

MANFRED MARKUS

Andreas Gröger. *Mittelenglische 'mentale' Verben. Eine semantische Beschreibung des Wortfeldes der Verben zum Ausdruck mentaler Prozesse und Zustände im Mittelenglischen, auf der Basis des HELSINKI CORPUS und einschlägiger Wörterbücher*. Berlin: Logos, 2001, v + 448 S., € 40,50.

Die vorliegende Studie, welche auf der im Erscheinungsjahr in Bayreuth vorgelegten Dissertation des Verfassers basiert, soll eine semantische Beschreibung des Wortfeldes der "mentalischen Verben" des Mittelenglischen liefern. Das Material wird aus dem mittelenglischen Teil des *Helsinki Corpus* (HCM) gewonnen, auf dieser Grundlage erfolgt auch die semantische Analyse, verbunden mit einer vergleichenden Konsultation vor allem des *MED*. Diese Reihenfolge bezeichnet der Verfasser als die "natürlichere und naheliegendere".

Die Beschreibungsmethode wird mit geringen Modifikationen aus Edgar W. Schneiders im Jahre 1988 veröffentlichter Habilitationsschrift übernommen. Die auf Merkmale gestützte Beschreibung und Abgrenzung von Wortbedeutungen im Feld findet letztlich ihre Verankerung in der strukturellen Semantik von Coseriu und seinen Schülern; weitere Ansätze werden im dritten Kapitel diskutiert. Für den Rezensenten ergab sich bei der Lektüre die Frage, warum die von Anna Wierzbicka propagierten *semantic primitives* sehr ausführlich (und sehr negativ) diskutiert werden und, wie zu erwarten, als für die vorliegende Arbeit unbrauchbar verworfen werden, während die vom Verfasser positiver charakterisierten Ansätze (Kay/Samuels, Prototypentheorie) weit kürzer abgehandelt werden und ohne gründlichere Argumentation *ad acta* gelegt werden. Der Grund kann nur in der bereits erfolgten Entscheidung für die Schneidersche Methode gesehen werden. Der in der Besprechung der Prototypensemantik gegen Andreas Fischer erhobene Vorwurf, daß letzterer in mit dem Charakter der Geisteswissenschaften unvereinbarer Weise Vorhersagen über sprachlichen Wandel von einer Theorie erwarte, erscheint doch etwas überzogen; niemand vertritt die Position, Wandel müsse stringent naturwissenschaftlich vorausgesagt werden können. Modelle wie die Prototypentheorie oder die Grammatikalisierungstheorie können aber sehr wohl wahrscheinliche und regelhafte Prozessabfolgen postulieren und auch belegen, mit deren Hilfe Vorhersagen über wahrscheinliche Richtungen auch semantischer Veränderungen getroffen werden können.

Als wichtigster und für die Analyse bedeutsamster Bestandteil der so festgelegten merkmalsgestützten Beschreibung werden die von Lipka und Schneider vorgeschlagenen *inferential features* herausgestellt. Wünschenswert wäre eine Diskussion solcher *features* in einem größeren Zusammenhang, wie ihn z. B. neuere Modelle der Kommunikationsforschung wie die Relevanztheorie

oder die kognitive Semantik herstellen könnten, in denen Inferenzprozesse eine herausragende Rolle spielen. Damit wäre allerdings der Charakter der vorliegenden Arbeit ganz wesentlich verändert worden.

Für die historische Semantik des Englischen hat der Verfasser sicherlich einen von großem Fleiß geprägten Beitrag geleistet, der mit vielen, auch exemplarisch angeführten Belegen arbeitet und akribisch das von Schneider geschaffene Beschreibungsinstrumentarium anwendet. Die hauptsächlichlichen Bedeutungen (hier Sememe genannt) der siebenundzwanzig für das mittelenglische Wortfeld angesetzten "mentalenen Verben" (z. B. *bileven*, *consideren*, *demen*, *gessen*, *thinken*, *wenen* usw.) werden herausgearbeitet. Wie erwartet zeigt sich, daß die lexikalische Differenzierung im Me. auch in diesem Teil des Wortschatzes geringer ausgeprägt ist als im heutigen Englisch mit den seit dem Fne. entlehnten, differenzierenden Lexemen. Damit ist das zentrale Problem der Polysemie angesprochen, welches eine noch systematischere Diskussion hätte erfahren können. Im wesentlichen befaßt sich der Verfasser in seinen diesbezüglichen Ausführungen mit Synonymie und partieller Synonymie, wobei Schneider der Vorwurf gemacht wird, sich in seiner hier weitgehend als Vorbild dienenden Arbeit zu sehr um Synonymie vermeidende Bedeutungs-differenzierungen bemüht zu haben, ohne daß diese Position (für das heutige Englisch) substantiell widerlegt würde.

Insgesamt stützen sich die Analysen auf die mit Hilfe von Merkmalen beschriebene Wortsemantik, die Kollokationen und die syntaktischen Strukturen, in denen die besprochenen Verben erscheinen. Die semantische Analyse greift sehr häufig auf die Beschreibungssprache des *MED* zurück, versucht also Bedeutungs-differenzierungen der me. Verben mit Hilfe der verschiedenen ne. Übersetzungen aufzuzeigen. Die verwendete Art der Merkmalbeschreibung bedingt eine hochgradig formale Darstellung der einzelnen Sememe.

Innerhalb der Merkmalsbeschreibungen werden vielfach Wahrheitsbedingungen bzw. vom Sprecher ("Thinker") vertretene Grade des Fürwahrhaltens diskutiert, und zwar wiederum im Rahmen des von Schneider entworfenen Modells. Man kann der Frage nicht ausweichen, ob hier nicht neuere pragmatische Ansätze der Bedeutungsbeschreibung hätten integriert werden können, die dann allerdings über den hier gewählten deskriptiven Rahmen und auch über die vielfach gepriesene strukturelle Semantik hinausgeführt hätten; die Arbeit hätte sich der historischen Pragmatik genähert.

Es werden zentrale und marginale Bedeutungen (Sememe) und Wortfeldglieder unterschieden, letztere durch das brauchbare Mittel, die Zahl der marginalen bzw. nicht zum Wortfeld gehörigen Bedeutungen bzw. Sememe zu zählen und zu gewichten. Das Fehlen sich anbietender Bezüge auf die *set theory* bzw. die Arbeiten von Langacker und anderen erklärt sich wohl wiederum durch die Beschränkung auf E. W. Schneiders Modell. Insgesamt erfährt man viel Wissenswertes über die Semantik der besprochenen "mentalenen" Verben, auch über die textsortenspezifische und dialektale Verteilung. Viele Tabellen vermitteln die reichhaltigen statistischen Daten, die aufgrund des *HCM* gewonnen wurden. Die Befunde des Korpus werden in akribischer Arbeitsweise in Beziehung zu den Einträgen des *MED* gesetzt.

Im Detail bietet das Vorgehen des Verfassers – wie bei einer Arbeit dieses Umfangs und Anspruchs nicht anders zu erwarten – Anlaß zu kritischer Stellungnahme, z. B. im Fall des Feldglieds *dremen*. Der Verfasser erkennt hier durchaus nicht eine immanente Schwäche des HCM, die in diesem Fall aufgrund der Berücksichtigung eines bestimmten Textes zu einer höheren Frequenz des Verbs führt, die der Verfasser offenbar als nicht repräsentativ ansieht; er bemerkt ferner, daß Chaucers Traumgedichte nicht hinreichend im Korpus enthalten seien. Angesichts dieser deutlich erkannten Situation hätte sich eine systematische Erweiterung des Belegmaterials angeboten, doch der Verfasser beschränkt sich auf die unwiderlegbare Bemerkung, daß Korpora eine “irgendwie geartete Auswahl” treffen müßten. Dieses Argument könnte natürlich zu einer Grundsatzdebatte darüber einladen, ob in einer Arbeit wie der vorliegenden das verwendete Korpus eine hinreichende Grundlage liefert, und ob gerade angesichts des den *inferential features* beigemessenen Wertes nicht eine stärker an Texten und Kontexten orientierte Arbeitsweise noch bessere Ergebnisse liefern könnte. Solche möglichen Einwände sollen jedoch insgesamt die durchaus wertvolle deskriptive Arbeitsleistung des Verfassers nicht schmälern.

DORTMUND

HANS PETERS

P. R. Robinson. *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 888–1600 in London Libraries*. 2 vols. London: The British Library, 2003, xiii + 118 pp. + 306 plates, £ 95.00.

Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile. Ed. Phillip Pulsiano and A. N. Doane. Volume 7: *Anglo-Saxon Bibles and “The Book of Cerne”*. Descriptions by A. N. Doane. Volume 8: *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*. Descriptions by Jonathan Wilcox. *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies* 187, 219. Tempe, Arizona: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002, 2000, x + 78 pp., 50 microfiches, and x + 82 pp., 50 microfiches, \$ 90.00 each volume.

The Index of Middle English Prose. General Editor A. S. G. Edwards; Co-editors N. F. Blake and R. Hanna III. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer:

Valerie Edden. *Handlist XV: Manuscripts in Midland Libraries*. 2000, xxvi + 110 pp., £ 30.00.

S. J. Ogilvie-Thomson. *Handlist XVI: Manuscripts in the Laudian Collection, Bodleian Library, Oxford*. 2000, xxii + 140 pp., £ 35.00.

Kari Anne Rand Schmidt. *Handlist XVII: Manuscripts in the Library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge*. 2001, xxvi + 168 pp., £ 35.00.

Fifty years ago, in 1953, the Comité International de Paléographie established an international research project with the aim “to produce a series of catalogues describing all precisely dated and generally datable manuscript books written in the Latin alphabet from the earliest times to 1600” (Robinson, p. 1); the catalogues were to be accompanied by photographic specimens

intended to provide reliable criteria for the dating of undated manuscripts. This project has been a remarkable success. More than fifty volumes, mostly in national series, have been published so far, covering libraries or collections in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the Vatican. An up-to-date list can be found at <<http://www.irht.cnrs.fr/cipl/Command.htm>>. More work, of course, remains to be done.

The dated and datable manuscripts in the most important English collections have been described in three works that are not part of a series, yet show uniformity in conception and presentation: *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700–1600 in the Department of Manuscripts, The British Library* (1979), *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 435–1600 in Oxford Libraries* (1984), both by Andrew G. Watson, and *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 737–1600 in Cambridge Libraries* (1988), by Pamela R. Robinson, to whom now we also owe an admirable catalogue of 285 dated or datable manuscript books in London libraries, which in scope and arrangement follows the earlier English catalogues. Of those 285, nearly half originated in England, and more than forty contain texts in English. Again, more than half of the books are now held in two libraries: 59 in the library of Lambeth Palace, mostly English; 78 at the Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, almost exclusively continental. Most of the dated manuscripts were written in the 15th and 16th centuries, fewer in the 14th (36), 13th (22) and twelfth (11); only four are earlier: The Great and Little Domesday Book, the homiliary in Lambeth Palace 489, and the late ninth-century MacDurnan Gospels (Lambeth Palace 1370). Among the English manuscripts, apart from the Lambeth collection, chronicles, cartularies, ordinance books, Statuta Angliae and related texts are fairly numerous.

Dr Robinson's Introduction treats the history of c. thirty existing libraries, among them that of St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey, as well as former religious houses in London. In the informative and judiciously written entries of the main section, I note only one minor error: among the documents added to the MacDurnan Gospels is a leaf with two writs by King Cnut (Sawyer nos. 988 and 987) on fol. 87 of MS Cotton Tiberius B.iv, not of the Lambeth MS, to which it originally belonged, as Neil Ker confidently stated (*Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 284), but David Dumville is in doubt about this relationship, see *Peritia* 2 (1983): 53. The author of the *Handschriftenerbe* (p. xii) is Sigrid Krämer. Six useful indexes conclude the first volume. The second provides a generous selection of manuscript reproductions, all of perfect quality, but here arranged not according to libraries but to their dates. I would like to join Albert Derolez, who contributed the Foreword to volume I, in expressing our gratitude to Dr Robinson for her second masterly achievement in the field of Dated Manuscripts.

Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile (ASM) is intended to provide complete reproductions on microfiches of all surviving manuscripts or fragments containing texts or glosses in Old English, together with detailed descriptions of their contents, a historical introduction and a bibliography for each manuscript. The first volume appeared in 1994; by now, twelve volumes

covering 119 manuscripts have been published, roughly a quarter of the whole work, in which the manuscripts have been assigned ‘main catalogue numbers’, so far unexplained, which unfortunately differ from those in Neil Ker’s *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Among the reasons for this may be the decision of the editors of ASM to treat *membra disiecta* as separate items.

This invaluable series has been introduced, and volumes 1–6 have been reviewed, in *Anglia* 116 (1998): 248–250, and 120 (2002): 236–237. Volume 7 (published after vol. 8) is entitled *Anglo-Saxon Bibles and “The Book of Cerne”*, but it includes fragments of homilies and a glossary, Harley 3376, together with two leaves originally belonging to this manuscript but here described separately; it also includes two copies of the Old English Hexateuch. In this volume, as well as in volume 8, the descriptions accompanying the microfiches are in general careful, accurate and reliable, but the following points should be observed, also by editors of future volumes of ASM.

Item 38 in the *Book of Cerne* (Doane p. 15) actually consists of *two* poems, *Sancte sator* (Schaller-Könsigen 14640, not a ‘hymn’), followed by *Christum peto*, *Christum prece* (Sch.-K. 2283), whose rubric *Incipit brithmon* is erroneously taken as part of *Sancte sator*. An editorial principle of ASM is to include descriptions of late parts of manuscripts that had nothing to do with the Anglo-Saxon parts. This happens when e.g. the extensive 14th-century collection of sequences (with later additions) following the Anglo-Saxon prayerbook ‘of Cerne’ is analysed on pp. 19–25. Here, references are to Legg’s edition of the Sarum sequences, in the *Sarum Missal*, although this is a secular service-book, and – where Legg does not have the text (but no. 5 is on his p. 462) – to other editions. But references to *Analecta Hymnica* and the scholarly and informative inventory of D. Schaller and E. Könsigen, *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum* (Göttingen, 1977) would have been much preferable, while the Bibliography, pp. 25–27, might have been somewhat more inclusive, and *Analecta Hymnica* should replace Daniel’s *Thesaurus* on p. 26.

The glossary fragment now at Lawrence, Kansas, has been edited, with facsimile, by Evelyn S. Firchow, in *Mittelalterliche volkssprachige Glossen*, ed. R. Bergmann *et al.* (Heidelberg, 2001) 243–259. The edition of the Hexteuch listed on p. 42 should have been that of 1969, with Neil Ker’s Supplement. For Harley 3376, there is an important note by David Dumville (*English Caroline Script and Monastic History*, Woodbridge [1993] 55) on its script, not here mentioned, but apparently used and misunderstood (p. 49); the reviews of Oliphant’s edition by Derolez and Schabram should have resulted in a warning on p. 53. The treatment of B. L. Royal 1.B.vii by Simon Keynes (*Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Michael Lapidge and H. Gneuss, Cambridge [1985] 185–189) would certainly have deserved a place on p. 57. Perhaps the most serious bibliographical omission is what is now the standard work on Anglo-Saxon gospel lists and gospel pericopes among the references for Royal 1.B.vii, 1.D.ix and Bodl. Auct. D.2.14: Ursula Lenker, *Die westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England* (München, 1997). The record on fol.

44v of Royal 1.D.ix is a writ, not a charter (Sawyer no. 985). Meritt's article (p. 71) is in *JEGP* 60.

Volume 8 of *ASM* contains *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, as its title indicates, but Wulfstan texts are in only four of the eleven manuscripts. The volume includes two books with texts that are not strictly Old English: the Trinity Homilies and the *Poema Morale*, in Trinity College, Cambridge, B.14.52, and the Vespasian Homilies, in B. L. Cotton Vespasian A.xxii, fols. 52–59. I add a few notes supplementing the descriptions by Professor Wilcox. The extensive additional notes by Michael Lapidge to his article listed on p. 13, on the metrical calendar, in his *Anglo-Latin Literature 900–1066* (London, 1993) might have deserved a reference. The text on fol. 89v of Cleopatra B.xiii is not a hymn, but a responsory from a rhymed office. For this manuscript, and for Lambeth Palace 489, Elaine Drage's masterly Dissertation, unfortunately unpublished, should have been listed on pp. 28 and 82, as on p. 12. The place of origin of the continental section of Cotton Vespasian D.xiv, fols. 170–224 (better to be kept separate from the 12th-century English part, fols. 4–169) has now been established by Bernhard Bischoff as a centre in Northern France, see his *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*, ed. B. Ebersperger, II (Wiesbaden, 2004), no. 2427. For items no. 55–58 of Vespasian D.xiv, one would have liked references to the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, ed. E. Dekkers, third ed. (Steenbrugge, 1995); this should become a standard reference work in all future volumes of *ASM*! Item 60 of Vespasian D.xiv is not a 'Church service', but two hymns; see *Mittel-lateinisches Jahrbuch* 35 (2000) 241. The edition of Ælfric's homily in Lambeth Palace MS 489, recorded as no. 8 by Wilcox, p. 82, has been superseded by the critical edition of Birgit Ebersperger, *Die angelsächsische Handschriften in den Pariser Bibliotheken* (Heidelberg, 1999) 237–262. To the Bibliography of the Lambeth MS should also be added Patrick W. Conner, *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth-Century Cultural History* (Woodbridge, 1993). – Further volumes of *ASM* appeared in 2001 (vol. 9), 2003 (vols. 10–11) and 2004 (vol. 12), but review copies have not so far been received.

The Index of Middle English Prose remains one of the most promising and important research projects in English medieval studies. In previous reviews in this periodical, I have treated its history, aims and methods, and the contents of the first fifteen volumes published since 1984 (*Anglia* 107 [1989]: 169–172; 115 [1997]: 255–257; 118 [2000]: 614–615). Three further volumes have appeared; they cover the manuscript holdings of Midland libraries, including the Cathedral libraries of Hereford, Lichfield, Peterborough and Worcester; the Laudian collection in the Bodleian Library (actually only manuscripts with the shelfmark Laud misc.), and the Library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

As in the earlier volumes, most of the recorded manuscripts containing Middle English prose texts were written in the fifteenth century, some in the fourteenth, and few in the thirteenth or twelfth. As to the manuscript contents and types of text, the picture differs considerably from that provided by the traditional 'History of Middle English Literature', not only because the *Index* does not record Middle English verse texts, but also because the manu-

scripts reveal the range and ubiquity of English *Fachprosa*, or English glosses in Latin writings of this kind. English medical tracts and recipes occur in almost every collection of late medieval manuscripts, together with veterinary and other recipes (e. g., for ink or dyes). Computus, astronomy and prognostications are frequent subjects, and especially school texts on Latin grammar and related matters. English glosses often occur in the work of John of Garland; texts dealing with synonyms and Latin-English vocabularies are also numerous. Religious prose is represented by devotional texts, sermons and saints' lives, while the Wycliffe version of the New Testament and the writings of Richard Rolle seem to have been widely read.

The editors have done their best in identifying the Middle English and Latin texts. Sometimes one would have liked to have some more information, as on the Latin grammar with English translation in Leicester MS Town Hall 4 (XV, p. 78). And what is the *Liber Sentenciarum de diversis voluminibus* of Casiodorus (XVI, p. 98)? The troth plight formulae in the marriage service are not in the Sarum Missal (XVI, pp. 100, 102 and XVII, p. 118) but in the Manual (called Ritual XVI, p. 101), as is rightly stated in the *Index of Printed Middle English Prose* no. 313 and p. 116, and accordingly in XV, p. 76. As to the *Liber de gestis Anglorum* in the Lichfield inventory of 1345, I very much doubt if this was a legendary, as Dr Edden appears to imply (XV, p. xv).

The editor of the Laud volume has compiled lists of c. 450 Laud lat. and Laud misc. manuscripts which, after an examination of all Laudian manuscripts dated between 1200 and 1500, were found to contain no English prose. But in many of those listed (XVI, pp. xiv–xv) one would hardly have expected Middle English prose at all, since they were among the hundreds of books that Archbishop Laud obtained from Germany (most coming from Mainz and Würzburg) in the course of the dreadful Thirty Years' War; they have been conveniently listed by Sigrid Krämer, *Handschriftenerbe des deutschen Mittelalters* (München, 1989–90), III. 441–447.

The introductory chapters in the volumes of the *Index* frequently offer useful information on the history of individual libraries and collections, as in *Handlists XV* and *XVII*. Unfortunately, *Handlist XV* is not reliable on early booklists. The earliest booklist of Peterborough is not one of the books 'held' by Bishop Æthelwold c. 964; it was a list of books donated by him to the monastery of Peterborough, and can only be dated 963 × 984. Worse confusion comes with Dr Edden's reference to a "twelfth century catalogue" in Bodleian Library, Bodley 163, actually to be dated s. xi/xii or s. xii in., in fact printed by Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885) 216–217, but she refers to a completely different list in Becker, pp. 238–239 (recording the books copied for Abbot Benedict, 1177–93) and so can claim that an English library c. 1100 or a little later contained Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter Lombard etc. (XV, p. xvii). Worcester fares no better. According to Edden, the earliest surviving list of books from Worcester is a list "included in a letter from Pope Alexander III" in "Bodleian Library, Bodley MS Tanner 3, ff. 189v–190" (sic). Now it is not quite certain that this is a Worcester list; it was added in the late eleventh or early twelfth century on blank leaves following an English copy of Gregory's *Dialogi* and so has nothing to do with the Pope's

letter to Bishop Roger of Worcester, dated 1167, actually added on the front flyleaf (fol. 1) of Tanner 3. Apart from this, the earliest genuine booklist from Worcester, written c. 1050, is in MS CCCC 367, fol. 48v. Dr Edden could have found all this, together with definitive, annotated editions of the lists from Peterborough and Worcester here mentioned – apart from earlier treatments – in Michael Lapidge, “Surviving booklists from Anglo-Saxon England”, in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes*, ed. M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985) 33–89, and the revised reprint in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, ed. Mary P. Richards (New York, 1994) 87–167. For Worcester, the editions of Rodney Thomson in *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues*, ed. R. Sharpe et al., Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 4 (1996) 651–659 were also available; for Peterborough see now in the same Corpus volume 8, *Peterborough Abbey*, ed. K. Friis-Jensen and J.M.W. Willoughby (2001).

MÜNCHEN

HELMUT GNEUSS

Anglo-Latin and its Heritage: Essays in Honour of A. G. Rigg on his 64th Birthday. Ed. Siân Echar d and Gernot R. Wieland. Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin 4. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001, xviii + 280 pp., € 50,00.

Wenige Gelehrte haben soviel für die Erforschung der in England verfaßten lateinischen Literatur im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter geleistet wie der 1937 geborene Arthur George Rigg. In einer Epoche der inflationären Bibliographien zeichnet sich seine Produktion weniger durch Quantität als durch den hohen philologischen Standard der Einzelstudien aus. Als sein wichtigstes Werk gilt auch außerhalb der engen Fachkreise die 1992 veröffentlichte *History of Anglo-Latin Literature*, aber nicht weniger Beachtung fand sein mit Frank Anthony Carl Mantello 1996 publiziertes, in zweiter Auflage 1999 erschienenes Buch mit dem schlichten Titel *Medieval Latin*, das die ambitionierteste Einführung in die lateinische Sprache und Literatur des mittelalterlichen Westens darstellt und ein geschätztes Arbeitsmittel nicht nur für Mittellateiner ist.

Eine Anzahl von Kollegen und Schülern Riggs haben sich für eine Festschrift zusammengefunden, die in drei Sektionen (*Roots and Debts; Anglo-Latin Literature 1066–1422; Influence and Survival*) unterteilt ist. Darin äußert sich in gemilderter Form die heutzutage grassierende Neigung, eine innere Geschlossenheit für Festschriften vorzutauschen, die höchstens ein nützlicher Vorwand bei der Beantragung von Druckkostenzuschüssen bzw. ein für die Verlage kommerziell verwertbares Feigenblatt sein kann. Aber gerade dieser Band zeigt, daß der Miszellencharakter den Wert eines solchen Buches nicht mindert, wenn darin interessante Forschungsergebnisse veröffentlicht werden.

Michael W. Herren (“Bavius and Maevius: *Duo pessimi poetae sui temporis*”, 3–15) setzt sich mit den beiden antiken Dichtern Bavius und Maevius

und ihrem Nachleben als Inbegriff der schlechten Dichter auseinander. Vom Kanon der Schlechten zum Kanon der Guten führt der Beitrag von Bernice M. Kaczynski ("Bede's Commentaries on Luke and Mark and the Formation of a Patristic Canon", 17–26). Sie zeigt, daß Beda († 735) einen Beitrag zur Entstehung eines Kanons von 'Kirchenvätern' geleistet hat, indem er Ambrosius, Augustinus, Hieronymus und Gregorius in seinen exegetischen Werken nicht nur ausführlich benutzte bzw. exzerpierte, sondern sie auch durch Angabe ihrer Namen am Rande des Textes graphisch hervorhob. Im Zentrum des Artikels von Gernot R. Wieland stehen hingegen die *Vita S. Willibrordi* des Echternacher Abtes Thiofrid († 1110) und der darin verwendete hohe Stil ("The Hermeneutic Style of Thiofrid of Echternach", 27–47). Thiofrid soll Aldhelms Werk oder Glossare gekannt haben und möglicherweise einen bewußt archaisierenden Stil verwendet haben (aber die Stilmittel und das Vokabular Thiofrids, einschließlich der von Wieland auf nützliche Weise aufgelisteten Gräzismen, 46 f., sind vor allem jene seiner Lütticher Lehrer und der Trierer Nachbarn, die hier nicht berücksichtigt werden). Mit dem nächsten Beitrag bleibt man im Schulraum: Alexandra Barratt ("Small Latin? The Post-Conquest Learning of English Religious Women", 51–65) stellt u. a. unter Heranziehung der handschriftlichen Evidenz dar, daß die Kenntnis des Lateinischen unter den frommen Frauen des englischen Mittelalters offenbar erst nach dem 12. Jahrhundert abnahm.

Sylvia Parsons bietet "A Verse Translation of Book 4 of Reginald of Canterbury's *Vita Sancti Malchi*" (67–91), deren Beurteilung der Rezensent Kompetenteren überlassen möchte (er fand den Originaltext einfacher zu lesen). Siân Echard ("Clothes Make the Man: The Importance of Appearance in Walter Map's *De Gadone milite strenuissimo*", 93–108) trifft den Kern des berühmten Buches *De nugis curialium* von Walter Map († um 1209), indem sie die Mischung aus erzählerischer Raffinertheit und pädagogischem Impetus herausarbeitet. Einer zweiten großen Gestalt des englischen Hochmittelalters widmet sich Michael Winterbottom ("William of Malmesbury *versificus*", 109–127). Er schildert die Kenntnisse der antiken Dichtung, die Wilhelm von Malmesbury († um 1140) besaß, und stellt seine Verse als jene eines fähigen Versschmiedes (*versificus*) eher als jene eines echten Dichters dar (eine für das Mittelalter allerdings problematische Unterscheidung).

Drei weitere Aufsätze konzentrieren sich auf die lateinische Dichtung im späten 12. und im 13. Jahrhundert. Christopher J. McDonough ("Alexander Neckam: Creation and Paradise in Book 2 of the *Suppletio defectuum*", 129–148) macht auf ein Gedicht des (ingesamt nach wie vor völlig zu Unrecht wenig beachteten) Gelehrten Alexander Neckam († 1217) aufmerksam, der durch ein dichtes Netz von Zitaten und Anspielungen seine Gelehrsamkeit unter Beweis stellt. Der um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts tätige Vielschreiber Heinrich von Avranches hat u. a. die Lebensbeschreibung des Franz von Assisi des Thomas von Celano um 1232–1234 in Verse gegossen: David Townsend stellt sie vor und übersetzt ausgewählte Passagen daraus ins Englische ("From Henry of Avranches's *Vita beati Francisci*: A Likeness in Words", 149–162). Greti Dinkova-Bruun ("The Story of Ezra: A Versification Added to Peter Riga's *Aurora*", 163–188) beschäftigt sich hingegen mit

einem Supplement zur verbreiteten Versbibel des Petrus Riga († 1209), dem *Liber Esdre prophete*, den sie aus einer Handschrift des Fitzwilliam Museums in Cambridge (MS McClean 31, saec. XIII) wiedergibt und kurz kommentiert.

Ebenfalls eine Edition enthält der Aufsatz von E. Gordon Whatley ("John Lydgate's *Saint Austin at Compton*: The Poem and its Sources", 191–227), aber nicht Lydgates Gedicht selbst, das in einem Band mit *Saints' Legends from Middle English Collections* (TEAMS Middle English Texts Series) erscheinen soll, sondern dessen Quelle, die in nicht weniger als neun Handschriften überlieferte Prosa-Erzählung eines *miraculum* des Heiligen Augustinus von Canterbury – kein Stoff für Zartbesaitete, geht es doch um die kurzfristige Auferstehung eines Toten, welcher der Kirche seinen Zehnt nicht entrichtet hatte. Um Leichen dreht sich auch der nächste Aufsatz, indes um weniger aufregende: James P. Carley behandelt "Misattributions and Ghost Entries in John Bale's *Index Britanniae scriptorum*: Some Representative Examples *Ex bibliotheca Anglorum Regis*" (229–242). Carin Ruff "True Latin, True Verse, and Good Sense: John Peter's *Artificial Versifying*", 243–255) weist ihrerseits auf eine Anleitung zum mechanischen Dichten lateinischer Verse, die ein gewisser John Peter als *school-boys' recreation* 1677 erscheinen ließ und die zweimal nachgedruckt wurde. Wenn man weiß, daß in England später richtige Maschinen zum Verfassen von Hexametern erfunden wurden, wird man sich über die *versifying tables* von Mr. Peter kaum wundern können.

Der inhaltsreiche Band wird durch eine Bibliographie des Jubilars, von Matthew Ponsse zusammengestellt, und ein ausführliches Register der Handschriften (265–267) sowie der Namen, Orte und Texte (268–280) abgeschlossen. Er stellt eine gediegene Hommage an eine um die mittelalterliche Literatur verdiente Persönlichkeit und einen soliden Forschungsbeitrag dar.

ERLANGEN

MICHELE C. FERRARI

Lisi Oliver. *The Beginnings of English Law*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002, xiv + 297 pp., \$ 60.00.

This volume contains editions and facing-page translations of the earliest Anglo-Saxon law codes. The laws of Æthelberht, Hloþhere and Eadric, and Wihtried were written approximately 600, 685–86, and 690, respectively; however ancient, they survive only in the twelfth-century compilations known as the *Textus Roffensis* (Rochester Cathedral Library MS A.3.5), the product of a Kentish scriptorium and hence a fitting repository for the earliest Kentish laws. An episcopal seat at Rochester was founded by Æthelberht in 604, and, as Lisi Oliver suggests, the custodians of learning at Rochester five hundred years later no doubt were aware of the heritage the laws preserved (23).

Oliver's book is an important contribution to the study of early English law. In addition to the texts and translations, *The Beginnings of English Law* con-

tains appendices offering diplomatic transcriptions of each code and tables comparing restitution in Æthelberht's codes (according to amount and according to status), and payments for disturbing the king's peace. Each edition is supplemented by extensive commentary that follows the sequence of the code in question. Topics range from broad concerns, such as the monetary system, the status of women and children, and oaths, among others, to linguistic questions; parallels to Nordic texts are frequently noted. Scholars used to the editions and translations of F.L. Attenborough (1922) will be pleased to have this work, which is precisely translated and thoroughly contextualized, to use in its place.

Especially valuable is the volume's commentary on the codes' historical context. Oliver outlines relevant political and social circumstances for each text and thereby creates continuity among the book's three main sections. *The Beginnings of English Law* is particularly rich in regard to its integration of law codes into social history, including the application of writing to the codes. Following Patrick Wormald on this issue (and others), Oliver accepts the view that Christianity was the major influence on the decision to commit the laws to writing. However, Oliver points out that writing itself does not imply a "Christianization" of the laws (16–17). Instead, she argues that writing seems to have been used by Æthelberht to promote "monumental self-immortalization", the same reason it was used by kings of the German federations under Rome (19). Writing, she points out, was often used to record trivial information; important information (myths of origin, for example) would have been too thoroughly ingrained in a culture to be dependent on a new technology.

The bibliography concentrates on works related to Kentish law, a useful focus in regard to the three texts edited and translated here but not so useful for scholars wishing to connect these texts to later codes. On the ecclesiastical side, which concerns the interaction of law and penance, there are some oversights, including Thomas P. Oakley's 1927 study on English law and penitential discipline. Oakley does not discuss the Kentish laws, and his work is indeed very old, but it and more recent work (more recent, that is, than McNeil and Gamer's *Medieval Handbooks of Penance* [1938]) would have been helpful in developing the book's perspective on this important topic.

That said, however, *The Beginnings of English Law* is an excellent book. Written with verve as well as with care, it puts a fresh face on three ancient law codes and surrounds them with clear and useful commentary that scholars in many different fields will find useful.

The Old English Life of St. Mary of Egypt: An Edition of the Old English Text with Modern English Parallel-Text Translation by Hugh Magennis. Exeter Medieval Texts and Studies. Exeter: U of Exeter P, 2002, xii + 260 pp., £ 13.99.

The Old English Life of Maria *Ægyptiaca* is preserved in three manuscripts, almost complete in B.L. Cotton Julius E.vii, and fragmentarily in Cotton Otho B.x and Gloucester Cathedral Library 35. Curiously enough, in the three books the legend occurs together with saints' lives by *Ælfric*, who would hardly have appreciated seeing his orthodox work combined with the account of a repentant harlot. The Old English Life is a translation of the Latin *Vita* by Paul the Deacon of Naples, which in turn goes back to a Greek Life attributed to Sophronius of Jerusalem. The full Old English text was first edited by Walter William Skeat in 1890 (*Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, pt. III, EETS O.S. 94).

Dr Magennis's earlier work on the non-*Ælfric* pieces in Cotton Julius E.vii is well known. His new edition of the Life of St. Mary of Egypt, published almost exactly a century after that by Skeat, leaves little to be desired. The Introduction provides all that is essential for our understanding of the Old English Life; it deals with the Greek and Latin sources and their authorship, with the transmission of the Latin text in Anglo-Saxon England (two copies of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary, and the independent collection in Cotton Claudius A.i, for which see below, and my list of contents in *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 [2004], 297–98); it also deals with the textual relationship of the Old English and the Latin manuscripts, and, finally, with language and style of the Old English version.

Everything in this Introduction is marked by sound method and thorough, knowledgeable analysis. In order to establish what the Latin exemplar of the Old English text was like, the editor has consulted fourteen early continental manuscripts of the Latin *Vita*; in a number of difficult cases he even adduces the text of the Greek Life. His careful examination of Old English grammar and vocabulary supports the results of earlier studies by Else von Schaubert, Franz Wenisch and Walter Hofstetter in making an Anglian original of the Old English text appear likely.

Magennis's accurate edition of the Old English text, based on Julius E.vii, is accompanied by a Modern English translation. The only error I have found in the text is in line 96, where *sylfre* should be replaced by *syfre*. A full collation of the variant readings of the Otho and Gloucester fragments follows the useful commentary; this seems somewhat unfortunate, because only a limited number of these variants found a place in the critical apparatus printed with the Old English text. This apparatus is therefore not always as informative as one could wish, as for line 277, where the Gloucester MS has more to offer than the pronoun *hi*, cf. p. 76 with p. 131. A practical consequence of the new edition will follow from its lineation, with Magennis's 960 lines differing from the 855 of Skeat, to whose edition so far all publications have referred; a concordance table might have been useful.

The edition of the Latin text, based on three English manuscripts and again accompanied by a translation, is most welcome, especially as Dr Magennis

rightly notes that the recent edition and translation by Jane Stevenson (in *The Legend of Mary of Egypt in Medieval Insular Hagiography*, ed. Erich Poppe and Bianca Ross, Blackrock 1996) are not reliable. A carefully compiled glossary to the Old English text concludes the book.

Finally, a few points and suggestions. A word about Skeat's edition and his heroic attempts at restoring the Old English text where it is lost would have been of interest. The reader should have been told that the cover illustration, appropriately picturing Luxuria dancing, comes from an English copy of the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius (B. L. Add. 24199). Dr Magennis points out that the feastday of Maria Ægyptiaca is recorded in Anglo-Saxon calendars, but provides references to only three (12, n. 35), although in his previous work he referred to these three as examples. Actually there are thirteen surviving Anglo-Saxon calendars that include Mary of Egypt's day; see now the excellent *Atlas of Saints in Anglo-Saxon Calendars* (ASNC Guides, Texts and Studies 6, Cambridge 2002) by Rebecca Rushforth. As far as I can see, the cult of this Mary in England had its limitations. There are no mass sets or offices (apart from the evidence of the late Cotton-Corpus Legendary) in Anglo-Saxon sources, and they are not common in later books. But when one compares the evidence of the thirteen calendars just mentioned with that of Anglo-Saxon calendars that do not provide an entry for Mary of Egypt, it seems clear that she was then culted or commemorated in the West or South-west of England, not in the East, and not in Canterbury.

MS Cotton Claudius A.i, fols. 41–123, important for our knowledge of the Latin text of the legend in Anglo-Saxon England, is a collection of saints' lives and related texts written in England s. xi/xii (not on the Continent s. x); the (earlier) Old English glosses to which Dr Magennis refers (13, n. 36) are not in this part of the manuscript, but in the copy of Frithegod's *Vita S. Wilfridi*, fols. 5–36 of Claudius A.i, originally a separate book.

MÜNCHEN

HELMUT GNEUSS

John Edward Damon. *Soldier Saints and Holy Warriors: Warfare and Sanctity in the Literature of Early England*. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2003, ix + 327 pp., £ 45.00/\$ 79.95.

In *Soldier Saints and Holy Warriors* John Edward Damon has produced an excellently written account of attitudes to warfare revealed in early medieval hagiographical and related texts, chiefly from Anglo-Saxon England. The argument of the book, underpinned by mastery of a wide range of key secondary literature, is that the attitudes to war of Christian writers in the early Middle Ages were a good deal more varied and more complicated than has traditionally been thought but that generally a shift in thinking is discernible in the period, from the Christian pacificism of the early church to the kind of martial outlook that eventually lent justification to the Crusades. Productive use is made of the early medieval concept of the three orders of society (*bel-*

latores, oratores and *laboratores*), with the king standing outside and above this structure.

The book begins with a seminal hagiographical text, the *Life of St. Martin of Tours* by Sulpicius Severus, which is uncompromising in its dissociation of the saint from warfare; it then examines a series of Anglo-Saxon texts in Latin and Old English, before coming full circle with a consideration of the six Anglo-Saxon treatments of Martin's life and a look forward to the portrayal of Martin in the *South English Legendary*, the latter providing an example of the accommodation of sanctity and warfare that fully emerges in the eleventh century and later.

In the opening chapter Damon identifies a number of anti-war tropes in Sulpicius's *Life of St. Martin*, tropes that later writers inherit and respond to. These are the tropes of "the unwilling warrior", "the soldier in name only", "the bloodless victory" and "the saint's repudiation of military life", all of which are shown to reappear in various forms in Anglo-Saxon hagiography.

The second chapter, focusing on two Northumbrian texts, the anonymous *Life of St. Gregory the Great* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, identifies what Damon sees as an ideal of sanctity opposed to the Martinian one, that of the warrior king, whose archetype is St. Oswald. Damon argues that the ideal of the warrior king presented an alternative model for later writers and that Anglo-Saxon hagiographers who deal with warfare operate between these two poles of sanctity, the martial and the anti-war. It is worth noting here, however, that although later saints followed Martin in rejecting war, only one figure truly belongs to the class of warrior saints, namely Oswald himself.

There follow chapters on Felix's *Life of St. Guthlac* and Old English poetic saints' lives, containing some of the most original and insightful material in the book. In these chapters Damon offers particularly compelling readings of the works discussed. In new ways he highlights the importance of the figure of King Æthelbald in the *Life of St. Guthlac* and that of Constantine in *Elene*, and he presents illuminating close readings of key passages in *Andreas*, *Guthlac B* and, especially (in my view), *Guthlac A*. His analysis of the poems bears out his statement, "In representing the lives of saints, Anglo-Saxon poets used martial language to investigate the nature of violence, as enacted upon unresisting martyrs, employed by apostolic heroes or abandoned by those seeking union with the divine" (147).

In chapter 5 Damon turns to the writings of Alcuin and Abbo of Fleury. Developing a theme of "cultural cross-pollination", he presents the former as transplanting the (posited) cult of martyred warrior-kings into Carolingian culture, suggesting that Alcuin's model of holy kings was drawn upon in the Carolingian ideal of kingship, with its exaltation of Charlemagne and his descendants. There certainly was an ideal of holy kingship in Carolingian thinking, to which Alcuin may be seen to have contributed, even if he was not necessarily the decisive source. Damon goes on to argue that this ideal of holy kingship was significantly transformed by Abbo into a powerful new model of the self-sacrificing leader in his *Life of St. Edmund*, in which Edmund moves to a higher level of spiritual achievement from that of traditional kingship. Damon writes that Abbo saw in the figure of Edmund "a higher form

of kingship than that of his own day, and through his literary skills he created a unique and influential portrait of the king as Christ-like martyr for his people" (191). From his treatment of Edmund, however, it is not clear what Abbo might have been saying about the place of violence with respect to real kings in the tenth century. Was the Edmundian model meant to apply in real life? Perhaps at this point it would have been useful to explore the potentially significant distinction between holy kings and kings as saints.

Ælfric of Eynsham figures centrally in the closing two chapters. Chapter 6 presents an examination of Ælfric's collection *Lives of Saints*, while chapter 7 looks at appropriations of the St. Martin story, including the two by Ælfric. Damon is aware of apparent inconsistencies in Ælfric's attitude to warfare: this is a writer who celebrates the violent Maccabees and St. Oswald but also the non-violent St. Edmund. For Damon, Ælfric achieves a synthesis of the Martinian and Oswaldian models of sanctity. In explaining this synthesis he speculates that Ælfric's thought on the subject of warfare developed even as he was writing *Lives of Saints*, at a time of renewed Viking attack. In Damon's view, "St. Edmund" was written before "St. Oswald", and the "Forty Soldiers", in which it is accepted that holy soldiers can have a good role to play (though it should be emphasized that the Forty achieve sanctity only when they have stopped fighting), is an even later composition. Damon suggests that Ælfric presents in *Lives of Saints* images of "spiritual transformation" (in which warfare is transcended) but also – and later – images of "spiritual fulfilment" (in which sanctity can be fulfilled in warfare). (At 241, however, he writes of spiritual transformation with reference to the "Forty Soldiers" when surely he means spiritual fulfilment.)

The evidence for Damon's view of the chronology of *Lives of Saints* is interesting but hardly decisive. Presumably the *Lives of Saints* "St. Martin" should also be seen as a later composition, as it is argued (in chapter 7) that the shift in Ælfric's thinking about warfare is brought out particularly by examination of his two versions of Martin's life, subtle changes in emphasis being apparent in the *Lives of Saints* version: "From an opponent of war", writes Damon, "Ælfric would appear to have become a proponent of defensive or 'just' war as he began to develop his idea of spiritual fulfilment, which eventually guided his final version of [*Lives of Saints*]" (268).

All of this is very indirect in Ælfric, however, and it still remains the case that with the exception of Oswald his warrior saints have stopped fighting by the time they achieve sanctity. One wonders why Ælfric should be so indirect if a central part of his message in *Lives of Saints* is to present teaching about warfare – why the changes to the presentation of Martin should be quite so subtle. Ælfric's hostility to warfare may have softened in the *Lives of Saints* "St. Martin", influenced perhaps by the context in which he was writing and by the particular audience he was writing for, but, in my view, an important message of Ælfric for this audience in his treatment of warrior saints is that the highest spiritual fulfilment is not achieved in warfare but in religious life. At the end of the "Maccabees" it is the *oratores* that he concentrates on, not the *bellatores*. And among warriors, as Damon reminds us, only kings ever become saints (and only one king, at that).

Soldier Saints and Holy Warriors is an important book, bringing our understanding of martial themes in Anglo-Saxon literature onto a new and highly sophisticated level. I am not convinced that Ælfric, as he wrestled with the issues raised by his warrior saints, ever reached the kind of achieved synthesis that Damon asserts, but this book makes it clear that Anglo-Saxon writers, including Ælfric, were preoccupied by warfare and the implications of warfare and that throughout the period the tension between Christian traditions of the rejection of warfare and political (including Christian) perceptions of the necessity of warfare (along with Germanic notions of the glory of warfare) continued to be played out in the culture, not least in hagiographical texts. A potentially very illuminating text not discussed by Damon is the “Life of St. Eustace and his Companions”, a non-Ælfrician piece that somehow ended up in the *Lives of Saints* collection. Eustace is probably the most enthusiastic warrior saint in Old English, and a Christian fighting in a pagan army. It would have been impossible for Damon to have covered everything, however, and we are in his debt for his sensitive accounts of the texts he does treat, including Latin works to which others of us in the area have not given due attention. As it is, Damon combines sharpness of focus with breadth of coverage to produce a welcome and thought-provoking contribution to the study of early medieval literature and culture.

BELFAST

HUGH MAGENNIS

Naked before God: Uncovering the Body in Anglo-Saxon England. Ed. Benjamin C. Withers and Jonathan Wilcox. Medieval European Studies 3. Morgantown: West Virginia UP, 2003, xii + 315 pp., \$ 45.00.

“Why All the Fuss about the Body?” – in her 1995 essay Caroline Walker Bynum explored the phenomenon of the “rapidly increasing number of books with *the body* in the title”.¹ While, in the last 25 years, the history of the body has been ambitiously studied across a wide range of disciplines, the Anglo-Saxon body has escaped attention until recently when scholars such as Gillian Overing and Clare Lees began to counter the “generally held assumptions about the diminished role the body plays in early medieval England (that is, that there is no body in Anglo-Saxon England, no sex, and little gender)”.²

A new collection of essays, edited by Benjamin C. Withers and Jonathan Wilcox, proves that a “fuss” about the Anglo-Saxon body is indeed worth making. By combining essays that cover a wide range of topics and integrate

¹ Caroline Walker Bynum, “Why all the Fuss about the Body? A Medievalist’s Perspective”, *Critical Inquiry* 22 (1995): 1–33, at 3.

² Clare A. Lees, Gillian R. Overing, “Before History, Before Difference: Bodies, Metaphor, and the Church in Anglo-Saxon England”, *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 11.2 (1998): 315–334, at 331.

diverse textual and visual sources, the editors succeed in bringing out the multivalence of the Anglo-Saxon body. This is due to the editors' commitment to interdisciplinarity, and to the variety of perspectives and diverse approaches offered by the contributors, covering a wide range of topics and source material (including saints' lives, biblical translations and their illustrations, legal codes, embroidered histories, epics and riddles). Indeed, it seems that the editors have followed Bynum's advice to "focus on a wide range of topics in our study of body or bodies"³ that go beyond a "discussion of sex and gender".⁴ *Naked Before God* appears as volume 3 of the Medieval European Studies Series recently established at West Virginia University Press. Together with volume 4 of the series, *Theorizing Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*, ed. by Catherine E. Karkov and Fred Orton (2003), this seminal collection of essays forms a significant contribution to our understanding of Anglo-Saxon culture. The ten essays are preceded by foreword and introduction and followed by an index. Particularly valuable are the 45 black-and-white illustrations.

In his "forward", Benjamin Withers provides a useful overview of previous Anglo-Saxon scholarship on the body (Frantzen, Lees, O'Brien O'Keefe, Overing, Clark, Nead) and sets out the structure and scope of the volume. Like Margaret Miles in her influential study *Carnal Knowing, Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West* (1989), the editors of this collection deliberately use the term 'naked' instead of 'nude' in the title to counter Kenneth Clark's authoritative distinction between 'naked' and 'nude' – the one "deprived of our clothes", implying "some of the embarrassment which most of us feel in that condition", the other "a balanced prosperous and confident body: the body-reformed".⁵ And, like Miles, with their title they also point at the religious meanings associated with the body.

By situating the volume within the wider fields of medieval studies and studies of the body, Suzanne Lewis' general introduction creates an interpretative context for the Anglo-Saxon sources examined in this collection. The ten essays that follow are not presented in a chronological order but are thematically structured in pairs and engage in, and open up, discussions about the (often contradictory) representations of, and meanings given to, the naked body in Anglo-Saxon culture. Some pairs of essays address the same source from different angles. Thus, Sarah L. Higley and Mercedes Salvador approach the sexual riddles of the Exeter Book from different vantage points. Higley proposes that the lexical and grammatical ambiguities in Riddle 12 offer an innocent and an obscene reading of the text and suggest that "Old English grammar [...] is in itself a kind of dark body that can amaze and elude us" (58). Focusing on Riddles 42–46, Salvador enquires into the function of obscene themes in a collection that clearly has a didactic bent. Read allegorically, the presence of the riddles in the Exeter Book may be understood as a

³ Bynum 1995, 8.

⁴ Bynum 1995, 5.

⁵ Kenneth Clark, *The Nude: A Study in Ideal Art* (London: John Murray, 1956) 1.

warning against the dangers posed by the literal, that is carnal, dimensions of the texts.

Mary P. Richards' and John M. Hill's essays offer valuable insights into meanings of mutilated bodies in Anglo-Saxon England. In what the reviewer regards as one of the most intriguing contributions to the collection, Richards' essay enquires into the injury tariffs in the law codes of Æthelbert and Alfred. Richards convincingly argues that, in the law codes, the (male) injured body appears as text on which the evidence of the crime can be read. To the wounded victim, the public exposure of his naked, fractured body thus becomes a means of appealing for compensation for his wounds. "[P]hysical wounds", as Richards succinctly puts it, "also have utilitarian value" (106). The 'value' of body parts is further explored in John Hill's essay "The Sacrificial Synecdoche of Hands, Heads, and Arms in Anglo-Saxon Heroic Story". As Hill notes at the beginning, the word *nacod* appears but rarely in heroic literature. However, by exploring the metaphoric aspects of body parts in *The Battle of Maldon*, *Beowulf*, and *The Battle of Brunanburh*, Hill offers insights into further meanings of mutilated bodies in Anglo-Saxon England.

In its focus on the display of naked body parts, Richards' essay may also be usefully read alongside the two succeeding pairs of essays: Karen Rose Mathews and Susan M. Kim examine the exposure of the naked body in the culture's boundaries and margins; Catherine E. Karkov and Mary Dockray-Miller focus on the depictions of unclothed bodies in the Junius 11 *Genesis*. In her analysis of the Bayeux Tapestry, Mathews argues that the naked bodies in the margins may be compared to marginal sculpture on the continent rather than to scenes in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. She points out the "affinities in iconography, placement, and reception" (141) between the tapestry's marginal nudes and Romanesque marginal church sculpture, such as the sheela-na-gigs or the ithyphallic or megaphallic men. The exposure of naked body parts is complemented by Kim's essay, which explores the emphatic display of the male genitalia of the Donestre (a beast part human, part monster) in the two illuminated manuscripts of the *Wonders of the East*. As John Block Friedman has argued, "the monstrous races in medieval art were often shown naked" to depict their bestiality.⁶ In the Vitellius manuscript, the opposition between (clothed) man and (naked) monster is supplemented by sexual difference by placing the Donestre next to a female figure. This female, however, conceals and, at the same time, exposes her genitals. For Kim, this gesture serves to obscure "the actual point of difference which the figure of the woman might provide". The illustration, then, "reveals the fragility of the categories maintained by both differences" (164).

By drawing on an impressive range of literary, legal and archaeological sources, Karkov considers the illustrations of the fallen angels in the Old English poetic *Genesis A* and *B* and of the demons in the Harley Psalter "within a larger discourse of crime and punishment in Anglo-Saxon England" (184).

⁶ John Block Friedman, *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought* (1981, rpt. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 2000) 31 f.

Like in Richards' analysis of the injury tariffs, this discourse appears to be largely male. "The deviant female body", Karkov explains, "remains absent from the material record of crime and punishment, not because it was not there, but because it was desired not to be seen as being there. Art of course helped to guarantee the veracity of this picture" (216). In "Breasts and Babies: The Maternal Body of Eve in the Junius 11 *Genesis*", Dockray-Miller focuses on the naked female body in the poetic *Genesis A* and *B* and their illustrations. She argues that what is traditionally separated into *Genesis A* and *B* and their illustrations should be read as a cohesive unit. By doing so, she reveals the tension between poetic text and its illustrations. The emphasis on breasts and breast-feeding in the illustrations and thus the prominence of motherhood conflict with the masculine dominance in the poetic text.

The representation of Eve in the Old English *Genesis* is taken up in the following pair of essays. Janet S. Ericksen discusses nakedness as a "penitential motif" (258) in the Old English *Genesis*. She points at the repeated use of nakedness as metaphor for the state of the soul before confession: "The Junius 11 *Genesis* narrative, like the homilies, uses literal nakedness to emphasize the need for figurative clothing and defines part of that clothing as confession and penance" (258). The text thus encourages acts of confession and penance and is an "especially effective vernacular conveyor of the penitential message" (260). Jonathan Wilcox's essay on the distinction between shame and embarrassment has been wisely chosen as the final essay of the volume. In his broadly-pitched survey of the representations of the naked body and ambitious analysis of the distinction between shame and embarrassment we re-encounter many of the sources analysed in the previous essays of the volume. From his wide-ranging source material he concludes that, while the term 'embarrassment' was first recorded in English in the seventeenth century, the idea of embarrassment ("more situational, more spontaneous, and more dependent upon an observer", can be differentiated from that of 'shame' ("a more serious, more internalized breach of a moral code", 278) and can be found more often in Christian than in heroic literature.

The eminently readable essays in this collection counter once more the idea that "[b]efore the Renaissance, art of the Christian era found it almost impossible to represent male genitalia"⁷ and will prove invaluable to Anglo-Saxonists and to historians of the body alike.

MÜNSTER

ANNETTE KERN-STÄHLER

⁷ Edward Lucie-Smith, *Adam: The Male Figure in Art* (New York: Rizzoli, 1998) 115.

Writing Gender and Genre in Medieval Literature. Approaches to Old and Middle English Texts. Ed. Elaine Treharne for the English Association. Essays and Studies 55. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002, 142 pp., £ 30.00.

The relation between gender and genre reaches beyond their etymological kinship. In the field of medieval literature, numerous studies have disclosed links between gender and genre. As Simon Gaunt suggests, genres “inscribe ideologies” which invariably construct and represent gender.¹ Inasmuch as gender is constructed by genre, the genre is itself limited by gender. Thus, Angela Weisl has pointed out that “just as the romance genre limits its characters’ gendered possibilities, so do these defined gendered terms limit the genre itself”.² Disruptions of genre expectations, then, may serve to destabilize gender expectations and vice versa. In medieval literature, especially, generic expectations are disarranged and modulated. Well-defined genres, like poetic rules in general, are more often than not disregarded, disarranged, disrupted. As Helen Cooper has remarked, it is “notoriously difficult to square medieval generic theory, with its classically-derived categories, with actual poetic practice”.³ It is because of these irregularities and variations that medieval genre has remained a flourishing field of study.

Chaucer, while making abundant use of generic signals and generic terms (*lay, legende, comedye, tragedye, geste, virelai*, to name but a few),⁴ most notably resists his models: he frames, modulates, combines and hybridizes genres and subverts generic expectations – most conspicuously in his *Canterbury Tales*. It is not surprising, then, that in a new collection devoted to the interplay of gender and genre, edited by Elaine Treharne, three out of six essays concern themselves with Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales* (*The Miller’s Tale, The Wife of Bath’s Prologue* and *The Prioress’s Tale*). These are preceded by two essays on Old English literature (the Old English narrative poem *Judith* and two Old English narrative texts on Veronica) and an essay on two Middle English romances (*Octavian* and *Kyng Alisaunder*).

In his essay “Gender and Heroism in the Old English *Judith*”, Hugh Magennis shows with great clarity that the eponymous heroine of the Old English narrative poem *Judith* refutes gender expectations while keeping her female qualities. Instead of peace-weaving or performing counsel, roles traditionally assigned to women in heroic poetry, Judith becomes the leader of her

¹ Simon Gaunt, *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature*, Cambridge Studies in French 53 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 16.

² Angela Jane Weisl, *Conquering the Reign of Femeny: Gender and Genre in Chaucer’s Romance* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1995) 3.

³ Helen Cooper, “Generic Variations on the Theme of Poetic and Civil Authority”, in: *Poetics: Theory and Practice in Medieval English Literature*, ed. Piero Boitani and Anna Torti (Cambridge: Brewer, 1991) 82–103, at 86.

⁴ Cf. David Burnley, “Chaucer’s Literary Terms”, *Anglia* 114 (1996): 202–235.

people and thus takes on the role of the male hero. She is described as *ellen-rof* and *modig*, heroic epithets also applied to Beowulf. However, at the same time the text refrains from masculinizing her. The *Vulgate's* praise of Judith on account of her acting manfully, for instance, is omitted in the Old English poem. Countering the assumption that Judith is based on the model of the virgin martyr, Magennis argues that Judith is presented as a “widowed Germanic noblewoman” (11). He suggests that “[i]t is the discrepancy between the person and the role that gives particular interest to the characterisation of Judith and urgency to the narrative of her killing of Holofernes” (18).

Mary Swan's notable contribution “Remembering Veronica in Anglo-Saxon England” challenges the commonly held assumption that Veronica as relic-holder, and indeed the early movements of affective piety, originate in the twelfth century. Swan's essay provides new insights into the date of origin of affective piety and is thus well placed in a volume that may be read by early and late medievalists alike. Veronica is named in two Old English narrative texts of the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, which are extant in two manuscripts, written in Exeter at the end of the eleventh century. By closely comparing the two Old English narrative texts with the Latin version of the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, contained in a ninth-century manuscript, Swan notices slight changes from the Latin text which suggest that in parts of late eleventh-century England, Veronica was already associated with the image of Christ's face on a piece of cloth, similar to her wiping his face with her veil, which is usually dated to the fourteenth century. Swan comes to an intriguing conclusion: “If this development of the legend is indeed already circulating in Old English texts in late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman England, it is an indicator of the early stages of the movement towards affective piety in that it depicts a human figure enjoying a privileged relationship with Christ because she has possession of a piece of his clothing related to his Passion.” (31)

More closely focused on the connection between gender and genre promised by the volume's title, David Salter's essay discusses the roles of wife and mother in two Middle English romances. Romances were owned, read by, and passed on among, women. Indeed, as Carol Meale has shown, romances “form the second largest generic grouping amongst women's books in the Middle Ages as a whole”.⁵ Yet this ‘female genre’ deals almost exclusively with male concerns: The romance, as Salter puts it, is a “feminine genre with virtually no female heroines” (42). Women are defined only by their relationship to men. Salter compares the conventional and virtuous mother and wife in *Octavian* with the idiosyncratic mother of King Alisaunder and reaches the interesting conclusion that “the emotional ambivalence that is evident in *Octavian* – but that is expressed through the two female characters – is focused singularly on the figure of Olympias in *Kyng Alisaunder*” (58).

⁵ Carol M. Meale, “. . . alle the bokes that I haue of latyn, english, and frensch’: laywomen and their books in late medieval England”, in: Carol M. Meale (ed.), *Women and Literature in Britain, 1150–1500*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 17 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 128–158, at 139.

It has long been pointed out that *The Miller's Tale* in many ways defies the generic label *fabliau*. As Dieter Mehl argued as early as 1986 [1973], the tale “gives evidence of a stylistic virtuosity and a familiarity with literary traditions far beyond the scope of a drunken churl”.⁶ Due to the tale's courtly-love conventions and its style, Absolon is commonly read as a parody of heroes of romance and *The Miller's Tale* as a direct response to the *Knight's Tale*. In his essay “Rough Girls and Squeamish Boys: The Trouble with Absolon in *The Miller's Tale*”, Greg Walker argues that Absolon's ‘proper place’ is not, however, in romance but in religious literature. Absolon's idea of womanhood, Walker argues, is called forth by Mariolatry and by annunciation and nativity plays. Walker concludes: “If, *The Miller's Tale* seems to argue, one accepts that all women can, and indeed should be like the Virgin, then one must also accept that all men could, indeed should be like Absolon: a prospect the tale treats as so absurd as to demand our laughter.” (91)

Analysing interactions between language and gender and between language and power, Elaine Treharne takes a sociolinguistic approach to the *Prologue to The Wife of Bath's Tale*. She argues that Chaucer's characterization of the Wife of Bath can be read as a “handbook to observations on women's language” (104) and is, as such, 500 years ahead of Otto Jespersen's linguistic theory. Treharne sees both Chaucer's *Prologue to The Wife of Bath's Tale* and Jespersen's book on language and its origins (published 1922) as “proponents of folklinguistic stereotyping of women's language” (105) that define women's language as deviant from the (male) norm: Women nag, give bad advice, talk uncontrollably; they use tag questions, rhetorical questions and euphemisms; their use of language exhibits a lack of logical thought. Arguing against the view put forth by Jill Mann that the Wife, in her *Prologue*, is confined to masculine language,⁷ Treharne demonstrates that Chaucer does, in fact, attempt to “invent a new female language” (96). Thus, Chaucer emulates and confirms stereotypes of women's language use. The Wife of Bath, Treharne argues, is ultimately powerless, “not so much through what she says but through *how* she says it” (115).

Anne Marie D'Arcy's essay is a thoughtful analysis of the *Prioress's Tale*. D'Arcy gives a thorough account of the anti-Judaism in, and the critical responses to, the Prioress and her tale. Prominence is also given to the tale's pathetic tone and the emphasis on the suffering of the “litel clergeon” killed by the Jews, which (like devotional texts and art) invite *compassio*, and to the Prioress's assumed humility (and thereby authority as a speaker) *in imitatione Mariae*.

For a “summary sample of the current state of play” (2), which, in their introduction, Elaine Treharne and Greg Walker promise the collection to be, its range of material certainly seems a bit narrow. In addition, such an enterprise would have benefitted from a more substantial introduction and from a

⁶ Dieter Mehl, *Geoffrey Chaucer: An Introduction to his Narrative Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986) [in German 1973] 172.

⁷ Jill Mann, *Geoffrey Chaucer* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991) 79.

conclusion. While the individual essays are valuable scholarly contributions in their own right, their connectedness seems rather doubtful, particularly since some of them do not address the interplay of gender and genre at all. In her introduction, Treharne writes that “the essays are united by a commitment to a variety of traditional scholarly methodologies” (2) – but aren’t all? However, this should not downplay the merit of the individual contributions, which deserve our full critical attention.

MÜNSTER

ANNETTE KERN-STÄHLER

Larissa Tracy. *Women of the ‘Gilte Legende’: A Selection of Middle English Saints Lives*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2003, 149 pp., \$ 60.00/£ 35.00.

This book makes available in modern English translation eleven legends from the 1438 *Gilte Legende*, a Middle English translation of a close French translation of Jacobus de Voragine’s popular thirteenth-century collection of saints’ lives, the *Legenda aurea*. Tracy’s judicious selection includes legends of four major types of female saint: the virgin martyr (Christina, Dorothy, and Margaret), the holy mother (Paula and Elizabeth of Hungary), the penitent (Mary Magdalene and Thäis), and the transvestite (Marina, Margaret Pelagia, Pelagia, and Theodora – the last two also penitents). As is standard for the “Library of Medieval Women” series, the translations are followed by an interpretive essay. An annotated bibliography concludes the volume.

The style throughout suggests that Tracy has sought to produce a conservative translation, and comparison against the only text yet edited, the life of Dorothy edited by Richard Hamer and Vida Russell in *Supplementary Lives in Some Manuscripts of the ‘Gilte Legende’* (Oxford, 2000) 243–49, supports this inference. She departs most from her original when she wisely breaks up long Middle English sentences to simplify convoluted syntax into prose that sounds more natural to modern ears. The Middle English of the *Gilte Legende* is close to modern English, and often Tracy merely modernizes the spelling. Though fidelity to the original is a worthy goal, it is not furthered by using Modern English cognates whose meanings have shifted; it is odd to read that Dorothy was “replenished” with beauty and virtue (34, 37), or that Theophilus was a “solemn” doctor (37). Preserving recognizable but obsolete expressions works against the purpose of a translation: Dorothy answers “with glad cheer”; she “shall joy with” Christ in heaven; condemned, she walks “toward her judgment” (37). Numerous inaccuracies obscure or alter the sense of the original – “necromancy” (34) for “mawmetry” (243), “unfettered bliss” (35) for “vnwemmyd” (244), “mockingly” (37) for “full desyrously” (247). “[S]he was dyspoused by her loue and feythe” (244) becomes “she was married to her love and faith” (35). Fabricius, in proposing marriage, offers Dorothy many riches “for her endowance” (dowry) (244); in Tracy’s translation, he offers those riches “without any thought to her virtues”

(34). Words and phrases are sometimes omitted, in at least one case making the translation less comprehensible than the original. Dorothy's father fled Rome because of the "greuous persecucion of crystyn peple euerywhere, but most specyally amonge the Romaynes" (243); Tracy does not translate "but most specyally amonge the Romaynes", leaving the reader to wonder why, with persecution "everywhere" (33), he thought it any use to flee.

The critical apparatus leaves much to be desired. Footnotes throughout compare the *Gilte Legende's* rendition of names, words, and phrases not with the original French or Latin but, rather pointlessly, with their rendition in William Ryan's English translation of the *Legenda aurea*. In her introduction, interpretive essay, and notes, Tracy uses "scribe" and "translator" interchangeably, and she at times appears to confuse the heroines of literary texts with actual women (e.g., "Based on the text of the lives of women saints in ... the *Gilte Legende*, it is evident that women were not as silent as some historians and scholars have suggested" [20]). The interpretive essay, entitled "Silence and Speech in the Female Lives of the *Gilte Legende* and Their Influence on the Lives of Ordinary Medieval Women", has little to say about the reception of the *Gilte Legende* and nothing about its "ordinary" women readers, except to note that a woman's name appears twice in a *Gilte Legende* manuscript. Rather, the essay is a loosely organized reflection on how legends of female saints influenced, or might have, medieval women such as Hildegard of Bingen, Margery Kempe, and Christine de Pisan. Colourful oversimplifications and misrepresentations abound – for example, that anchorites were "essentially buried alive" (81). Inaccurate annotations mar the bibliography. Most surprising among these is Tracy's assertion that Leslie Donovan's *Women Saints' Lives in Old English Prose* is derived from "Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the *Golden Legend*" (131)! Minor mistakes, from inaccurate citations to punctuation errors, are found throughout.

Tracy is to be commended for her effort to make these important and interesting legends accessible to a wider audience. However, the defects of execution impair the volume's value as a student text. Scholars will prefer to consult manuscripts and facsimiles until the projected Early English Text Society edition of the *Gilte Legende* appears.

COLUMBUS, OH

KAREN A. WINSTEAD

The Arthurian Bibliography IV, 1993–1998: Author Listing and Subject Index. Compiled by Elaine Barber. Arthurian Studies 49. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002, xxii + 464 pp., £ 80.00/\$ 110.00.

With so much about Arthurian literature in print, first-rate bibliographies are essential, and fortunately they are at hand. Edmund Reiss, Louise Horner Reiss, and Beverly Taylor, *Arthurian Legend and Literature*, 2 vols. (New York, 1984), for example, is a highly useful starting point for research. However, if one wants to scoop up nearly everything on an Arthurian subject, there

is no substitute for the *Arthurian Bibliography* series. Without it, Arthurians would have to comb through each issue of the *Bibliographical Bulletin of the International Arthurian Society*, a task that would take the researcher back only as far as 1949. In order to go back further, one would have to consult *The Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature*, published by the Modern Language Association in two volumes (1922–1929 and 1930–1935), and “A Bibliography of Critical Arthuriana”, ed. John J. Parry and Margaret Schlauch (vol. 1), *Modern Language Quarterly* 1 ff. (1940 ff.), whose first issue covers 1935–1939. To go back even further, one would have to rely on the bibliography in J. D. Bruce, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300*, 2nd ed. with a supplement by Alfons Hilka, 2 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1928; rpt. Gloucester, MA, 1958). Other Arthurian bibliographies, though highly useful, are mostly focused on a special topic – for instance, Harvey L. Sharrer’s *Critical Bibliography of Hispanic Arthurian Materials I* (London, 1977).

Volume IV of the *Arthurian Bibliography*, compiled by Elaine Barber, follows the format of Volume III, compiled by Caroline Palmer, which covered 1978–1992 (Arthurian Studies 31, reviewed in *Anglia* 118 [2000]: 445–47). The current volume, covering six years, contains 3909 entries, including reviews. Entries are in alphabetical order, arranged by author’s last name, and each entry is numbered. For the sake of simplicity, editors and authors are grouped together as authors, and editors are identified as such. The works of authors and editors having more than one entry are arranged in ascending chronological order between 1993 and 1998. Full citations are given for journal articles; essays in collections are given a brief citation and a cross-reference to the main entry, where the full citation is given under the editor’s name. Collaborative works may be located under the names of all persons whose names appear on the title page, in which case the main entry is under the first collaborator’s name, and all other entries are cross-referenced to it. Reviews of books and monographs are helpfully included in the main entry.

Although the Author Index constitutes 408 pages and the Subject Index a mere 55, the Subject Index is really the heart of this bibliography. Subjects are indexed by main topics and subtopics; thus, using Malory as an example: medieval authors (“Malory, Sir Thomas”), medieval texts (“*Le Morte Darthur*”), important sections of a listed text (“ending of”), themes (“adventure in”), manuscripts (“Winchester ms. of”), topics in literary and textual criticism (“reception of, texts of”), aspects of medieval culture (“hunting and hawking in”), sources (“and *Alliterative Morte Arthure*”), influence on later authors (“and Shakespeare”), modern adaptations in various art forms (“and T. H. White”, “influence on Pre-Raphaelites”). The more entries there are per main topic, the richer the range of sub-topics under the main topic. Thus, for many topics there is only one entry, whereas for the topic “Chrétien de Troyes” there are 701, with sub-topics for general treatments, studies of individual works and aspects of those works, and investigations into themes, literary relations, and so on. In fact, for the period covered in this volume, Chrétien receives more coverage (calculated in numbers of entries) than any other author or any other topic – indeed, even more than Arthur himself.

The Subject Index is meticulously compiled and the subtopics define standard areas of research, which means that the reader is likely to be rewarded for his efforts. Nevertheless, let the reader beware that he must cross-check, because the Subject Index does not cross-list systematically. For example, a search comparing Chrétien to Hartmann von Aue finds nineteen entries via the main topic “Chrétien de Troyes” and the subtopic “and Hartmann von Aue”, but a search beginning with the main topic “Hartmann von Aue” finds only six entries under the subtopic “and Chrétien de Troyes”. One of those six does not occur among the nineteen found under Chrétien’s name. The reader is thus advised to search for possible entries describing all topics and all subtopics that might bear on his research. To cite another example, the main topic “*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*” does not include the following as subtopics; rather, they occur as main topics for which *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is listed as a subtopic, nor does it have over 90% of the entries listed under them: “Animals”, “Antifeminism”, “Arming”, “Audience”, “Berger, Thomas”, “Bibliography on”, “Birtwistle, Harrison”, “Breton analogues of”, “Characterization”, “Courage in”, “Courtesy in”, “Covetousness in”, “Description in”, “Feasts and feasting in”, “Game in”, “Gawain-Poet”, “Girdle, green in”, “Hope as theological virtue in”, “Identity in”, “Illustrations in”, “Intention, authorial in”, “Knighthood in”, “Knot in”, “Lace in”, “Language in”, “Middle English in”, “Morality and”, “Myth and”, “Religion and”, “Righteousness in”, “Romance and”, “Self in”, “Sources and analogues of”, “Temptation of Sir Gawain in”, “Theme in”, “Time in”, “Versification and”, and “*Walewein* and”. The manuscript has to be searched separately under the main topic “Manuscripts” and the subtopic “of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*” – but not under the shelf-mark (London, British Library, Cotton Nero A.x), for it is not a subtopic. Since many of these topics are crucial for studying the poem, the reader therefore needs to exercise a good deal of imagination and persistence in order to do an exhaustive search.

The sheer size and complexity of Arthurian bibliography raises the question of whether it should continue to be published in book form, or whether it should be released in an electronic, searchable form, as are bibliographies such as *Medioevo Latino* and the *International Medieval Bibliography*. The entries for volumes III and IV of *The Arthurian Bibliography* are already in an electronic database (see vol. III, p. ix and vol. IV, p. vii). Ideally, electronic databases make it possible to perform exhaustive keyword searches. The proviso is the same as for printed bibliographies: namely, that the keywords must accurately reflect the contents of each article and not merely the title. As of this writing, the International Arthurian Society is experimenting with a bibliography Web site (<http://www.dur.ac.uk/arthurian.society/biblio.htm>) that may someday obviate the need for printed bibliographies. However, it contains only the years 1998–2000, it cannot be searched except via the Edit > Find function of the user’s Web browser, and, like *The Arthurian Bibliography IV, 1993–1998*, it is not cross-referenced by subject; thus the reader has to perform the same cross-checking, subject by subject, as described in the previous paragraph of the present review.

Valentine Cunningham. *Reading After Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002, 194 pp., £ 12.99.

Read it. Engage with it. Argue with it. But read it. It is a book for theory lovers, for theory haters, for the worldly-wise literary critic as much as for the novice who has just begun tracing the strange events which have characterised literary theory and criticism for the last few decades. And although it deals with the paradox of being another book on theory while arguing for the importance of primary texts, Valentine Cunningham's latest book-length publication does so without falling in with the "we hate theory because we don't need it"-camp. On the contrary, before criticising theory's excesses, Cunningham explains how much has been gained: new horizons, new perspectives, new voices, new canons.

The book consists of ten chapters, all of them sporting characteristic Cunningham-esque titles: "Theory Shrinks" and "All What Jazz? Or, the Incredibly Disappearing Text", to name but two. The titles indicate that in spite of or perhaps because of its grandness and (self-)importance, theory requires being cut down to size, given the Cunningham-treatment, being taken apart and put together again in a language which crackles with the fun of reading and writing. Cleverly, so that no one who has actually read the book can accuse its author of brushing all theory aside, as some die-hards in the business still do, Cunningham begins by singing theory's praises before moving on to a more critical assessment of theory-led literary criticism and ends with his own model of what he calls "touching reading" based on tact.

He starts by explaining that no such thing as complete innocence exists with regard to reading: no prelapsarian state is imaginable in which we encounter a text without some sort of perhaps unconscious theoretical position, taught us by teachers, lecturers, parents or peers. Consequently, no such thing as a 'return' to such a state of blissful innocence is possible. "We are all, always, post-theory, post-theorists." (3) But if that is the case, to which kind of theory should one turn and what may one gain? Cunningham combines a discussion of what theory has been and what it has become with a first criticism of the dangers of misappropriation. When he explains the seminal role that Ferdinand de Saussure played for the development of theory, he draws the reader's attention to the problem that post-Saussurean theorists have tended to expand his idea of the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign to the arbitrariness of language as such, thus loosing any relationship it might have had with reality and quickly making the assumption possible that reference is irrelevant, that the world is merely a text. (20) While the notion which Cunningham develops that all theory is simply a new mixture of three essential components – a writer, a text, a reader – may seem slightly schematic at first it does help to put into perspective theory's claims to newness: "For all that, theorizing about literature is always a palimpsest. Below the latest lines you can always still read the older inscriptions. Theoretical memory is always stronger than Theory's would-be revolutionaries hope." (37) With the relative importance and impact of theory thus placed, Cunningham then moves on to celebrate what the most recent developments have brought in terms of

insights and inspiration, an inspiration which he can still remember in the dull and stifling times of “the by-then established New Critical routines suffocating reading in their affectionate but strangulating grip . . .” (38). First of all, a quality of doubt has entered the interpretation of texts which is a positive development since, at least at face value, it makes easy assumptions and unquestionable truths impossible. Secondly, theory’s impact has foregrounded issues and meanings which were either completely hidden before or only had a very shadowy presence. Not least among these is a focus on the marginal and the disempowered. Cunningham wonders how one could have missed their presence and importance in so many texts, e. g. in *Jane Eyre* or *Othello*: “How were we able to prattle on about Caliban without thinking about the institution of slavery, or, for that matter, rest content with white actors blacking up to play Othello? How could we? That we do so no longer is a tribute to Theory.” (42) And with these new worlds having opened up, new genres, new texts and even new period models come into being which have invigorated literary studies: “The new Theorized readings have been like the switching on of a bright light.” (43) With this bright new light, a new sense of purpose, of urgency has entered the academy and critical writing, resulting in the questioning and, in some cases, the firing, of formerly established canons. There is greater freedom, greater delight in reading, there are more possibilities. A wider range of texts and characters, writers and contexts allows for a broader range of people who might identify with texts. But here the first problems rare their heads: identificatory reading is not all, and the trend observable in some theorists’ contributions towards the over-personal goes further than what Cunningham at least can stomach in terms of “confessional criticism”, as he calls it. (51) He chooses a feminist example in this context (others follow, feminist and non-feminist) and, rarely, perhaps misses the point of feminist confessionalism which promotes the writer so much. It is embarrassing, sometimes unfortunate, but certainly necessary, at least from the point of view of many writers and their readers, to ensure the visibility and audibility of these new voices whose existence is not praised by everyone in Cunningham’s fashion. For political purposes, then, perhaps feminists have chosen a mode which to the already converted seems unnecessary.

The first notes of unease are already present in the chapter which celebrates theory’s positive impact. In subsequent chapters, Cunningham discusses a number of problems which theory poses. First, its negativity. Theoretical explorations of literary texts, often not by literary critics, but by people from other professions who also use literary texts are governed by a “hermeneutics of suspicion” (Cunningham/Ricoeur) which foregrounds absences, lacunae, negative spaces etc. – the absence of meaning, the impossibility of meaning in texts. “Under Theory, the text is demonised by a clamantly Pyrrhonic rhetoric of lapse, failure, lack, disablement, deficiency. This rhetoric of deploring is all over the pages of Theorists. The text is in ruins, a ruin, a bomb-site.” (60) Related to this love of negativity is a tendency to produce gibberish, to be wilfully obscure. However, Cunningham takes care not to simply make fun of the complexity of theoretical language, but rather asks which purpose it might serve. If it cannot do anything except create endless doubt, endless

deferral of meaning, sometimes in the face of much more obvious readings, why bother? Here the annoying bunch of theory-happy emulators of the Big Names of course rightly get a mention, but “No one demands, I hope, absolute plainness of style as a necessary requirement of critical writing, but deliberate crypticity, stuttering by choice, should not be surprised if it attracts vexation over its obfuscation”. (66) One of the many good things about this book is of course the fact that it resists “deliberate crypticity”.

The following chapter deals with another problematic aspect to theory: the tendency to denigrate literary texts either by diverting attention away from the text onto other, seemingly more important issues, or by smothering texts with detailed attentions which obscure more obvious readings, or perhaps worst of all, “by pretending [the literary text] is not really there” (70). This chapter discusses at length the problem of reference, there is a plea for contextualisation but not the mad anything-goes kind that some New Historicists provide us with, and it ends with the strong contention that not every reading is equally valid, although many readings of a single text may be possible. Total pluralism is labelled a “corrupting reading practice” – a strong concept, smacking perhaps too much of moralism? (83) Nevertheless, the following chapters and particularly the quotations on which the discussion is based allow for this degree of moralism since some readings produced in theory’s name are indeed deplorable.

Some of the funniest passages in Cunningham’s book follow in the seventh chapter on “Textual Abuse: Or, Down with Stock Responses”. Yes! One wants to shout when he argues against the abusive readings by people like Lacan who are then religiously followed by hapless emulators. After joyfully taking apart several mis-translations and mis-readings, intentional or otherwise, Cunningham ends with a hilarious passage on an over-sexed piece of Victorianist criticism which sees hand-jobs, masturbation and private parts all over Dickens’s novels where there are blatantly none. When was the last time you laughed out loud when reading a book on theory? Here’s a good place to start. When critics start making things up so as to fill the pages of their books, rather than write about the texts and what they refer to (yes, texts do refer to ‘things’ outside them), the only thing one can do about them is ridicule them. It is easy to laugh at silly theoretical notions but of course more serious problems lie behind these laughable flights of fancy: the denial of reference, a dehumanising tendency, a consequent rejection of history, the danger of stock responses which don’t expand textual meanings (at least not in the bad examples), but diminish, “shrink” texts, as the next chapter shows.

Cunningham is of course aware that models are necessary in order to understand literary texts. But if one falls for scientism, e.g. by creating lists and taxonomies of possible structures, one loses sight of the poverty of such models and the models become sufficient ends in themselves. Instead of helping to understand a text, the model is illustrated by textual extracts. Literary texts, in other words, simply serve to support the model rather than vice versa, a process Cunningham calls “dinkification”. (122) “Reading, real reading cries out for more, much more.” (139) In order to remedy this, Cunningham ends his book with a chapter on “tactful reading”, a kind of reading which

takes the text into account, which uses tact – neither shrinking the text, nor denying its presence, nor simply looking for negative spaces, absences all the time – and is interested in the importance of reading, in the importance of the human, of ethics and emotion. Anyone who has ever sat in a library with an original imprint or manuscript before him or her, who has read more than snippets of texts provided in photocopies or paperback editions which show no trace of the materiality of the text will be able to understand what Cunningham means by tactful reading: handle with care, in all respects. Theory's excesses led to a dehumanizing of texts, "not least by denying [texts] a humanizing link to authors, they dehumanized readers and reading in the same fell swoop." (141) In order to counteract this, Cunningham proposes a model of reading which reinstates the reader as well as the text. Due attention, proper behaviour, tenderness of touch are the keywords he uses to describe this process. The result, he hopes, will be the following: "The touch that will result in the toucher being touched, in the sense of emotionality, affect. Close reading, no less. The tender, tending, tenting touch of the rightly tactful communicant. The lover. . . . True readers don't paw and mammoth, don't abuse the text." (156f.)

In a final short chapter, Cunningham lists others whose reading practices he numbers among the tactful, after having named of course numerous tactless readers and readings. This turn of events is perhaps slightly unfortunate since it seems to limit his type of tactful reading once again to the specialists. But whatever other readers might think of the uses of lists and names, the final notion of the book that one should "respect the primacy of text over all theorizing about text", that "theory is the lesser partner" (169) is one I can only agree with wholeheartedly since, without texts, why should there be theory? And without texts, why should there be critics?

Being able to criticise theoretical excesses presupposes a privileged position: the position of one who has read if not all, then enough contributions to the theory wars to know what he or she is about. Just as being able to judge the gains of a more informed, more aware kind of reading presupposes some kind of position, any position, vis-à-vis the LitCrit world. This, then, is the only problem with *Reading After Theory*: one can only fully appreciate Cunningham's arguments if one is, like him, in the know – at least to some extent. So for a student without any theoretical background to read the book and nothing else on the topic might mean he or she couldn't share in the positive outcomes of theory while being put in a position to reject its overblown offshoots. On the other hand: is there a student today who knows nothing about theory? Who can take a degree in literature without being exposed to some kind of meta-level criticism? If such a student doesn't exist anyway, then perhaps there is no need to worry that new readers of this volume in the Blackwell Manifesto series will reject too much of theory out of hand. If, however, they adopt a more critical attitude towards theory, and a less supercilious attitude towards literary texts, after having read the book, then surely that has to be a good thing. And it is certainly not only students who would profit from a mode of reading which respects literary texts at least as much, if not more, as the theoretical assessments of these texts. In other words: it won't

hurt to follow Cunningham, to ensure that reading and the objects of reading – literary texts – are reinstated at least alongside theory, if not perhaps above it, as long as one doesn't lose sight of the "Good of Theory" (chapter 4) in the process. Therefore: read it. Engage with it. Argue with it. But read it – with tact.

BERLIN

GESA STEDMAN

Jürgen Peper. *Ästhetisierung als Aufklärung. Unterwegs zur demokratischen Privatkultur. Eine literarästhetisch abgeleitete Kulturtheorie*. Berliner Beiträge zur Amerikanistik 11. Berlin: John F. Kennedy-Institut für Nordamerikastudien, 2002, 300 S., € 12,50.

Angeichts der anhaltenden Konjunktur kulturwissenschaftlicher Ansätze in der Literaturwissenschaft dürfte einer 'literarästhetisch abgeleiteten Kulturtheorie' das Interesse der Fachwelt sicher sein. Das vorliegende Buch des Emeritus der Grazer Amerikanistik ist mehr als ein Beispiel für diese Tendenz; es ist der ambitionierte Versuch einer theoretischen und methodischen Vermittlung zwischen Kulturwissenschaft und Philologie. Von einem "Ausverkauf literaturwissenschaftlicher Kompetenzen" und einem "Verlust disziplinärer Traditionen und Untersuchungsgegenstände"¹ kann bei Peper keine Rede sein. Er überschreitet die Fachgrenzen der Amerikanistik, ohne sich der modischen Rhetorik wohlfeiler, aber konzeptuell vager Schlagworte wie Interdisziplinarität und Interkulturalität zu befleißigen und ohne sich bei den *cultural studies* anzubiedern. Sein Vertrauen in die Tragweite traditionell-literaturwissenschaftlicher Methoden und sein Mut, sich mittels dieses Instrumentariums ein erweitertes Terrain, das der Kultur, zu erschließen, verdienen Anerkennung.

Peper's Terrain ist in der Tat ein denkbar weites Feld. Es reicht von Alteuropa bis zum postmodernen Amerika, von Platon und Aristoteles über Jane Austen, Rousseau, Kant und die Romantik bis zu Derrida und Judith Butler, von Cooper bis De Lillo und von Emersons "self-culture" bis zur Privat- und Individualkultur einer Weltgesellschaft vor 9/11 zwischen Love Parade und Terrorismus. Peper ist ein belesener, stets gut informierter Autor, dessen Einzelanalysen pointiert und konzis sind. Er erzählt eine Geschichte der westlichen Kultur, die aus der Rückschau sehr zielgerichtet wirkt und die mit bekannten soziologischen und historischen Beschreibungen durchaus harmoniert: eine Geschichte des Aufbrechens fester Sinnordnungen, der Entflechtung

¹ Ansgar Nünning/Roy Sommer, "Kulturwissenschaftliche Literaturwissenschaft: Disziplinäre Ansätze, theoretische Positionen und transdisziplinäre Perspektiven", in: dies. (Hrsg.), *Kulturwissenschaftliche Literaturwissenschaft. Disziplinäre Ansätze – Theoretische Positionen – Transdisziplinäre Perspektiven* (Tübingen: Narr, 2004), S. 9–29, hier: S. 9.

funktionaler Strukturen, der zunehmenden Säkularisierung, Individualisierung und Dezentrierung. Alles zusammengekommen bildet Peper's Schlagwort, Hauptthese und Zielrichtung: 'Ästhetisierung als Aufklärung'. Er erzählt diese Geschichte am Beispiel der Literatur, genauer: der Binnenentwicklung der literarischen Ästhetik und der fortschreitenden Emanzipation literarischer Gestaltungsmittel, etwa am Beispiel der Metapher in Lyrik und Prosa. Die Geschichte der Moderne ist bei Peper eine Geschichte der graduellen Lockerung und Aufhebung (Epoché) kultureller Sinnfilter.

All dies ist im einzelnen sicher nicht falsch, aber es erweckt mitunter, gerade in den besonders soziologisch geratenen Schlußkapiteln, in seiner allzu geradlinigen und einsträngigen Zuspitzung den Eindruck eines Zerrbildes der Philosophie- und Literaturgeschichte: eines Bildes, in dem eben manches enthalten ist, während ebenso Wichtiges, der zentralen These vielleicht Abträgliches, aber fehlt. Zwischen Platon und Pope, zwischen den Hierarchien der klassischen und der klassizistischen Mimesis liegen immerhin über zwei Jahrtausende, die sich schwerlich in *ein* "klassisches System" zusammenzwingen und auf zehn Seiten abhandeln lassen. Peper's Verdienste liegen woanders: Es sind vor allem die amerikanistischen Teile des Buches, die zu überzeugen verstehen: stilistische und rhetorische, immer aber auf die Hauptthese der Ästhetisierung als fortschreitendes Abblenden kultureller Verbindlichkeiten bezogene Lektüren, die Brücken schlagen zwischen detailgenauem *close reading* und einem weit ausgespannten kulturhistorischen Horizont. Besonders hervorzuheben sind die Abschnitte zu Cooper, Dickinson, Williams und Hemingway. Der Erfolg dieser Analysen wirft jedoch auch ein Licht auf das Problem, daß die Vermittlung zwischen Kulturtheorie und literaturwissenschaftlicher Analyse zwar praktisch sehr gut zu funktionieren scheint, aber eben nur so lange, wie sie nicht theoretisch reflektiert wird. Wo dies geschieht, trifft der Leser auf ein Dilemma: Die Vermittlung zwischen Text und Kontext, zwischen überzeugenden Einzeldarstellungen und der theoretischen Perspektivierung des Ganzen, die man sich zur Methodologie ausgebaut wünschte, kommt über Behauptungen einer 'Dialektik' nicht hinaus. Mit anderen Worten: Peper ist dort am überzeugendsten, wo er nah am Text Literaturwissenschaft betreibt; wo er aber Kulturtheoretiker sein will, führen seine 'Ableitungen' allzuoft auf dünnes Eis. Eine Reihe inspirierter kulturhistorischer Lektüren macht noch keine Kulturtheorie, noch dazu mit "breiterem Geltungsanspruch" (xiv). Diesem etwas vollmundigen Anspruch, auch auf Originalität ("Es ist wohl der erste Versuch dieser Art", ebd.), ist mit Skepsis zu begegnen.

Dabei ist sein Unternehmen durchaus sympathisch. Peper distanziert sich gleichermaßen vom Kulturpessimismus jeglicher Couleur wie von "Habermasens Konsensseligkeit" (209); er interpretiert die literarische und künstlerische Moderne nicht als Verfalls-, sondern als Erfolgsgeschichte. In phänomenologischem Vokabular, aber in kantianischer Manier identifiziert er "die heuristische Epoché in der ästhetisierenden Einstellung" als das "generative Prinzip" einer demokratischen Ästhetik (ebd.). Aber Ästhetisierung ist eben immer, so auch hier, Sache des Interpreten, und ihr kultureller Kontext oder Horizont versteht sich nicht von selbst bzw. erschließt sich aus der Ästheti-

sierung allenfalls mittelbar. So integer die Absichten, so treffend und stimmig die Einzelanalysen – bei der Beantwortung der zentralen theoretischen Grundfrage, ob und wie man Kulturtheorie literarästhetisch “ableiten” könne, kommt Peper über eine *petitio principii* nicht hinaus.

Ein kurzer Rückblick: In seinem ersten Buch hatte Peper 1966 eine erkenntnistheoretische Sichtweise auf literarisch gestaltete Wirklichkeit entwickelt, die in eine historische Abfolge von “Bewußtseinslagen des Erzählens” und, nur konsequent, in eine Pluralisierung von “Wirklichkeiten” und den Modalitäten ihrer Hervorbringung mündete.² Heute liest es sich als ein wichtiger Beitrag zur phänomenologisch und funktionsgeschichtlich orientierten Literaturwissenschaft der sechziger und siebziger Jahre. An der kantianischen Grundorientierung der *Bewußtseinslagen* hält auch *Ästhetisierung* fest. Es gibt weitere Gemeinsamkeiten: Dem “stufenweise[n] Abbau mentaler Synthesis”, den Peper seinerzeit in der Literatur (aber auch in den anderen Künsten) seit der Romantik beobachtet hatte,³ entspricht heute eine Abfolge “sukzessiver Epochéen”, in denen “kulturelle Vorstellungsfiler und mit ihnen das Gerippe einer kollektiv verbindlichen Kultur” (283) nach und nach eingeklammert und verabschiedet werden. Es ist dieser emanzipatorische (Zivilisations-)Prozeß, der hier den Namen “Ästhetisierung als Aufklärung” trägt. Er vollzieht sich zudem mit der gleichen dialektischen “Gesetzlichkeit”, die Peper 1966 in der Entfaltung von Bewußtseinslagen am Werk sah und die er “rein literarisch abzuleiten” suchte, d. h. “ohne Berufung auf Einflüsse, Reaktionen und dergleichen”.⁴ Dieser Ansatz wird im vorliegenden Buch weiterentwickelt in Richtung auf eine literar-*ästhetische* Ableitung. Die Ästhetisierung des Literarischen in der Moderne, d. h. seine Isolierung und Entbindung aus funktionalen Kontexten, wird so zum exemplarischen Kennzeichen einer weiteren *kulturellen* Ästhetisierung und zugleich zum Paradigma von Peper's Erkenntnismethode erhoben. Es ist dieser höheren Komplexität des Literaturverständnisses zu verdanken, daß die “Seitenblicke”⁵ auf andere Künste und auf gesellschaftspolitische Zusammenhänge im neuen Buch mehr Raum gewinnen. Doch die oben bereits beobachtete unzureichende *Verknüpfung und Unterscheidung* zwischen Methode und Gegenstand führt dazu, daß Literaturgeschichte, Ästhetisierung und Demokratisierung – allen Behauptungen des Gegenteils zum Trotz – recht unvermittelt beieinander stehenbleiben. Sie fügen sich jedenfalls nicht zu einer Kulturtheorie und auch zu keiner Theorie des Ästhetischen. Zwar schreibt Peper sehr kluge Sätze wie: “Ästhetische Wirksamkeit kann sich nur gegen und in das Nicht-

² Jürgen Peper, *Bewußtseinslagen des Erzählens und erzählte Wirklichkeiten. Dargestellt an amerikanischen Romanen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, insbesondere am Werk William Faulkners* (Studien zur amerikanischen Literatur und Geschichte 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).

³ Peper 1966, 296.

⁴ Peper 1966, 18.

⁵ Peper 1966, 18.

Ästhetische hinein entfalten“, oder: “Die Struktur, in der und gegen die sich das ästhetische Spiel zu entfalten trachtet, sollte also wohl das Gewicht einer anthropologischen oder kulturellen Vorgabe besitzen” (197). Über die Bedingungen, Eigenschaften und Wirkungsweisen dieser Vorgaben schweigt er sich jedoch aus – die literarische Anthropologie W. Iusers etwa spielt bei ihm keine Rolle –, und auch über das Verhältnis von Ästhetischem und Nicht-Ästhetischem hätte man gern Genaueres erfahren.

Die Rede von kulturellen *Vorgaben*, vorgetragen mit der Suggestion des Normativen und zugleich Unsicheren (“sollte wohl”), weckt Mißtrauen, denn sie wirft erneut die Frage nach der ungeklärten Priorität des Literarischen oder des Kulturellen auf. Peper's Kulturtheorie bleibt größtenteils ein Postulat: Kultur wird zwar definiert (“gelebte und gestaltete Wahrheitsvorstellung einer Gemeinschaft”, xiv *passim*) und von Zivilisation unterschieden; aber diese Definition ist eben nicht literarästhetisch abgeleitet, sondern allenfalls soziologisch, und ihr koevolutiver Zusammenhang mit Literatur wird nicht eigentlich theoretisiert, sondern bleibt spukhaft ‘dialektisch’. Geht es um eine bloße “Analogie von kunstmedialer und demokratischer ‘Emanzipation’” (201, Hervorhebung IB) oder um Ästhetisierung als “generierendes Prinzip” (209)? Seine retrospektive Teleologie (vgl. 286 Fn. 2) verleitet Peper zu einer Art Selbstinvolvement seiner literarästhetischen Methode: Dialektisch präsentiert sich in ihr das Verhältnis von Text und Wirklichkeit; dialektisch zeichnet er die Geschichte der Ästhetisierung, Individualisierung und Enthierarchisierung als Aufklärung nach; dialektisch aber sei auch schon die Aufklärung selbst (2, übrigens ohne Horkheimer/Adorno).

Diese Zirkularität wirft ein “System” namens Kultur aus, dessen Systematizität in Relation zu sich selbst und anderen Teilbereichen der Gesellschaft – auch angesichts des Fehlens jeglicher Verweise auf die Systemtheorie – unbestimmt bleibt. Was “sich gegenseitig bedingt” (vgl. xi, xiii, 203, 266), ist deshalb noch kein System. Epistemologisch ähnelt Peper's ‘Dialektik’ vielmehr den klassischen und vorklassischen Vorstellungen einer Analogie von Mikro- und Makrokosmos, die sich mit seinen Anleihen bei der modernen Soziologie allerdings schlecht verträgt:

Kultur als System sollte es ermöglichen, jeden ihrer Aspekte möglichst unabhängig und in sich folgerichtig darzustellen, um dann von ihm aus Licht auf das Ganze werfen zu können. Für eine literarästhetisch abgeleitete Kulturtheorie ist also eine in sich folgerichtige Literaturgeschichte Voraussetzung. Auf der Suche nach ihr ist der Fokus wohl stark einzuengen, und zwar innerhalb der imaginativen Literatur überhaupt auf jene Literatur, die literarästhetisch – nicht in der Güte! – eine irreversible, d. h. doch eine systematische Entfaltungsgeschichte zeigt. Falls eine solche Entwicklung erkennbar sein sollte, läge der Rückschluß auf ein umfassenderes Kultursystem nahe. Im Falle einer Bestätigung würden sich literaturübergreifende, weil nun kulturimmanente Bezüge von selbst ergeben.(xiii)

Fazit: Luhmann wird schon gewußt haben, was er tat, als er in seiner Gesellschaftstheorie der Kultur keinen Systemstatus zugestand. Bei ihm vollzog und reflektierte sich Gesellschaft in der Kommunikation – Punktum. Peper begibt

sich dagegen mit seiner Definition von Kultur als "gelebter und gestalteter Wahrheitsvorstellung einer Gemeinschaft" in ein Dickicht wissenschaftsgeschichtlich höchst voraussetzungs- und assoziationsreicher Begriffe und in eine Perspektive, die er dann fast ad absurdum führen muß, wenn die "demokratische Privatkultur" nicht mehr nur die Wahrheitsvorstellung einer Gruppe, sondern auch die eines Einzelnen beinhalten soll (277, 280). Dabei hätte es durchaus in seinem Interesse liegen können, zu zeigen, wie in den westlichen Gesellschaften der Moderne eine graduelle Entflechtung normativer Orientierungen zusammen mit fortschreitender Institutionalisierung und Formalisierung (Peper nennt dies liebevoll "öffentlich rechtliche Zivilisation" [287]) zu einem Obsoletwerden seines Kulturbegriffs führt, das sich auch in modernen Gesellschaftstheorien (z. B. der Systemtheorie Luhmanns) niederschlägt und zu dessen Symptomen nicht zuletzt auch der Geltungsschwund der Literatur als kulturelles Leitmedium gehört. Diesen Schritt vollzieht Peper jedoch nicht: Bei ihm bleibt, zumindest als Horizont, 'Kultur' in seiner Definition auch noch für Individualkultur verbindlich (267); Hochkultur zählt als deren "Kernbereich" (xiv), und die kulturanthropologischen Vorgaben von Literatur und Kultur werden nicht beleuchtet. Ohne Zweifel gibt es vieles in diesem Buch, das man mit intellektuellem Vergnügen lesen und von dem man etwas lernen kann (wie gesagt: Cooper, Dickinson, Williams und Hemingway). Auf den großen Brückenschlag zwischen literarischer Ästhetik und Kulturtheorie wird man weiter warten müssen.

SIEGEN

INGO BERENSMEYER

Diaspora and Multiculturalism: Common Traditions and New Developments.
Ed. Monika Fludernik. Cross/Cultures 66. Amsterdam and New York:
Rodopi, 2003, lxvii + 391 pp., € 115,00 hb./€ 50,00 pb.

'Diaspora' has, to some extent, supplanted 'hybridity' as a fashionable concept in recent cultural and literary studies. In the collection of essays under review here, the origins of the inflationary use of the term since the 1990s are traced to the emergence of the politics of multiculturalism, and the concepts of 'old' and 'new' diasporas are systematically compared, taking into account "literary representations of the diaspora" and "theoretical negotiations of the topic by literary scholars" (xxviii).

The editor's excellent introductory chapter on "The Diasporic Imaginary: Postcolonial Reconfigurations in the Context of Multiculturalism" does not only provide a comprehensive review of recent diaspora studies but, convincingly arguing for the interrelation between the rise in diasporic consciousness and the (political) concept of multiculturalism, succeeds very well in elaborating the unifying rationale of the collection. The 'diasporic imaginary', signifying "that web of images and dreams which creates a consciousness of ethnic belonging and collective identity in the hearts and minds of expatriates" (xxviii) and essentially informed by narrative, is recognised by

the editor as a category central to the construction of diasporic consciousness. It thus serves also to justify the literary, and not sociological, economic or historical, perspective of the collection. Its approach is comparative, focusing on the one hand on the “comparative analysis between the prototypical Jewish diaspora in the contemporary situation and the more recent contenders for diasporic existence” (xxiv) and, on the other hand, on the contrast between the multiculturalist situation in the UK, the US, Canada and Australia and in the Caribbean and Germany.

The volume is sub-divided into three sections under whose headings, “Introduction”, “The Jewish Diaspora”, and “American, British and Other Diasporas: Multiculturalisms at Play”, are gathered twelve original contributions. To the editor’s introductory chapter is joined under the common title of “Introduction” an essay on “Dispelling the Spells of Memory: Another Approach to Reading Our Yesterdays” by Uma Parameswaran. The Indian-born poet and critic, who lives in Canada, enquires into the conspicuous absences of Canada in the works of Canadian writers of the Indian diaspora and of the Indian diaspora in the writings of other Canadian authors. With her emphasis on the shortcomings of theoretical models of diaspora, Parameswaran furthermore introduces a critical aspect which persists in some of the other contributions.

The first essay in the section on “The Jewish Diaspora” is Ursula Zeller’s “Between *goldene medine* and Promised Land: Legitimizing the American Jewish Diaspora”. Zeller’s is not only a very comprehensive and useful account of Jewish interpretations of diaspora and exile (both religious and secular) but provides also an informed discussion of notions of the ‘exceptional’ status of the American-Jewish diaspora and, with reference to texts by Cynthia Ozick, Daniel and Jonathan Boyarin, and Philip Roth, outlines three distinctly contrasting diasporic conceptions of Jewish identities between the parameters of diaspora and Israel. The radical difference of British-Jewish constructions of diaspora from those current within American-Jewish discourse is demonstrated by Bryan Cheyette in his “Diasporas of the Mind: British-Jewish Writing Beyond Multiculturalism”. Discussing the work of Muriel Spark, George Steiner, and Clive Sinclair, Cheyette emphasises that these (diasporist) writers reject a unitary model of diaspora determined by the criteria of nation and exile and argues that they occupy an ‘extraterritorial’ space.¹ A very different aspect of the Jewish diaspora is addressed by Beate Neumeier in her essay on “*Kindertransport*: Memory, Identity and the British-Jewish Diaspora”. Neumeier sees the rise of public interest in the British rescue of ten thousand Jewish children from Germany and Eastern Europe (1938/1939) connected to recent re-definitions of ‘Englishness’. She convincingly argues that “only in the wake of a changing British self-image were ques-

¹ Cheyette’s forthcoming critical history of British-Jewish literature with the same suggestive main title as his contribution in this volume, *Diasporas of the Mind. British-Jewish Writing and the Nightmare of History* (Yale UP), will be of interest in this context.

tions of British-Jewish relations and aspects of anti-semitism finally allowed to surface, and led to a reconsideration and redefinition of the relation between the British-Jewish diaspora and their host country" (89f.).

It certainly is true, as suggested by the editor, that "the American framework dominates in discussions of the Jewish diaspora" (xxx), and it is laudable that the collection, with the contributions of Cheyette and Neumeier, shifts this emphasis, acknowledging the diasporic situation in the UK as well. A further exploration of the diversity of Jewish diaspora(s), even the various anglophone Jewish diaspora(s), might have been desirable but there are, naturally, limits to what a collection of essays can do. Certainly, for the comparative analysis intended by the editor, the focus on the Jewish diasporas in the US and the UK seems quite appropriate, and six of the eight contributions of the third, and last, section on "American, British and Other Diasporas: Multiculturalisms at Play" actually deal with 'new' diasporas in those very same contact zones.

Feroza Jussawalla considers the situation of Mexican immigrants to the US in the contexts of American multiculturalism and international migrancy prompted by economic globalisation. In her "Cultural-Rights Theory: A View from the US-Mexican Border", Jussawalla argues forcibly that fashionable concepts of critical theory, like 'hybridity' and 'liberal multiculturalism', are largely inadequate to protect the cultural rights of diasporic communities. A critique of critical theory is also intended by Roy Sommer. Examining two novels by Courttia Newland and Zadie Smith, Sommer proposes in his "'Simple Survival' in 'Happy Multicultural Land'? Diasporic Identities and Cultural Hybridity in the Contemporary British Novel" a distinction between transcultural ('assimilationist') and diasporic ('particularist') multiculturalisms and contends that multiculturalism "is not a homogeneous concept but a discourse on multiethnicity that accommodates conflicting voices" (178).

A particular focus of the collection on the South Asian diaspora is introduced by Minoli Salgado's "Nonlinear Dynamics and the Diasporic Imagination", in which the author applies chaos theory to the concept of diaspora, illustrating her argument with discussions of Michael Ondaatje and Salman Rushdie. In "Postponed Arrivals: The Afro-Asian Diaspora in M. G. Vassanji's *No New Land*", Vera Alexander discusses Vassanji's text as one of only a few diaspora novels which actually locate diasporic existence within a multicultural paradigm and challenge the validity of theoretical models. The South Asian diaspora in Australia is addressed by Makarand Paranjape in "Writing Across Boundaries: South Asian Diasporas and Homelands", an attempt at theorizing the diaspora as a "dialectical Other of colonialism" (240). Paranjape's special interest is in the relationship of diasporas with their homelands and he interprets the diasporic experience as an interstitial site between the homeland and the adopted country that is fully reconcilable with neither. Monika Fludernik proposes in her "Imagined Communities as Imaginary Homelands: The South Asian Diaspora in Fiction" a typology of diaspora novels (distinguishing immigration novels, multicultural novels, diaspora novels, and cosmopolitan novels) and, discussing a wide range of texts by South Asian authors, concludes that, paradoxically, the 'properly' diasporic

novel is as yet comparatively rare and that “the most flourishing fashion in critical theory has so far no equivalent in literary status” (267).

With Ulfried Reichardt’s “Diaspora Studies and the Culture of the African Diaspora: The Poetry of Derek Walcott, Kamau Braithwaite and Linton Kwesi Johnson”, the discussion of the diasporic concept is extended to the black diaspora and the aspect of the colonial trauma, somewhat eclipsed in most of the other contributions by the expatriate experience, is re-introduced. Finally, Sandra Hestermann addresses “The German-Turkish Diaspora and Multicultural German Identity: Hyphenated and Alternative Discourses of Identity in the Works of Zafer ”enocak and Feridun Zaimoğlu”. Dealing with a non-anglophone diaspora and with a country (Germany) that has not yet adopted a policy of multiculturalism comparable to that of the anglophone countries referred to, Hestermann’s essay, though certainly not without merit of its own, rather serves as a counterpoint to the other contributions in the collection. To some extent the essay even undermines the collection’s main thesis that diasporic consciousness evolves in the wake of multiculturalism (xvii), as it, in the words of the editor, “underlines the fact that the existence of more recent diasporas is wholly independent of multiculturalist settings, arising instead from a globalized capitalist economy” (xxxiii). A truly comparative exploration of diaspora(s), it seems, may challenge conceptions conceived in the anglophone ‘hothouse’ and there appears to be ample scope for further research.

The comparison between the ‘prototypical’ Jewish diaspora and more recent diasporas, promised by the editor, is brought about in this volume largely by the structural juxtaposition of essays dealing with either the one or the other. Although individual contributions reflect this comparative approach, it is thus especially the editor’s introductory chapter which makes good on her own promise. This should not, however, deflect from the merit of the collection as a whole, whose thematic coherence and high academic standards (the editor’s balanced choice of contributions from ‘old hands’ and relative ‘newcomers’ from across the world should be mentioned here) make it a profitable as well as a pleasant read.

To conclude, the collection provides valuable insights into a subject matter very much at the core of the (post-)modern experience and is to be highly recommended to anyone interested in diaspora(s), migration, identity, multiculturalism and postcolonial theory.

BONN

AXEL STÄHLER

Imaginary (Re-)Locations: Tradition, Modernity, and the Market in Contemporary Native American Literature and Culture. Ed. Helmbrecht Breinig. ZAA Studies 18. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003, 297 pp., € 39,00.

In the context of an increasingly globalized world, many theorists have postulated that with the overcoming of distances and borderlines through information and transport networks, space and location are turning into obsolete

and irrelevant categories.¹ That this is not the case, and especially not for Native American cultures, is convincingly manifested by this recent collection of critical approaches. Based on an international conference in Erlangen, this volume – edited with great care and dedication by Helmbrecht Breinig – illustrates that, on the contrary, the concept of ‘space’ is gaining in both complexity and need of differentiation. In six literary and ten critical contributions, an interdisciplinary combination of Native and non-Native scholars and writers do not only significantly engage with the current debate on the spatial dimensions of cultural identity, but laudably uphold diversity and dialogue as key strategies of a mode of representation determined by *location* and *locution* (a connection elsewhere outlined as central by Alfred Hornung and Rüdiger Kunow²). Therefore, while it has become a commonplace with reviewers to point to conference proceedings’ usual lack of coherence, this collection provides a notable exception to the rule: a wide range of instruments is orchestrated harmoniously along the score promised by the title but without failing to include a remarkable diversity of angles, a multiplicity of voices, and an inspiring level of controversy. In the same manner, the volume’s thesis that “[t]he question of real or imaginary (re-)location turns out to be inextricably intertwined with that of social, cultural, and literary identity construction” (41) is consistently underlined by the editorial decision to frame and interweave the analyses with literary texts; a practice that additionally foregrounds the necessity to deconstruct hierarchical boundaries between different forms of discourse.

After Kimberly Blaeser’s opening poems, which outline the fragile, permeable identity categories of family ties, communal belonging, space and time, Helmbrecht Breinig maps out the theoretical dimensions of the project by the cornerstones of cultural identity, representation, and the market. Locating common bases of collective Native identity (such as essentialism, issues of sovereignty, or traditionalism) in the field of tension between sameness and difference, Breinig reports that many approaches – such as David Hollinger’s substitution of identity with postethnic affiliations, Nancy Fraser’s politics of redistribution and recognition, or Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of ‘cultural capital’ are in need of modification and recombination (for a Navajo context, for instance, the author suggests an extension of Bourdieu’s terminology by “medicinal, equibrial, religious, or community capital” [29]) to do justice to non-binary and multilateral realities. In acknowledgement of this complexity, Breinig introduces the term of “transdifference,” a concept he developed with Klaus Lösch, which “implies a shift of emphasis away from notions of

¹ John Rennie Short names a few examples in his survey on *Global Dimensions: Space, Place and the Contemporary World* (London: Reaktion, 2001) 168.

² “[T]he question of representing the global turns out to be a question about *location* just as much as it is about *locution*.” Alfred Hornung and Rüdiger Kunow, “Preface”, *Global Fictions*, Special Issue of *Amerikastudien/ American Studies* 47.2 (2002): 193–98, 196.

a melange in the direction of a simultaneity of – often conflicting – positions, loyalties, affiliations and participations” and which “denotes all that which resists the construction of meaning based on an exclusionary and conclusional binary model,” but without entirely abandoning notions of difference (38–39). Along the lines of this innovative and feasible trajectory, then, the concerted achievement of all following contributions can be seen in their common “search for or articulat[ion of] third-space, trans-dichotomous, hybrid, and in a sense, transdifferent identity formations and locations” (41–42).

In the subsequent approach to “The Urban Reservation: Narrative, Identity, and the Postmodern City in Contemporary Native American Literature,” James Ruppert departs from modernism’s cities as sites of alienation, reading the connections between urban spaces and identity in three Native redefinitions as a) revolt, b) neocolonial testing grounds, or c) playful deconstruction by urban tricksters. Using C. S. Peirce’s semiotic model, Ruppert contends that the identities suggested by the three responses are indexical, not only because they are “temporary, partial, and translucent” (52) but because they point beyond themselves. Unfortunately, especially in the third part, Ruppert’s textual evidence first appears vague, as he saves his example – Vizenor’s *Harold of Orange* – for the conclusion. This structural decision, in addition to a slight diffusion of terminologies – e. g. the implicit equation of ‘post-modern’ with Vizenor’s ‘*post-indian*’ – may distract the reader from the argument’s coherence. In his defense, however, the inclusion (in print) of Louise Erdrich’s poem “Jacklight”, is a helpful move followed by a convincing analysis of the text’s indexically constructed identities as well as a close reading of Vizenor’s (postindian) urban trickster, which shows “how identity evades ossification, spins like a weathervane to show us what is important to life, leaving us finally with something yet to say” (60).

In a well-argued article entitled “Cultural Identity, Territory, and the Discursive Location of Native American Fiction,” Klaus Lösch combines theoretical insights and analyses of literary texts to efficiently address the construction of cultural difference “in relation to space or territory in Native American cultures” (63), especially with regard to the reverberations of globalization, hybridization and concepts of diaspora. He diagnoses three discursive affiliations of Native American literature which correspond to the texts’ trajectories: a) an autonomous tribal discourse aimed intraculturally at a “pan-tribal diasporic audience” (70), b) an inner- and intercultural counter-hegemonic discourse directed at an in-group and out-group audience, and c) a transcultural discourse of hybridity that includes all available audiences. Strongly supported by a thorough critical outline of the concepts of culture and authenticity, these categories are rewardingly applied to the respective examples of N. Scott Momaday’s *The Ancient Child*, Leslie Marmon Silko’s *The Almanac of the Dead*, and Gerald Vizenor’s *The Heirs of Columbus*.

After Gordon Henry’s playful literary excerpts on notions of autobiographical constructions of self, Arnold Krupat structurally follows Ruppert and Lösch in the establishment of another critical threesome in “Nationalism, Indigenism, Cosmopolitanism: Three Critical Perspectives on Native American Literatures”. Aptly aware of the overlappings and necessary simplifica-

tion of such categories, and thoroughly analysing their interrelations, he sees these make-shift approaches as part of a larger “project of an anti-colonial criticism” (87): the first relying on the legal and political meanings of sovereignty, the second focusing on the “animate and sentient earth” as a source of values (91), and the third, exemplarily used by Gerald Vizenor, Louis Owens, and W. S. Penn, as a perspective which foregrounds multilateral cultural understanding in a global context.

The first part of the volume, with its trifoliate mappings of cultural identity theory, is complemented by Hartwig Isernhagen’s challenging look into “identitarian” discourses and “discourses of exchange” as central ingredients of “Ethno-Cultural Difference.” The former is characterized by a historical shaping of identity through continuous (re)construction that often relies on crisis, loss, or trauma, whereas a discourse of exchange – much like Lösch’s model of transculturation or Krupat’s cosmopolitan perspective – avoids closure and displaces meaning beyond a textual scope. With regard to Bakhtin’s human “chronotope,” Isernhagen differentiates the identitarian foci on either time or space as mono-linear sites, whereas a discourse of exchange would replace essentialist tendencies by a “search for alternatives in a focus on the complexities of place/space and derive its energy from them” (120). As clear as this division may look, Isernhagen rightfully warns that these two perspectives cannot – as has often been done (and as Ruppert, to a certain extent, suggests) – simply be seen in analogy to the temporal movements of modernism and postmodernism. In order to show the interrelations between both models, Isernhagen provides a sound analysis of Leslie Marmon Silko’s latest novel, *Gardens in the Dunes*, in which the identitarian focus on space, time, and trauma is intertwined with a discourse of exchange in which “[m]ultiple mappings in multiple histories are networked into megamaps” in a dominant gesture of “accumulation” (133).

Introducing the volume’s second part and its implicit focus on representation with a familial memory and two Haida origin stories, Jeane Breinig and her mother Julie Coburn underline once more the dependence of all identity constitution on oral traditions, followed by Brigitte Georgi-Findlay’s comprehensive and thorough analysis of the works of Louis Owens, an author more prominently known for his critical than his literary achievements. In a well-argued and textually supported reading of Owens’ novels *Wolfsong*, *Bone Game*, *The Sharpest Sight*, and *Nightland*, Georgi-Findlay highlights their celebrations of ‘mixedblood’ identity as a site of hybridization and dialogue. Seeing his latest novel, *Dark River*, as the zenith of a development from Owens’ focus on mixed heritage to the social conventions surrounding Native life, the author also diagnoses a “departure” (162) here. While *Dark River* is clearly Owens’ most deconstructive novel, this evaluation is debatable, as one might ask if the author’s move from contents to representations, especially considering his critical project of unmasking Baudrillardian simulations of Natives, is not so much a change of direction as a logical consequence of his overall work. Such debates aside, in summarizing Owens’ critical and literary achievements as “brilliant acts of mixedblood postindian literary terrorism” (165) – as opposed to the widespread “literary tourism” that nourishes colo-

nialist clichés – Georgi-Findlay rightfully argues for an increased recognition of a Native writer who may well (as the “postindian” in her conclusion suggests) claim a place alongside Gerald Vizenor in the critical pantheon of ethnic studies. The latter, also the conference’s keynote speaker, proceeds in the following article on “Imagic Moments: Native Identities and Literary Modernity” to look at various agendas behind visual representations, i. e., the “certificates of presence” (171) of Native Americans. Employing pictorial discourses of W. J. T. Mitchell, Susan Sontag or Roland Barthes, Gerald Vizenor distinguishes the premodern simulations of “*indians* as cultural representations” or authentic poses (171) from strategic identity maneuvers of resistance and “survivance”: ironic, “visionary” moments in which Native people become the “storiers” of both self and modernity. As exemplary experiences by Greg Sarris and W. S. Penn show, “imagic moments” are “inclusive and reciprocal, [creating] a native sense of presence and ‘ontic significance’ that cannot be reversed by the deceptive actions of racial separatists” (181). With his usual wit, Vizenor weaves his analysis like a blanket, making the threads visible by repetitions and exposing its *in-process* status by probing into habitualized discourse, sharply questioning formulae, creating new meanings, and expertly challenging the reader to follow his web of neologisms, word-play and insight.

In an analysis of Thomas King’s novel *Green Grass, Running Water*, John Purdy also focuses on the images of Native people, mapping the intersections between their representation in literature or visual media and their impact on contemporary audiences. Solutions to the key question, how to “engage a deeply inscribed, invisible, make-believe interpretive mechanism that does not provide a productive understanding of current or historical events and people?” (185), lie in King’s strategy of humor, which is reinforced through what Purdy calls “grafting” – a term borrowed from botany that describes “the process by which hybridity is accomplished” (187). As Purdy convincingly argues, Thomas King does not only graft the genres of film and fiction by techniques such as “parallel editing” (191), but he exposes the vertical interrelatedness of film and narrative by telescoping them, turning the scripts into self-referential visual texts. Although Purdy follows the unfortunate practice of assuming the novel to be known by his readers, his examples from the texts provide apt and coherent evidence for his thesis that King succeeds in dissecting Hollywood’s mechanisms of colonial image control, thus spotlighting the audiences’ responsibilities in dealing with different media and the ideologies they convey.

Emma Lee Warrior’s previously unpublished short story “The Powwow Committee,” which fictionally negotiates a plurality of positions toward German dancers’ cultural appropriation of Peigan powwows, provides the perfect transition to Hartmut Lutz’s survey of the relations between Canadian First Nations people and Germans from the nineteenth century to the present. In a highly informative and clearly structured paper entitled “‘Okay, I’ll be their annual Indian for next year’: Thoughts on the Marketing of a Canadian Indian Icon in Germany,” he probes into instances of German “Indi-anthusiasm” – a substantial and powerful term Lutz has coined elsewhere –

from Anishinabe writer George Copway's visit in 1850 to the (self-)com-modifications of Silkirtis Nichols in the 1970s or Peigan educator Murray Small Legs today. Historically deducing the "Plains Indian's" essentialization as an icon from George Catlin, Buffalo Bill, and Karl May, Lutz points to the diverse relations among authenticity, identity performance, and narcissistic desires (as also expressed by German "wannabe" appropriations of Native heritage) to conclude that "Native people entering the German market stand little or no chance to escape objectification as *Indianer*, and, in order to be successful, will have to lose their specific ethnic subjectivity . . . or will have to adjust to the icon" (241). However, as the title quote by Yvette Nolan as well as the textual examples from Thomas King or Emma Lee Warrior illustrate, this practice is not without counter-discourses that do promise some hope for an "ethics of mutual respect in intercultural relations" (236).

Just as Hartmut Lutz looks into Native American culture in the northern part of the American continent, Reinhold Görling dedicates the volume's final critical piece, "Negotiating Cultural Difference in Mexico," to the area south of the U. S. border. Departing from the example of a U. S. critic's refusal to acknowledge the authenticity and aesthetic value of Purépecha pottery from the village of Ocumicho, Görling historically shows how the blurring of cultural difference in Mexico is not only a recent or externally forced practice but the dominant Mexican reality since 1521" (258). In this "invention" of the Mexican, the "Indian" image forms the dominant pillar for the construction of the syncretist *mestizaje* ideology as the major "tool to homogenize a culturally diverse country with a history of violence" (260). Unfortunately, although he acknowledges the word's colonial implications, Görling himself repeatedly falls victim to an undifferentiated use of the term "Indian" (247, 260). With the example of the literary mediation of the Zapatista national liberation organization, the author then identifies secrets and masks as the symbolic sites of a power struggle central to the manifestation of cultural difference. His conclusion that the secret "wakes the desire of the other [and that] it is a kind of *mise en scène* to bring aspects of the unconscious into representation" (266) may be taken as a point of departure for much further debate, if Hartmut Lutz's considerations of desire's power structures are taken into account, or if questions are raised about the secret's actual potential to resist control within the sphere of representation. In maintaining that "the trauma and the gift" are the other "figures of places where culture . . . is located" (266), Görling's thesis also stands against Isernhagen's warning of trauma as a basis of identitarian interaction which "will again and again degenerate into war" (135).

As Görling's final thesis partly revokes positions elaborately argued by Isernhagen, Lutz, or even Vizenor, this paper's 'location' near the end of the book may first seem to have an ambiguous touch. However, considering the project's focus on the vibrant dynamics in negotiating transdifference and its refusal to settle for simple solutions, such controversial impulses are particularly welcome at this position. In addition, as if to dissolve any considerations of closure in the familiar trickster-like fashion, Gerald Vizenor concludes the volume with an excerpt from his novel *Chancers* – which also handles secrets

as “sacred” and providing a “sense of presence” (271) but which, in its ironic intertwining of multiple meanings and metatextual levels resists any hierarchies of fixity. Clearly, and especially in this context of power relations, one might discuss whether the overtly central role of Gerald Vizenor to this volume is not also a step towards biased canonization. However, as he was not only “mentor, magus and trickster discussant” at the conference, as Breinig summarizes (39), but – by his continuous self-inquiry, irony, and dedication – presents one of the most prominent agents of Native American *Imaginary (Re-)locations*, his position is well justified.

Cherokee writer Diane Glancy has recently emphasized that Native American Studies most urgently need “an expanding theory with various centers of the universe, taking in more than one view, more than one multiplicity.”³ Considering the difficult balancing act of combining diverse and controversial approaches without losing a common denominator – while at the same time resisting the lure of either simplification or diffusion on an increasingly complex theoretical platform, this is precisely the merit and achievement of this volume. With its focus on U.S., Canadian, Mexican, and German “chronotopes,” it excellently illustrates on all levels that relocation is a relative phenomenon – not only in spatial terms – and that the “sites” of inter- and transcultural dialogue are best represented from multiple angles.

WÜRZBURG

BIRGIT DÄWES

Jens Martin Gurr. *The Human Soul as Battleground. Variations on Dualism and the Self in English Literature*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2003, 229 pp, € 28,00.

This intensively-researched and exhaustively documented study offers a selective overview of the mind-body dichotomy in English literature. Gurr has chronicled well what for Baudelaire was “une lutte des deux principes qui ont choisi le coeur humain pour principal champ de bataille” (7). Space permits detailed consideration of only a few aspects of his ten chapters.

The first – “Classical and Medieval Interests on Dualism and the Self” – encompasses, among other subjects, Plato, the Bible, St. Paul, and Augustine. Prudentius’s allegorical *Psychomachia* (ca. 400), one of the most influential works of European literature, dramatizes the psychological/moral scrutiny of self and society via proof-texts from biblical, classical, and historical literature. Drawing in very broad terms on the Prudentian concept, Gurr assesses individual and cultural issues that arise from tensions between spiritual transcendence and physical appetites. After considering Continental writers such

³ Diane Glancy, “Further (Farther): Creating Dialogue to Talk about Native American Plays”, *American Gypsy* (Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2002) 200–204, 204.

as Dante and Petrarch, he demonstrates how his theme is manifest in an impressive range of genres and periods of English literature from the *Canterbury Tales* to Joyce's *Ulysses*, by way of Sydney, Spenser, Shakespeare, Donne, *Paradise Lost*, Bunyan's several allegories, Richardson's *Pamela*, Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, Wordsworth's *Prelude*, Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, and Wilde's *Picture of Dorian Gray*. The range of this study is daunting, and discussion occasionally digresses from the announced theme – Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* receives an interesting but perhaps tangential footnote – but more often Gurr illumines the subject at hand. How “soul” changes from a concept of metaphysical progression into otherworldly realms of being to “soul” as a mode of higher personal moral realization in this life is fascinating to follow. Although Gurr applies literary theories popular in the last twenty years, he also welcomingly grounds his work in the virtues of what we might call neo-Germanic philology.

This, however, does not mean that there are no disputable points and one often learns as one disagrees. Chaucerians familiar with the work of Siegfried Wenzel and Lee Patterson on the Parson's Tale may wince at Gurr's claim that it and the other tales are “ultimately irreconcilable opposites” (42). He considers Chaucer the only English medieval writer who had major impact on later works involving his theme; yet Langland's *Piers Plowman* which asks “how can I save my soul?” – significantly influenced Spenser and Milton. Miltonists who have spent lifetimes struggling with Miltonic paradoxes will be astonished to read that Gurr believes they “can easily be resolved” (85).

In light of the immensity of the theme, we may question the extensive text-space Gurr spends on the *Rump Songs*, mainly the one of 1642 by the Stuart-friendly Francis Quarles. Nevertheless, his discussion, which sees the “liberty vs. license” issue in Cavalier (and later Restoration) terms as opposite to Milton's, nicely leads in to an “anthropologically pessimistic” reading of *Paradise Lost*, which, as dramatized in Adam and Eve's relationship, he views as an account of the failed English revolution. Gurr does not underestimate Milton's theodicy and finds Milton more critical of Cromwell than is commonly thought. But believing recent Milton scholarship has been redirected “away from political readings” is incorrect (82). Quite the contrary. Also, we cannot concur with the assertion that Milton “very firmly upholds the dichotomy” between body and spirit (98). As a Monist materialist, Milton saw body and spirit commingled, the spiritual aspect becoming stronger in time with proper “contemplation of created things” (*Paradise Lost*, 5.511). For Milton, saving one's soul via the use of right reason was intricately tied to saving the soul of the nation, an issue that preoccupied him publicly from his earliest published prose pamphlet, *Of Reformation* of 1641 to his death in 1674.

As with Milton, Gurr has much to say about Bunyan's works and the critical response to them. But his belief that Bunyan represents “a crucial step in the shift from centuries of nonindividualized allegorical and moralizing tracts towards the new form of the novel with its psychologizing focus on the individual” somewhat overstates the case (105). Certainly both *Piers Plowman* and Spenser's *Faerie Queene* are highly psychological and individualized in their treatment of the growth of their respective poets' minds over the years

they wrote their epics. Gurr notes how in working out his allegorical mode Bunyan's literary sensibilities partially undercut his professed Calvinist doctrine. He also analyzes well the gender reversal of the moral guide figure from Dante's Beatrice to Bunyan's Christian. (That Bunyan "certainly would not have known" *The Divine Comedy* [129] is not however certain.) Because Gurr has mastered so much material, one shouldn't quibble overly, but a stronger knowledge of English medieval literature, particularly the *Castle of Perseverance* with its treatment of the "double temptation" and Langland and John Lydgate for allegorical landscape, would have strengthened his treatment of these motifs in Bunyan.

In the several chapters that follow, among the most interesting in the book, "soul" issues are less connected to a goal of heavenly inhabitation than to earthly moral probity. Gurr's approach to *Pamela* – one that "has largely gone unnoticed" – sees the novel intricately engaged with *Paradise Lost* in terms of "the conception of love and the sexual ethics it advocates" (132, 131). For him, Richardson's view on the doctrine of love looks back to that in Spenser's sonnets, already discussed. His *Pamela* emerges as morally superior to *Eve*.

Gurr considers Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* a work characterized by "plaisanterie on the brink of intellectual despair" (151). In a cognitive approach emphasizing Yorick's intense self-scrutiny, Gurr's harmonized, anti-sentimentalist reading balances aspects of "radical skepticism" with the work's "humour and charm" (139). After discussing Sterne's complex response to mechanistic materialism, Gurr concludes that this author views the soul as but a "bodily effect", the "sum of mental and psychological processes" (150). Gender conflicts can be resolved not by "abstract sympathy" but by true desire.

Gurr's Wordsworth draws upon Michael Gassenmeier's fine scholarship. He holds, however, that by emphasizing the superiority of the mental to the physical he goes "decisively beyond" previous approaches in seeing Wordsworth as reinstating a Christian doctrine worthy of Paul and Augustine (154). Although Wordsworth in *The Prelude* rejected intense experiences like the French Revolution as injurious to the nourishment his "natural graciousness of mind" and intellectual "eye" received from nature, Gurr finds the poet's evaluations of the interplay of his sensory memory confused (154, 155). Directing "attention to the theological overtones in Wordsworth's diction", he takes up Wordsworth's "spots of time" and makes us see them anew (157).

Gurr contends that *Jane Eyre's* analysis of desire is a "reworking of Milton's battle of the sexes" (173). Comparing Jane to Viola of *Twelfth Night*, he interprets the novel as a Petrarchan celebration of the female subject. He treats Rochester's mutilation in terms of "insights of the heart" but rightly questions the cultural pathology of Jane's belief that she can love the mutilated Rochester better than the whole one because he needs her more (177).

Within the stream-of-consciousness modality, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is, for Gurr, an aesthetization of psychological perception. Darwinian inevitability has replaced Christianity as a template for the soul. In biological terms *Dorian Gray* is a literary version of ontology recapitulating philology. Miltonic overtones remain important, however, particularly Satan's boast in *Paradise Lost* that "the mind is its own place and in itself / Can make a Heav'n

of Hell, a Hell of Heav'n" (1.254–255). By the end "the picture has become more real than the physical Dorian" (192). Gurr's argument encapsulates the dilemma of Gertrude Stein, whose portrait by Picasso was, the artist assured its worried subject, a more lasting representation of her than her present self.

Gurr concludes, again bringing Milton to bear, by taking up Molly Bloom's interior monologue in *Ulysses*. Molly, a more realized representation of the eternal feminine, voices Adam's thoughts on Eve. After Joyce, modernist literature, with its "emphasis on the multiplicity of the personality", chiefly replaces "the dualism of body and soul or of heaven and hell" (200).

Gurr handles ideas well and is fascinated by them. His book is full of shrewd observations clearly expressed in his own distinct voice. To his task he has brought impressive linguistic competence, in Greek and Latin as well as French and Italian. The frequent references to German-language scholarship reminded us once again how often that scholarship has furthered our understanding of English literature. The book has both an index of names and a useful "Index of Major Themes." Though sometimes the procession of others' critical viewpoints cramps Gurr's originality of interpretation, the lengthy bibliographical footnotes provide valuable reviews of recent scholarship. Specialists may take issue with the occasional broad assertion, but few will deny that in including literary-critical, political, philosophical, historical, psychological, anthropological and theological perspectives, he has brushed an impressive landscape.

SANTA FE

JOAN BLYTHE AND JOHN CLUBBE

Cynthia Dereli. *A War Culture in Action. A Study of the Literature of the Crimean War Period*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2003, 266 pp., € 51,00.

Wäre es nicht um der Gestalt Florence Nightingales und Alfred Tennysons patriotischen Gedichts "The Charge of the Light Brigade" willen, dann wäre der Krimkrieg von 1854–56 in der breiteren Öffentlichkeit Großbritanniens fast völlig vergessen. Dabei war er in dem Jahrhundert zwischen 1815 und dem Beginn des Ersten Weltkriegs im August 1914 die größte kriegerische Auseinandersetzung mit britischer Beteiligung, eine neue Herausforderung und ein Vorbote der modernen Kriege des 20. Jahrhunderts, wie die Autorin pointiert hervorhebt:

So many firsts – the first war of the post-1832 era, with new democratic expectations hardly assimilated into the nation's self-image, the first war correspondent at the front reporting back to the nation, the first occasion of a readily available postal service for the soldiers, the first photographic records of war, the first use of telegraph, speeding up the reporting – those in power found themselves sailing in largely uncharted waters. (76)

Mehr noch, sie betrachtet diesen Krieg nicht als eingegrenztes militärisches Phänomen, sondern als Teil einer die Nation erfassenden allgemeinen "war

culture". Sie konzentriert sich dabei auf literarische Texte, Gedichte und Romane zumeist, und die Presseberichterstattung während eines Jahres, von September 1854 bis September 1855. Es geht nicht um die Stellungnahmen von Augenzeugen, sondern um den britischen "distant observer" (15) des Krimkrieges aus der Heimat, mit der Zielsetzung, die zeitgenössische Sichtweise nachzuschaffen, "to reconstruct [...] the impressions of the war which the British public were able to glean from the media" (191). Angesichts dessen wird der Autorin jedoch mitunter vor ihrer eigenen Courage bange, so daß sie wiederholt betont, mit dem zeitlichen Abstand von anderthalb Jahrhunderten wenig durchweg Verlässliches aussagen zu können (11; 30; 71; 196). Ihre These im engeren lautet, daß sich um den Krimkrieg herum eine ganze Kultur arrangiert habe, in der alle gesellschaftlichen Kräfte und Gegensätze wie Aristokratie, Bürgertum, Arbeiter und Frauen eingebunden und anschließend retrospektiv harmonisiert werden. Kultur wird in dem vielfach üblichen, weitgefaßt-deskriptiven Sinn mit Raymond Williams als "signifying system" (192) verstanden: "The power of these accumulated 'myths' I have referred to as a culture of war" (195). Mehrfach wird die Übertragung dieses Modells auf spätere Kriege und die Terrorfurcht des beginnenden 21. Jahrhunderts angesprochen; dies bleibt jedoch außerhalb der selbstgewählten Fragestellung. Eine textliche Vorwegnahme von Kiplings berühmtem Mahngedicht "Recessional" (1897) bleibt undiagnostiziert (114) wie die Popularisierung von "when England calls" im Ersten (113) oder von Shakespeares *Henry V* im Zweiten Weltkrieg (115). Selbst vom "people's war" ist in viktorianischer Literatur bereits die Rede (49), ohne daß die Autorin den zwangsläufigen Bezug zu diesem seit Angus Calders *The People's War. Britain 1939-45* (1969) fest mit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg assoziierten Begriff herstellt.

Nach einer knappen Einleitung wird der Stoff in neun Kapiteln ausgebreitet; der ebenfalls bündig gehaltene Schlußteil ("Conclusions: War Culture in Action") wird als zehntes Kapitel aufgeführt. Der Konzeption nach handelt es sich weniger um ein organisch aufgebautes Buch als um eine Abfolge einzelner, kaum durch Überleitungen verbundener Kapitel, die auch als Aufsätze für sich stehen könnten: Zwei Kapitel sind dementsprechend bereits anderenorts veröffentlicht worden. Dieser lockeren Struktur entspricht, daß manche Bemerkungen wiederholt fallen, etwa zu den Tücken des zeitlichen Abstandes oder zum überdauernden Nachruhm ausgerechnet von "The Charge of the Light Brigade". So kommt eine insgesamt recht bunte Reihung zusammen, von der ein kurzer Kommentar bereits einen guten Begriff geben mag. Zwei Kapitel befassen sich mit dem "War as Context of Literature" (Part I und II), wovon Kapitel 1 sich der zeitgenössischen Situation Englands bis zum militärischen Eingreifen widmet, Kapitel 4 der aktuellen Tagespresse und dem Zustand des Landes währenddessen. Dazwischen erfolgt in Kapitel 2 eine Betrachtung der Kriegsthematik und der britischen sozialgeschichtlichen Situation in Werken von Dickens und Mrs. Gaskell von Ende 1854, die sich vom zeitgenössischen Journalismus und anderen literarischen Werken unterscheiden, indem sie sich weniger mit dem Krieg selbst als mit häuslichen Gegenständen – "domestic issues" – befassen (61). Akzentuiert wird dabei der Rahmen einer weitgefaßten sozialen Verantwortlichkeit: "And what about re-

sponsibility? What about the poor at home?” (72) Die Behandlung von “Charge of the Light Brigade” mit dem Untertitel “The Poetry of Heroes and Patriots”, die Tennysons Rolle als Laureatus und erfolgsabhängigen Literaten herausstellt, betont das publikumswirksame Umdeuten einer sinnlosen Niederlage in einen moralischen Sieg: “To glorify a victory was appropriate, to create a glorious image out of a defeat was sublime.” (91) Angesichts dieses gut erforschten Gedichts hat das Kapitel eher zusammenfassenden Charakter. Genaue Interpretation ist nicht zentral für die Aufgabenstellung der Studie, es geht erkennbar mehr um den Kontext als den Text. Über Tennysons stringent gebautes und relativ kurzes Gedicht hinaus wird auf weitere Bearbeitungen verwiesen, wie Francis Hastings Doyles “Balaclava” mit seinen nicht weniger als sechzig Versen von Kampfschilderungen und Handgemenge (92 f.).

Das zweite Kontextkapitel, Kapitel 4 der übergeordneten Zählung, befaßt sich mit der auch nach 1832 fortbestehenden aristokratischen Monopolstellung für die Offizierslaufbahn, der entsprechenden Günstlingswirtschaft sowie dem Stolz auf einen britischen Freiheitsbegriff, der sich unter anderem aus dem Bewußtsein speiste, im Gegensatz zu vergleichbaren Mächten kein stehendes Heer von großer Personalstärke zu unterhalten. Schließlich führte Großbritannien die allgemeine Wehrpflicht erst mitten im Ersten Weltkrieg, im Frühjahr 1916 ein. Kapitel 5 widmet sich der poetischen Tagesproduktion, oftmals Amateurgedichten aus Quellen, die heutzutage vielfach schwer zugänglich sind. Hier gebührt der Arbeit das Verdienst, das Bild der Forschung von der literarischen Spiegelung des Krimkrieges deutlich geweitet zu haben mit Bezug auf Autoren wie William Cox Bennett, Robert Brough, Sydney Dobell, Ernest Jones, W. J. Linton, Gerald Massey, Alexander Smith, Richard Chenevix Trench und Martin Tupper (109). In Kapitel 6 wird Tennysons *Maud* unter der Fragestellung betrachtet, inwieweit zeitgenössische Leser es als Kriegsgedicht gelesen haben würden. Im Kontrast geht es in Kapitel 7 mit Charles Kingsleys historisierendem Roman *Westward Ho!*, in elisabethanischer Zeit angesiedelt, geradezu um eine “recruiting novel for the war” (146), voll ständiger Vergleiche von einst und jetzt und mit dem interessanten Detail, daß der historisch begründete Antikatholizismus des Buches angesichts von einem Drittel Iren unter den britischen Soldaten auf der Krim doch inopportun erscheinen mußte (147). Mit Trollopes *Warden* und Dickens’ *Little Dorrit* widmet sich Kapitel 8 zwei Werken, die nicht unmittelbar thematisch mit dem Krimkrieg zu tun haben, in Konzeption und Rezeption jedoch durch den allgegenwärtigen Hintergrund des Krieges beeinflusst waren (155). Insbesondere in *Little Dorrit* wird die übergeordnete Debatte in eine kritische Betrachtung der Aristokratie umgelenkt und wendet sich damit wiederum den heimischen Verhältnissen zu. Kapitel 9 vollzieht einen Paradigmenwechsel, indem es sich der Geschlechterrollenthematik unter der Fragestellung “Creating Roles for Women?” zuwendet. Im Zentrum steht dabei die Gestalt der Florence Nightingale, einige andere Frauengestalten wie die Kreolin Mary Seacole werden eher flüchtig betrachtet. Zugespitzt läßt sich hier festhalten, daß die “war culture” das viktorianische Frauenbild insofern veränderte, als sie mit Florence Nightingale den Mythos eines neuen Rollen-

verständnisses schuf, das gleichwohl mit den weiterhin tradierten Vorstellungen gemäß Patmores *The Angel in the House* (1854–62) und Ruskins “Of Queens’ Gardens” (1865) zu vereinbaren war, “not only as substitute mother-carer, but even (with apparently no moral difficulties) substitute wife.” (182)

Insgesamt ist die Studie dadurch bestimmt, daß sie eher referiert statt zu analysieren. Ausführlich werden literarische Texte paraphrasiert, ohne daß dem Leser angesichts der teilweise schwierigen Quellenlage die Möglichkeit eingeräumt würde, ihre Aussagen zu überprüfen. Die einzelnen Kapitel werden in ihrer Auswahl und Anordnung kaum begründet, die Gelenkstellen sind kurz, eher der Form genügend (vgl. 172) und beruhen auf einem vorwiegend impliziten Zusammenhalt und der Einbindung in den einjährigen Rahmen des Generalthemas der “war culture”. Gelegentlich wird die Autorin Opfer ihrer eigenen additiven Darstellungsweise: Wenn sie etwa auf “some of the implications” (16) verweist, dann wirkt das wie wahllos herausgegriffen, ohne es doch sein zu müssen. Die Vorzüge der Arbeit liegen demnach auf der Detailebene, dem Faktenreichtum und der Aufarbeitung des historischen Hintergrunds. Wenn sie auf das besonders hohe Handelsvolumen zwischen Großbritannien und Rußland aufmerksam macht oder ausführt, wie unter dem Einfluß der Kriegskonstellation *Blackwood’s Magazine* entdeckte, daß der Bibel die Türken näher als die Russen stehen (27), dann teilt sie dem Leser Wissenswertes mit. Überzeugend wird gezeigt, wie sich mit zunehmender Dauer ein gemeinsamer Vorstellungs- und Formelschatz herausbildete, wie eine ideologische und sprachliche Formierung der britischen Öffentlichkeit erfolgte und Abweichungen von Publikum wie Kritik mit Ablehnung sanktioniert wurde. Sie verharrt aber in der Momentaufnahme.

Die Vorläuferfunktion des Krimkriegs für den Ersten Weltkrieg, in England noch immer *Great War* genannt, bleibt insgesamt unerörtert. Die neue Waffenbrüderschaft von Franzosen und Engländern im Krimkrieg ist bereits die Einübung in die *Entente cordiale* und damit die Konstellation von 1914. Ein Denkmal für Florence Nightingale wird angesprochen, mitten im Ersten Weltkrieg errichtet (173), die Übertragung der “war culture” im kalkuliert propagandistischen Symbol jedoch kaum adäquat gedeutet. Wenn die Arbeit auf die sprachprägende Kraft des Krieges und ihre Bedeutung für zukünftige Leser verweist (193), dann ist die Brücke zur einschlägigen Studie für den Ersten Weltkrieg, Paul Fussells *The Great War and Modern Memory* (1975), und die kontrastive Betrachtung der herkömmlich-pathetischen gegenüber der angesichts des verlustreichen Stellungskrieges ernüchterten Sprachgebung bereits geschlagen, ohne daß sie dann überquert würde. Umgekehrt wird eine “jingoistic mood” (115) konstatiert, ohne die historische Nachzeitigkeit von 1878 auszuweisen, oder Chamforts – und Büchners – berühmte Forderung “Krieg den Palästen! Friede den Hütten!” paraphrasiert (116), ohne diese Tradition offenzulegen. Zwar mag man der Goetheschen Feststellung von der sich erst in der Beschränkung offenbarenden Meisterschaft gerade in bezug auf Dissertationen nicht widersprechen, aber das Ausmaß einer umfassenden “war culture” wird doch vor allem in solchen Tradierungen und Anverwandlungen augenfällig. Auch das Fazit der Arbeit selbst unterstreicht dies:

“It seemed that every incident of ordinary life now had to be seen through the lens of this war culture.” (192) Der damit implizierte Blick auf die totalen Kriege des nachfolgenden 20. Jahrhunderts wird im Buch freilich nicht mehr diskutiert.

BERLIN

PETER KRAHÉ

Carola Surkamp. *Die Perspektivenstruktur narrativer Texte. Zu ihrer Theorie und Geschichte im englischen Roman zwischen Viktorianismus und Moderne*. ELCH – Studies in English Literary and Cultural History/ELK – Studien zur englischen Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaft 9. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2003, 321 S., € 29,50.

Mit dem bedeutenden Phänomen der erzählerischen Multiperspektivität befasst sich diese Gießener Dissertation (2002). Ihre “kulturwissenschaftlich-narratologisch[e]” (8) Ausrichtung ist neueren Entwicklungen in der literaturwissenschaftlichen Erzählforschung verpflichtet, die besonders auf eine kulturwissenschaftliche Kontextualisierung von Erzählweisen abzielen. Wie Verf. einleitend bemerkt, ist ihre Studie dementsprechend nicht auf die formale Analyse von Erzähltexten beschränkt, sondern berücksichtigt vor allem auch die “Semantisierung von Erzählformen” (2), d. h. die Spiegelung thematischer Aspekte durch narrative Strukturen. Als besonderes Desiderat erscheint in diesem Zusammenhang “der Entwurf eines differenzierten Modells für die Beschreibung der inhaltlichen Ausgestaltung der Einzelperspektiven und der Semantik der Perspektivenrelationierung in Erzähltexten” (2). Ein solches Modell ist nicht allein auf der *discours*-Ebene der Erzählung angesiedelt, sondern erfasst auch die Ebene der *histoire*, indem die “Relationen zwischen den Perspektiven und die durch unterschiedliche Perspektiventräger vermittelten Versionen des Geschehens” (3) fassbar gemacht werden. Zentrale These der Studie ist, “daß die Perspektivenstruktur eines multiperspektivischen Textes eine wichtige ‘Gelenkstelle’ zwischen der reinen Beschreibung von Textmerkmalen und der Interpretation von Texten darstellt”, da die “Perspektivenstruktur eines narrativen Textes [...] Rückschlüsse auf die Wirklichkeitsvorstellungen seiner Entstehungszeit” ermöglicht (4f.). Dies wird im interpretationspraktisch orientierten Teil III der Studie anhand von Texten illustriert, die durch ihre literarhistorische Situierung zwischen Viktorianismus und Moderne weitreichende kulturwissenschaftliche Fragestellungen aufwerfen.

Kapitel zwei des einleitenden Teils I bietet (nach der Erläuterung der Problemstellung im ersten Kapitel) einen soliden Forschungsbericht, der die begrifflich-methodischen Defizite früherer Arbeiten (insbesondere die notorisch vage Verwendung der Begriffe ‘Perspektive’ und ‘point of view’ in der Erzählforschung, vgl. 11 f.) kritisch beleuchtet. Vor allem wird darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass trotz der Bedeutung multiperspektivischen Erzählens bisher keine narratologisch fundierte Theorie zur Perspektivenstruktur ein-

schlägiger Erzähltexte vorliegt. Dem abzuhelfen, macht sich die vorliegende Studie zur Aufgabe (vgl. Teil I, Kap. 3: "Zielsetzung und Vorgangsweise", 19–24). Dabei soll in einem ersten Schritt eine 'Neukonzeptualisierung', um ein Lieblingswort von Verf. zu gebrauchen, von 'Perspektive' nicht mehr im Sinn von 'Erzählperspektive' (also weitgehend synonym mit 'Erzählsituation'), sondern – wie im theoretischen Teil II eingehend ausgeführt wird (vgl. 38–49) – als Erzähler- und Figurenperspektive sowie als Perspektive des fiktiven Adressaten vorgenommen werden. Zweitens soll sodann eine "erzähltheoretische Definition des Konzepts der Perspektivenstruktur" (20) erfolgen, bevor drittens deren kulturwissenschaftliche Dimension erläutert wird. Diese Zielsetzungen werden, soviel kann man vorwegnehmen, im vorliegenden Band in methodisch schlüssiger und gedanklich nachvollziehbarer Weise erreicht.

Der theoretische Teil II der Studie ("Entwicklung eines Beschreibungsmodells für die Perspektivenrelationierung in narrativen Texten", 25–129) ist in fünf Kapitel gegliedert. Das erste (26–52) unternimmt eine begriffliche Klärung, die bis zur Verwendung des Begriffs der 'Perspektive' in Naturwissenschaft, bildender Kunst und Philosophie ausholt (30–36). Aufbauend auf Arbeiten aus dem Umkreis ihres Doktorvaters Ansgar Nünning,¹ gebraucht Verf. in der Folge den Begriff der 'Perspektive' nicht mehr im Sinn erzählerischer Vermittlung (vgl. 38–49), sondern gelangt auf der Basis des Kommunikationsmodells von Erzähltexten zu schlüssigen Definitionen der 'Figurenperspektive' (40 f.), der 'Erzählperspektive' (als Beschreibung der "Persönlichkeitsstruktur der Erzählinstanz", 43) und der 'Perspektive des fiktiven Lesers' (45) sowie der Perspektivenstruktur als der Beziehung zwischen den Einzelperspektiven eines Textes. Das zweite Kapitel (53–64) untersucht die Semantisierung quantitativer und qualitativer perspektivischer Relationen. Hier erweisen sich, wie Verf. plausibel darlegt, Annahmen der *Possible Worlds Theory* (PWT) als nützlich, z. B. wenn es um die Beschreibung der Hierarchisierung oder Homogenisierung von Perspektiven geht.

Mit Bezug auf die Parameter kognitiver Narratologie betont Kapitel drei (65–83) die Bedeutung der Rezeptionsebene für die Konstituierung ebenso wie für die Relationierung der Perspektiven von Figuren, Erzähler und fiktivem Leser. Wie deutlich gemacht wird, erfolgt die vollständige 'Realisierung' der Perspektivenstruktur erst während der Lektüre, und zwar durch die Referentialisierung fiktionaler Instanzen mit der Erfahrungswelt des realen Lesers, mit anderen Worten durch die Interaktion des Textes und seiner Darstellungsmittel mit konzeptionellen Rahmen bzw. Interpretationsmustern des Rezipienten. Die Perspektivenstruktur eines Erzähltextes erscheint somit, so Verf., als dynamisches und variables Konstrukt bzw. als "das Resultat eines Zusammenspiels von perspektivesteuernden Merkmalen des Textes und der Konstruktionstätigkeit des Lesers" (84). Folgerichtig erstellt Verf. in Kapitel vier (84–114) einen Katalog textueller Kriterien zur "Erfassung des Perspek-

¹ Vgl. v. a. *Multiperspektivisches Erzählen. Zur Theorie und Geschichte der Perspektivenstruktur im englischen Roman des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Vera und Ansgar Nünning (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2000).

tivenangebots" (84). Spätestens hier erweist sich die strikte Trennung zwischen theoretischem und interpretationspraktischem Teil als ein gewisser Nachteil, denn durch das weitgehende Fehlen von Textbeispielen bleiben die identifizierten Aspekte vorerst sehr abstrakt. Dies ist aber einer der ganz wenigen Vorwürfe, die man dieser Arbeit machen kann.

Das fünfte Kapitel ("Formen und Funktionen der Perspektivenstruktur narrativer Texte", 115–129) unterteilt multiperspektivisches Erzählen je nachdem, "ob die multiperspektivische Auffächerung des Geschehens in einem gleichwertigen Nebeneinander der Wirklichkeitssichten und damit in einer Pluralität der Weltauslegung resultiert oder ob sich durch eine Homogenisierung oder Hierarchisierung der Perspektiven die unterschiedlichen Versionen am Ende doch zu einem eindeutigen Gesamtbild zusammenfügen lassen" (115). Im ersten Fall spricht Verf. von einer "offenen", im zweiten von einer "geschlossenen" Perspektivenstruktur (ebda), im Folgenden Pole eines skalaren Modells (120). Die anschließenden Überlegungen zur Funktion von Perspektivenstrukturen leiten über zum interpretationspraktischen Teil III, wo gezeigt wird, wie Perspektiven und ihre Beziehungen Aufschlüsse über Denkmuster und Wirklichkeitsmodelle der Entstehungszeit von Texten geben können. Verf. untersucht hierzu den Niederschlag 1.) epistemologischer Umwälzungen, 2.) veränderter Bilder von Weiblichkeit und 3.) sich wandelnder Einstellungen zum Imperialismus in der Perspektivenstruktur von zehn Romanen des späteren neunzehnten und frühen zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Hierbei zeigt sich, wie Verf. überzeugend darstellen kann, dass die für den realistischen Roman bis zur Mitte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts typische Bündelung der Einzelperspektiven, laut Verf. "Ausdruck einer überindividuell gültigen Wirklichkeitsordnung" (21), zunehmend der Kontrastierung einzelner Perspektiven weicht.

George Eliots *Middlemarch* (1871/72) eröffnet den Reigen der analysierten Texte. Verf. zeigt sehr anschaulich, wie die bereits weitgehend offene Perspektivenstruktur des Romans einen im späteren neunzehnten Jahrhundert sich verbreitenden epistemologischen Skeptizismus spiegelt und so entscheidend zur 'Modernität' dieses Werkes beiträgt. Allerdings, so Verf., erfolge schließlich doch ein gewisser Ausgleich der Perspektiven im Sinne einer kommunikativen Überwindung egoistischer Positionen (vgl. 156 f.). In Wildes *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890/91) hingegen unterbleibe ein solcher Ausgleich, die perspektivische Offenheit des Romans, einschließlich des Zurücktretens des Erzählers, diene der 'Inszenierung' (ein weiteres Lieblingswort) einer "ästhetizistische[n] Kunst- und Lebensauffassung" (159). Die "innovative Auflösung der Wirklichkeitserfassung in einer Vielzahl unvereinbarer subjektiver Perspektiven" (195) in Conrads *Lord Jim* (1899/1900) stellt laut Verf. einen weiteren Schritt in Richtung einer radikalen Abkehr vom viktorianischen Erzählen dar, wobei die wechselseitige Relativierung der einzelnen, ineinander verschachtelten Perspektiven das vergebliche Bemühen der Perspektiventräger, ein kohärentes Bild der Ereignisse zu gewinnen, versinnbildlicht. Stehe bei Conrad noch die "Relativität von Sinnstiftung" (221) im Vordergrund, so stelle Huxleys Roman *Point Counter Point* (1928), der am Ende dieser ersten Gruppe von Texten behandelt wird, durch seine kontra-

punktische Struktur die Frage, ob Sinnstiftung überhaupt möglich bzw. Wirklichkeit im Roman überhaupt darstellbar ist.

Die hier zwangsläufig äußerst knapp zusammengefassten Ergebnisse der Untersuchung sind im Kern nicht neu, wie auch die umfangreichen Bezüge auf die Sekundärliteratur deutlich machen. Sie erscheinen aber in Surkamps Begrifflichkeit präziser ausgedrückt und im erzähltheoretisch-kulturwissenschaftlichen Zusammenhang schlüssiger dargestellt, als dies bisher der Fall war. Dies gilt auch für die Ausführungen zu perspektivisch vermittelten Weiblichkeitsvorstellungen in Frauenromanen im zweiten Kapitel des praktischen Teils. Behandelt werden Sarah Grands *The Heavenly Twins* (1893), Virginia Woolfs *The Voyage Out* (1915) und Vita Sackville-Wests *All Passion Spent* (1921), allesamt Vertreter der *New Woman novel* der Zeit. Ihre 'feministische' Orientierung spiegelt sich, so Verf., in der Überordnung und entsprechenden Gewichtung einer dezidiert weiblichen auktorialen Erzählinstanz mit zusätzlicher Privilegierung der Sicht 'rebellischer' Frauenfiguren (Grand), der Unvereinbarkeit angepasster und kritischer Perspektiven bezüglich viktorianischer Geschlechternormen (Woolf) und der formalen Emanzipation einer nonkonformen weiblichen Perspektive im Verlauf der Erzählung (Sackville-West).

War es im Fall des Frauenromans die feministische Narratologie, die zahlreiche Anknüpfungspunkte für die vorliegende Studie bot, so ist dies im dritten, dem Kolonialroman gewidmeten Kapitel des praktischen Teils die post-koloniale Narratologie als eine weitere Teildisziplin der neueren literaturwissenschaftlichen Erzähltheorie. Die von der post-kolonialen Narratologie erörterte Frage, wie kolonialistische Konzepte (z. B. Vorstellungen einer rassischen Hierarchie) narrativ generiert und befördert werden, ist insofern von großer Relevanz, als von kulturwissenschaftlichen, und hier v. a. von post-kolonialen theoretischen Positionen die Bedeutung literarischer Texte als Teil des imperialistischen Diskurses betont wird. Zusammenhänge zwischen der Perspektivenstruktur eines Textes und der "Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion imperialistischer Denkweisen im Kolonialroman" (257), speziell von erzählerischer Perspektivierung und der literarischen Konstruktion von Alterität, erscheinen hier von besonderem Interesse. Diesen Zusammenhängen geht Verf. am Beispiel von G. A. Hentys *In Times of Peril* (1881), Kiplings *Kim* (1901) und Forsters *A Passage to India* (1924) nach. Während Hentys Abenteuerroman den Sepoi-Aufstand von 1857 ausschließlich aus britisch-imperialistischer Sicht schildert und indische Perspektiventräger so gut wie keine Rolle spielen, vermittelt in *Kim* ein breiteres Spektrum an Perspektiven (einschließlich der Perspektiven positiv gezeichneter indischer Figuren sowie der Dualität des Protagonisten) Ansätze, imperialistische Denk- und Handlungsweisen in Frage zu stellen. Allerdings – und auch dies spiegelt sich laut Verf. in der Perspektivenstruktur des Romans – werden diese Ansätze nicht ausgeführt, sondern es wird ein harmonisches Bild kolonialer Beziehungen und damit ein positives Bild der britischen Herrschaft gezeichnet. Forsters Roman, so Verf., weise hingegen eine deutlich andere, offenere Perspektivenstruktur auf, die letztlich die Kluft zwischen abendländischen und indischen Wahrnehmungsträgern betont.

Den Eindruck, dass an dieser Studie kaum etwas zu bemängeln ist, kann ein abschließendes Resümee vorbehaltlos bekräftigen. Verf. geht durchwegs überlegt, schlüssig und differenziert vor und ist deutlich (und sehr erfolgreich) um methodische und begriffliche Präzision bemüht. Ziele und Methoden werden immer transparent gemacht, die Orientierung des Lesers wird durch synoptische Kapitelüberschriften und konzise Zusammenfassungen erleichtert. Die Studie bewegt sich durchwegs auf dem aktuellen Stand der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion, ist aber dennoch in einer klaren, unpräntösen Sprache verfasst.² Im Theorieteil besticht die Bandbreite der (ausnahmslos kritisch und bedachtsam) beigezogenen theoretischen Ansätze und die Klarheit und Innovativität der entwickelten Konzepte, im praktischen Teil die umsichtige Anwendung dieser Konzepte im Rahmen erhellender, genaue Textkenntnis demonstrierender Analysen. Auch wenn man sich, wie schon angemerkt, bereits im Theorieteil mehr Textbeispiele wünschen würde, so ist doch die Verklammerung der beiden Teile durch die konsequente Anwendung der im theoretischen Teil entwickelten Kategorien eindrucksvoll gelungen. Eines der wesentlichen Verdienste der Arbeit ist es, dass diachrone Entwicklungen wie z. B. das Zurücktreten einer integrierenden und übergeordneten Erzählerperspektive, die bereits in 'klassischen' Werken der Erzähltheorie (namentlich Stanzels *Theorie des Erzählens*) skizziert werden, mit Hilfe des von Verf. beschriebenen Modells nunmehr präzisiert werden können. Mit der vorliegenden Studie hat Verf. der Erzählforschung zweifellos ein hilfreiches Instrumentarium zur Beschreibung der Zusammenhänge zwischen der formalen und der epistemologischen sowie moralisch-ethischen Dimension eines Erzählwerks in die Hände gegeben.

GRAZ

MARTIN LÖSCHNIGG

Simon J. James. *Unsettled Accounts. Money and Narrative in the Novels of George Gissing*. London: Anthem Press, 2003, ii + 200 pp., € 68,72.

According to a widely held notion, George Gissing (1857–1903) belongs to a group of novelists who responded to the uncertainties of late Victorian society not by retreating into nostalgia and sentimentality but by reacting to the new challenge with determined realism. As English society was transformed by the rise of modern consumer culture, new materials had to be appropriated into a body of literature traditionally bent on mastering fresh experiences by translating them into the languages of fiction. Given the wide range of ideas reflected in Gissing's prose, his intuitive grasp and often bril-

² Weiters hervorzuheben ist in diesem Zusammenhang auch die fast völlige Freiheit von sprachlichen und typographischen Fehlern. Lediglich der Begriff "Kolonisierer" (259, 276, 283; besser: "Kolonisatoren") wäre zu korrigieren.

liant rendering of social change in Victorian society, it comes as a surprise to learn that he is still described by many as a writer of “lesser critical standing” than Henry James or Thomas Hardy.¹

Simon James’ ambitious study seeks to put an end to this lack of academic recognition and to restore to the canon of Victorian fiction the work of one of the most talented but also most controversial of writers. His method is simple yet perfectly adequate to the topic under scrutiny: throughout much of his life Gissing presented himself as preoccupied with the “accursed” issue of money. All his novels are basically studies in social alienation, depicting the circumstances of men and women – often of good education – whose plans are thwarted by financial problems. In no other writer of the period is the presence of money and the hold of commodity relations on modern life so continually apparent, so “insisted on both by the language of the narration and by the shape of the plot.” (1) James’ analysis focuses on the manifold intersections of narrative and money in Gissing’s plots, examining images of circulation, commercial transaction and commodity spectacle in terms of fictional devices all “needed by realist fiction to oil the wheels of its plot mechanics.” (2)

As thus envisaged, the writer’s struggle for money becomes a struggle for textual representation as well. For how can one properly ‘narrativize’ issues such as money or labour which in itself are much too tedious to be even thought about in a work of fiction? As James points out, convincingly, all fictively imagined worlds need economies of some kind – economies which are usually driven by money. Money effectively sets into scene the machinery of the text because it can assume so many different shapes all working to propel forward the motion of the plot. The best example is that of a fortune or inheritance – a narrative device frequently introduced to resolve the accumulated tensions of a text into its (good) ending. Money in this case becomes the site where realism and romance converge in a Victorian novel and undermine the writer’s claim to mimetic accuracy and the analogical relationship of his text to the world ‘as it actually is’. In terms of narrative directedness, money can also be translated into power and commodities, thus obtaining the status of a signifier on which to project formulas of evilness (extravagance, speculation, venality, etc.) or ‘common good’ (thrift, charity, donations, etc.).

For Gissing, these components come to provide a highly lucrative set of narrative tools to express his own distinct attitude towards money and its correct or false use in society. Financial circumstances as represented in his novels translate the mechanic of narrative into a “pseudo-economic form” (6) according to which all accounts can finally be settled for good. The language of money may signify, e.g., the accretion of a moral debt that needs to be repaid at the end. If a debt is not repaid or forgiven, it provides an obstacle to closure, etc. In this manner, financial situations are threaded through all of Gissing’s major novels, suggesting that money is a second ‘text’ beneath the

¹ Bernard Bergonzi, “Late Victorian to Modernist”, *An Outline of English Literature*, ed. Pat Rogers (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982) 360.

first, one that funds the writer's assertions of moral value and finally generates a "balance sheet" of the various characters' "income and expenditure" (7) when their stories end.

In five chapters, all of them convincingly argued, James investigates Gissing's writing with regard to this methodology of narrative 'calculation'. The first one, largely introductory, examines the function of money in the larger context of Victorian debates. In it, James argues that many writers, especially in the last decades of the nineteenth century, recognised the status of their texts as commodity objects and therefore as essential parts of the very transactions of everyday capitalist life they set out to criticise. The moral resistance to financial power, they realised, must by necessity be limited, for the exchangeability of art for money inevitably weakens "culture's social mission to counteract the values of the marketplace." (9) Trollope and Thackeray openly acknowledged their debt to a commercial society increasingly bent on seeing its values reflected in works of fiction; Gissing, however, rejected the marketplace and the obligations it produced for the modern artist. His critique of capital and material value is frequently uncomfortable and often ambivalent, caught as it is between the claims to truth of its own assertions and the medium in which such assertions are made. The artefact itself and its actual object of discourse become highly evasive, for, in addition to being a dubious instrument of public power and influence, money even shares some of the qualities of the medium in which it is portrayed, especially its fictional status: "paper money is a fiction with its roots in the actual – but a fiction nonetheless."²

Lack of money or property constitutes, according to James, the "narratable" (13) in much Victorian fiction. Stories of individual suffering often begin when the protagonists are deprived of what they think is rightfully theirs. They subsequently dramatise the quest for justice and finally re-establish narrative equilibrium by regaining the hero's fortune or winning for him an adequate sum needed to continue his life in decency. In Gissing's novels, however, this pattern is radically transformed to accommodate the bitter experiences of those 'born without a silver spoon in their mouth'. Distinguishing Gissing's fiction from that of Charles Dickens, with which it nonetheless fruitfully interacts in terms of representing financial matters, James consistently describes the late-Victorian writer as one troubled by the shift in the nature of wealth away from "traditionally solid signifiers" (such as, e.g., landed property) towards the more "imaginary" (23) representations of finance. In the second chapter, Gissing's critical writings come in for scrutiny, protesting as they do against Dickens's uncritical ministering to the artistic tastes of the bourgeois public and, more important, providing some kind of index for the monetary issues addressed in Gissing's fiction. James argues, in particular, that one motivation behind Gissing's work is the desire to resist models of narrative closure presented by his idol Dickens. The way in which the latter enables his novels to create moral values "virtually separate from those of the

² John Vernon, *Money and Fiction: Literary Realism in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984) 7.

money-ordered reality” (39) in which they occur is precisely the reason why “Gissing chooses not to be Dickens” (38) and why he decides to rewrite the Victorian novel’s standard plot in terms of a lengthy struggle with material circumstances terminating in denial, defeat or defiance. Gissing, as James puts it, is thus committed to a more sincere and “less providential mimesis” (41) of material reality in which the controversial elements repressed by Dickens might be incorporated.

The third chapter seeks to apply this view to Gissing’s early novels, providing a splendid analysis of a body of work largely forgotten or simply out of print. According to James, Gissing’s primary technique of composition during his earliest phase must be seen in his deliberate attempt at containing the narratable in a manner quite different from that of his precursor Dickens. Novels such as *Workers in the Dawn*, *The Unclassed* and *The Nether World* openly refuse to seek consolation in fictive remedies such as romantic coincidence, patronising benevolence or the legacy and attract the modern reader by their being left tantalisingly incomplete. On the level of plot, they dramatise the failure of idealism in the face of everyday practicalities the worst of which is money and its hold over the individual striving for full development of his abilities. If they happen to have a happy ending – *The Unclassed* is one of the rare instances – this merely signals their own narrative “improbability” (68) since every happy ending in fiction serves to indicate how easily hero and heroine might have ended differently. Although primarily concerned with the issue of poverty, James in this chapter leaves it for the reader to decide if the first signs of ironic overturning of narrative conventions visible in Gissing’s early work can be seen in negative proportion to the constant theme of poverty which, naturally, causes a “functional inertia” (69) that retards the further development of plot and thus inadvertently reinforces the self-interrogative tendencies of the text.

Gissing’s major phase, elucidated in the fourth chapter, is marked by a growing interest in the determining effects upon the educated individual of an upbringing in poverty and the defence of forms of ‘high’ culture against the intrusions of an increasingly vulgar modern world. Lack of money prevents an improved self developed in Gissing’s masterpiece *Born in Exile*, e. g., and deprives the protagonist of any real chance of gaining access to the elitist social stratum he aspires to. *New Grub Street*, Gissing’s most widely-read novel, portrays the sufferings of Fin-de-siècle writers under the pressures of a mechanised literary mass production and their dependence on the commercial standards of the modern literary marketplace. Again, James notes, the problem lies with the novel’s satirising “the very modes of production that have called it into being” (95), a crucial paradox revealing the tendency of much late Victorian fiction to undermine its claims to truth and moral value. Gissing’s critique is pointless: to adhere to realism as a representational mode is to employ “materialism as critique of materialism”³ and thus to end up

³ Patrick Brantlinger, *The Reading Lesson: The Threat of Mass Literacy in Nineteenth-Century British Fiction* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1998) 190.

empty-handed; in order to resolve the contradictions of modernity, an entirely different form of narrative would be needed, one that is more self-consciously aware of the intricate webs of language and convention enfolding the critic of the *condition humaine*. The “literary market lambasted” (97) in *New Grub Street* is thus not strictly a sincere representation – a pattern that re-emerges with striking consistency in the later novels and is interpreted by James, persuasively, as an “increasing willingness” on Gissing’s side to compromise with the market, “garnering more widespread and favourable critical response.” (98)

The relevance of this remark is borne out in the last chapter in which James proceeds to provide an explanation for the more and more frequently employed technique of contradictory and dialogic assertions in Gissing’s prose. False appearances and their growing values as meaningful signifiers in a culture characterised by the display of its material well-being is what the ageing writer continues to attack in his later novels; in addition, his searing critique of the “spectacular, commodified, unreal economy” (127) of Victorian society is extended to include women as well. As James maintains, the “dialogic, self-interrogating structure” (12) of Gissing’s fiction allows women to protest at societal restrictions without entitling them to explore viable alternatives. Perceiving the justice of desiring universal emancipation for women, Gissing is too “instinctively conservative” (124) to question the premises of his own discourse which consistently refuses to account for the possibility of real change. His heroines thus regularly end up in an impasse situation comparable to that of the male protagonists of his early fiction. Again, the disabling factor is (lack of) money along with all the other social disadvantages of a supposedly ‘humble origin’ visibly inscribed into the characters’ outward appearance. For surface appearances have now become an attractive commodity to be traded, reducing the female to a calculable object in a vast structure of economic relations that threaten to subdue her personality and to ‘narrate’ her out of society altogether. Especially *In the Year of Jubilee* and *The Whirlpool*, two fine late novels, demonstrate the threat posed by an uncontrollable modern maelstrom of untruthful signs, misrepresentations and commercial simulacra undermining every effort on the individual’s part to intervene in the capitalist economy. Paradoxically, the ubiquity of commodity exchange is also what makes the characters and their life narratable in the first instance, as James never tires to point out; the same mechanism that works to disrupt the ‘organic’ continuity of English life sets in motion the plot machinery and therefore determines the very instrument of critique writers have at their hands! No wonder that the only resolutions the novels can finally come to at all amount to “non-resolution.”⁴

The chapter ends with some conclusive remarks on imperialism in the later fiction of Gissing, especially in *The Crown of Life* and *The Whirlpool*. As the author maintains, imperialism in the latter is characterised as the “grotesque

⁴ Patricia Comitini, “A Feminist Fantasy: Conflicting Ideologies in *The Odd Women*”, *Studies in the Novel* 27.4 (1995) 529–43: 530.

over-performance of aggressive masculinity” (142), which appears to suggest a well-defined attitude of political opposition on Gissing’s part. It is here that I would like to enter a caveat. Having in mind Gissing’s popular semi-autobiography *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*, published in the year of his death, I cannot really discern a position amounting to dismay of the “resurgence in nationalistic imperialism.” (142) Governing his late prose is not so much a “nostalgia neither narratable nor [...] especially engaging” (147) than a keen sense of belonging to a great nation, a sense of communion, solidarity and institutional success (“... the Englishman [...] is Pharisee absolute with regard to the foreigner. And there he stands, representing an Empire ...”).⁵ Reading the *Private Papers* today, in the light of the ongoing revisionism of empire and national identity, it is almost impossible not to touch on this controversial side of Gissing’s work. As Edward Said has argued in his groundbreaking study *Culture and Imperialism*, we “are at a point in our work when we can no longer ignore empires and the imperial context in our studies.”⁶ And Gissing certainly belonged to those for whom, at the end of the century, the idea of an expanding empire, a community of progress, created illusions of security with regard to the returns that would come to those who invested in this enterprise at a time of international competition, crisis and strife. He seemed to have accepted that if Britain wanted to make its economic future a long-term and profitable concern, it had to cling to the self-assertive and self-confident spirit of Victorian society – “the natural tendencies of English blood”,⁷ as Ryecroft puts it, rather bluntly, in his account of himself. Gissing’s “political quietism” (142) thus appears to be more implicated in the logic of imperialism than commonly recognised – an aspect that deserves more detailed treatment in future studies of Gissing’s work.

Such cautions aside, *Unsettled Accounts* is an important and remarkable book, splendidly documented and rare in its critical understanding of Gissing’s literary achievement. Informed “by different types of Marxist thinking” (35), it admirably engages both material form in fiction and the materiality of literary production itself and thus closes the gap between narratology and Cultural Materialism. Moreover, it re-introduces to our debates on Victorian literature a largely neglected writer, one who responded to domestic changes as well as to the external pressures from the empire and fused these elements to create a true end-of-the-century body of literary work – one that summed up the Victorian era and uneasily contemplated the coming age.

WÜRZBURG

RALPH PORDZIK

⁵ George Gissing, *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*. Introduction by John Stewart Collis (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982) 275.

⁶ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1994) 5.

⁷ Gissing 1982, 136. See also pages 13 ff. and 274 ff.

Gerd Hurm. *Rewriting the Vernacular Mark Twain: The Aesthetics and Politics of Orality in Samuel Clemens's Fiction*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2003, xi + 282 pp., € 28,00.

It is no doubt difficult to find something new to write about Mark Twain and the problem of the vernacular, a topic that has kept critics and readers busy for decades. *Rewriting the Vernacular* set a high goal for itself: not only to present an overview of the past and present discourses on orality and literacy, but also to exemplify these discourses in Clemens's works and combine them with his political, philosophical, and aesthetic views. Only when Hurm justifies the importance of his study by proclaiming that the vernacular paradigm "attributes views on orality to him [Clemens] that he never espoused," (19) the reader feels at a loss. Where would critical theory be, after all, if we only applied those views to writings that the author was conscious of or openly welcomed?

The introduction, designed for readers not yet familiar with the ups and downs of Clemens's reception history, starts out with detailed accounts of the most influential critics and their views, including a concise reiteration of the diverse and often inconsistent reception of Clemens's writings. Hurm shows in detail how each era appropriated one of the most popular American writers as one of theirs (the latest example being postmodern and deconstruction theory which view the use of inconsistencies as a subversive metafictional game). Clemens's fiction, revered by some as the achievement of a great literary mastermind, is regarded by others as uneven, flawed, and often inauthentic. Thus, while *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* was placed at the very top of the literary canon in the second part of the 20th century, it was considered vulgar and racist shortly thereafter, and while notable critics and writers praised Clemens's purification of the English language (T.S. Eliot) and called *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* the starting point of all modern American literature (E. Hemingway), others considered his language inelegant at best, ignorant and rough at worst.

After a rather long summary of critical views on Clemens's use of the vernacular, a densely argued theoretical chapter on the centrality of oral discourses for modernity and modernism follows. What initially is left somewhat in the dark – the relationship between phono-centered and gramma-centered models of orality on the one hand and the relationship between media and modernity on the other – is revealed in the following chapters. Here, Hurm applies current discourses on orality and literacy (from Walter Ong to Jacques Derrida) towards individual readings focusing on Clemens's divergent interpretations of orality in combination with his aesthetic positions. These readings include such well-known works as "Jim Smiley and his Jumping Frog", *The Innocents Abroad* and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as well as such lesser known and often neglected "jewels" as "Cannibalism in the Cars" and "The Great Revolution in Pitcairn". Hurm manages to approach even the most famous works, like "Jim Smiley and his Jumping Frog", from a new and innovative angle. Thus, the tale that has been considered authentic, unmediated folklore and predominately been associated with a frontier storytelling

tradition, Hurm now aligns with “male Bohemian circles of a cultivated, literary west” (77). By painstakingly tracing the diverse accounts of the “Jumping Frog” tale as well as other well-known works (like *Life on the Mississippi*), Hurm throws serious doubt on the long-held notion of Clemens as celebrating an unmediated orality by vernacular speakers. Instead, he establishes the master storyteller’s rather negative stance towards discourses he saw as reflecting the “inertia and repressive mind-set” (80) of traditional oral cultures. Always ready to please both his editors and his readers, Clemens trimmed any folk documents according to his audiences’ expectations. But if it is not the “true” oral impulse which underlies Clemens’s writings, what is it then? With his answer, which he locates both in Clemens’s aesthetic practice (“narratives that showcase authentic yarning are excellent tools to unsettle readers’ expectations and to train them to read narratives attentively” (91–92)) as well as in recent deconstructionist theory, Hurm kicks in open doors. Vernacular simplicity, Hurm writes, “empowers subversion, dislocation, and openness through its integration of oral elements within a literary context” (92). While this answer seems common knowledge among Twain critics, Hurm’s analysis of Clemens’s view of himself as the unchallenged mastermind behind his stories proves truly innovative. “By ventriloquizing a regional voice,” Hurm writes, “Clemens attempts to enhance his own position and produces for the white male intellectual a mask of democratic submission and controlled leadership” (95). Hurm plainly states what an entranced audience might at times wish to forget: that the apparent simplicity behind Clemens’s tales is in reality the literary expertise of a writer pretending to be “one of us”.

The fourth chapter, “Jeremiad Instructions in Independence: *The Innocents Abroad*”, deals with one of Clemens’s most successful works. *The Innocents Abroad* – together with Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* the national bestseller of the 19th century – proved to be Clemens’s literary (and financial) breakthrough. The book is based on Clemens’s own experiences: Working in the travel section of a Californian magazine in 1867, he was asked to accompany roughly 70 well-to-do tourists from the East Coast on a five-months-trip to Europe and the Middle East. Again, Hurm downplays the vernacular style and focuses instead on the “emancipatory discourse of the American jeremiad” (97). This approach, which rightly celebrates the book’s innovative juxtaposition of styles and genres, becomes most convincing in Hurm’s analysis of the reader’s dilemma. The impossibility to judge a certain passage as either straight or ironic implies, Hurm suggests, the empowerment of readers, forcing them to actively participate in finding appropriate ordering mechanisms and patterns of coherence. When Hurm – along with other critics – wonders why Clemens excludes strong and independent women from the “pilgrims’ adventures”, the reason might be quite simple: The exclusion of women further enhances the notion of men’s prankish, schoolboyish behavior, and this in turn serves Clemens as yet another lens in the ironic looking-glass through which he observes his male companions throughout.

The fifth chapter, “Vernacular Laboratory Hoaxes: ‘Cannibalism in the Cars’ and ‘The Great Revolution in Pitcairn’”, is one of the strongest in the

present volume. It deals with two often overlooked narratives that foreshadow several of the themes elaborated on in Clemens's major works and thus bear potential for both Twain and American studies. Both narratives serve to strengthen Hurm's basic thesis that no exclusively positive conception of an oral vernacular culture exists in Clemens's writings. In detailed readings, Hurm demonstrates Clemens's anxieties over the advance of science and the collapse of previously stable categories such as class, culture, and civilization. What rules these narratives are the power of chance, the irrational, and the unpredictable. Neither science nor culture or religion offer any viable alternative to overcoming moral dilemmas. The only means of introducing some stability lies in the (very modern) mode of telling and writing (Hurm calls this "controlled instability"). Both stories possess many traits associated with the vernacular mode common in Clemens's earlier writings (i. e. frame narrative, clash of two styles, close-knit community, introduction of an outsider). Hurm reads "The Great Revolution in Pitcairn", which takes place on the famous island of the Bounty mutiny, as a revisionist satire of South Sea literature. Instead of the tranquil island devoid of petty strife and conflict, Clemens exposes excessive piety and bigotry, gullibility and cowardice; instead of idyllic utopianism, he paints a dark, rather dystopian picture of the abilities of the "common man" and humanity as a whole. While "Cannibalism in the Cars" is an apocalyptic piece that anticipates the breakdown of stability in Clemens's later writings, "The Great Revolution in Pitcairn" is an early account of "a vernacular experiment in primitivism that shows the reluctance on Clemens's side to be concerned with the specific politics and aesthetics of an oral culture" (149). As both the forebodings of Clemens's skeptical nature and a rather gloomy outlook on oral cultures, these stories deserve every line of well-researched observation and innovative thinking that Hurm is willing to give them.

After the chapter, "Interpreting Nature: 'Old Times on the Mississippi'", in which Hurm thoughtfully analyzes the deconstructive mode of a presumably 'natural' and 'homogenous' stability, chapter 7 deals with Clemens's masterpiece, "Adventures of Huckleberry Finn." Under the heading, "The Inconsistent Masterpiece," Hurm both summarizes and elaborates upon his previously stated thesis that the vernacular (in most cases) is not a solely positive, liberatory force or a "quasi-natural, unmediated mode of expression," but instead a "cultural discourse that possesses plural and contrary effects" (182). Thus, Huck's semi-literate, inconsistent narrative is not interpreted as a liberation from the restrictions of printed matter but rather, in a broader sense, as both the medium and the target of Clemens's cultural critique. Hurm's interpretation thereby contradicts both those who see in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* an unquestioned masterpiece as well as those who see the book helplessly marred in gender, class, and race relations.

As examples of Clemens's later period, Hurm interprets the two essays "To the Person Sitting in Darkness" and "Corn-Pone Opinions", both written in 1901. Hurm leaves aside the issue of the vernacular and instead focuses on the pessimism of Clemens's late writings, which he interprets as poses that readers and critics should approach critically. By employing narrative strate-

gies that undermine the surface meaning, both texts throw a different light on the later writings. The gloomy view expressed, for instance, in the “Mysterious Stranger” fragments, where a world made by Satan is utterly deprived of even the minimum degree of freedom, justice, and happiness, are in part foreshadowed in these pieces. The conclusion, “The Aesthetics and Politics of Vernacular Deception”, recapitulates the various forms that the issue of “deception” possesses in Clemens’s writings, focusing in detail on his creation of a simulated oral style. Hurm convincingly reiterates the variety of modes Clemens chose to create the effect of being considered “natural, unconscious, and spontaneous” (238). These poses in particular helped shape the picture of Samuel Langhorne Clemens as Mark Twain, the “most American of American writers”.

Despite the study’s many obvious merits, some problems remain. First, the footnotes are rather opaque at times and leave the reader in desperate need of “private-eye” abilities. When in footnote 10, the author states that “Winfried Fluck has recently argued that . . .” (4) and simply gives a page number at the end of the quote, the reader may take her pick from a wide variety of Fluck’s writings, trying to decide what the author might have considered “recent”. Second, when there’s hardly a sentence (in the theoretical chapters) not followed by a footnote, a remark, or a page number, the reader sometimes yearns for a more “Anglo-American” approach of summarizing critical literature and restricting the number of footnotes in book-length critical writings. Thus, while the present volume is thoroughly researched, the documentation often proves to be a stumbling block in the reader’s unquestioned enjoyment. *Rewriting the Vernacular Mark Twain* gets stronger as it progresses and is strongest in those chapters which deal with Twain’s lesser known fictional pieces and essays. In conclusion, Hurm’s study – an informative, if slightly uneven book – constitutes an important addition to Twain studies. Aside from its practical value as an accumulation of critical voices on the problem of Clemens and orality, Gerd Hurm deserves praise for challenging that part of the “Twain reception history” that all too often overlooked his ambivalent stance, if not outright negative attitude, towards orality and the vernacular.

LÜNEBURG

MARIA MOSS

Pascal Fischer. *Yidishkeyt und Jewishness. Identität in jüdisch-amerikanischer Literatur unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sprache: Cahans Yekl, Lewisohns The Island Within, Roths Call it Sleep, Malamuds The Assistant*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2003, 366 pp., € 40,00.

How does one imagine a world of Jewish Diaspora writing? One way, perhaps the easiest, is to see the literary and aesthetic structures of one culture imported in whole cloth into another. Thus when one reads Yiddish literature written in America during the period of the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries, one would expect a type of literary text written in classic

genres evoking a nostalgia for a lost land. Such nostalgia is, of course, found in the very late work of Shalom Aleichim but it is countered by the overwhelming number of Yiddish writers of the period, such as Shalom Asch and I. J. Singer, whose use of European and American Realism certainly refuses the pitfalls of nostalgia.

But what happens, as Pascal Fischer quires, when such writers shift languages? What happens when their expectations concerning the appropriate language for literary expression change, for the choice of language defines who reads them and whether their readership transcends a "Jewish" readership? Pascal Fischer takes four very different case studies: Abraham Cahan's novel of the streets *Yekl: A Tale of the New York Ghetto* (1896), Ludwig Lewisohn's *The Island Within* (1928), Henry Roth's *Call it Sleep* (1934), and Bernard Malamud's *The Assistant* (1957). All are novels by very different writers with very different relationships to both the Yiddish language and Jewish culture in general.

There are two great caesuras that are represented in the selection of Fischer's works. The first is the Eastern European Jewish Diaspora that arrives in the United States at the close of the nineteenth century overwhelming by sheer numbers the more established (though very much marginalized) German Jews. The second is the post-Holocaust appearance of the Displaced Person, the survivor in a world in which the children of the Eastern European Diaspora were entering into the American middle class. Both took place after the beginning of a notable phase of American anti-Semitism in the 1870s. The German-Jewish banker Joseph Seligman had tried to check into the Saratoga Inn in 1877 and been refused. Because he was a prominent New Yorker, a financier once invited to be U. S. Secretary of the Treasury, Seligman went public about the hotel's refusal, believing there would be a public outcry condemning Hilton. Exactly the opposite occurred. The general consensus was that he should have known his place.

In light of this moment both Cahan (writing from the perspective of a moderate acculturationist Yiddish perspective) and Lewisohn (writing from the perspective of a newly embattled German-Jewish assimilationist) work out their fantasies of the malleability and mutability of Jewish identity in their novels. Roth's novel represents the next generation of assimilated eastern Jews whose anxiety in a world of real, existing anti-Semitism thinks about the Jew as a perpetual outsider. (Henry Ford, Father Coughlin, the KKK, and *The Bund* framed his sense of being Jewish.) After the Holocaust, Bernard Malamud has yet another generation of damaged Jews, now the survivors, to deal with in his American fantasy of Jewish adaptability. Here Malamud's novel is typical of texts of the time from Philip Roth's "Eli, the Fanatic" to I. B. Singer's *A Love Story*.

Fischer's book provides an excellent historical context for this set of conflicts and transformations in American Jewish writing and consciousness. Concise yet detailed his general overview provides a sense of how and why the literary models used had the power. His social approach demands a biographical feature and we are given short biographies of the authors and summaries of the salient novels.

Following this introductory material Fischer focuses on two aspects of the novels (and the world). First, he looks at the construction of identity in the fictional world. Approaching this question through anthropological categories of kinship, religion, education, economic role, geographical and physical location, he is able to show how the “immigrant” novel constitutes its fictional boundaries. Perhaps even more important, he shows how these boundaries are violated to enable those within to enter “America,” for good or for ill.

The final hundred and fifty pages of the dissertation (for Fischer’s book is a revised Würzburg dissertation of some merit) focus on a problem within the literary world that has fascinated me for decades. How do the authors represent the language of the Jews in a Diaspora setting, where there is an automatic contrast between the English of the author and the Yiddish or German or mixed *langue* of the characters? In what language do such characters think so as to make their thoughts available to English-language readers? Using a wide range of sources, from popular spoken records of the time to films and further fictions, Fischer carefully dissects the function of the strands of language in his four novels. Here the novels do really serve as four radically different case studies given their positionality and historicity. He is able to show how each of the authors in each of the texts is able to draw on conventions of the presentations of Jews speaking both in English-language and Yiddish-language traditions to emphasize the inner nature of their constructed Jews.

This is a solid addition to the expanding literature on the presentation of Jews in Jewish writing in the Diaspora. Fischer has made a major contribution to this literature. One hopes that Americanists will pay attention to his substantial theoretical and critical contribution.

CHICAGO

SANDER L. GILMAN