Buchbesprechungen


The editorial policy of the Johns Hopkins edition of The Complete Poetry of Percy Bysshe Shelley was explained and discussed when its first volume was reviewed, together with the second volume of Kelvin Everest’s and Geoffrey Matthew’s The Poems of Shelley (the Longman edition) in ZAA 53 (2005), 92-95. But the major points can be briefly repeated here: Reiman and Freistat present the texts in the versions in which Percy Bysshe Shelley released them, offering variants in the footnotes; they separate text from extensive commentary to arrive at a format that comes close to “the clarity of presentation in which his works appeared to his first readers” (xxx); they distinguish wisely between released “poems” and unreleased “poetry;” and they replicate groupings of texts that Shelley arranged and in a chronological order in which he hoped to issue them.

This policy is especially pertinent with regard to the present volume, since it publishes two works which Shelley, at least in February 1813, wanted to see published together: the one is the sequence of 58 poems that is now known as The Esdaile Notebook (unpublished during Shelley’s lifetime, first published in its entirety in 1964 – here 3-158), the other is Queen Mab; A Philosophical Poem: With Notes, privately printed in 1813, Shelley’s most pirated work and arguably his most widely read work in the nineteenth century – “The Chartists’ bible” (159-312).

This critical edition leaves nothing to be desired. It conforms to the highest standards of editorial scholarship. The circumstances of the composition of both the poems in the Esdaile Notebook and of Queen Mab are already recounted in the “Editorial Overview” (xvii-xxxvi), but given in more detail in the formidable Commentaries (317-490, 491-670, respectively). Due attention is paid to sources and influences, to the varied and complicated history of their (non-)publication, and, finally, to their reception history. All this is based on the latest scholarship, so that this volume offers us not only the definitive edition of these works – it is also a summa, a compendium reflecting the state of the art in Romantic Studies in general and in Shelley studies in particular.

But the editors and their staff have also carried out much original research of their own and made some astonishing discoveries. For example, comparing Shelley’s long passage in French in Note 13 to Queen Mab to the 1781 edition of Holbach’s Système de la nature, which Shelley used, the editors found that Shelley interpolated two passages of his own, in French, smuggled them in, as it were, passing them off as Holbach’s.

Special features of Volume II are the unusual care with which the varied verse forms in the Esdaile Notebook are analyzed; the identification of direct sources for Queen Mab that Shelley does not mention; and full translations of Shelley’s quotations from Greek, Latin, and French. As if this were not enough, Reiman and Freistat also offer a “Historical Collations” section (675-836) that records all verbal variants and significant changes in punctuation and orthography in all historically relevant critical editions of Percy Bysshe Shelley’s poems, viz. the ones by Rossetti, Forman, Woodberry, Hutchin-

The History of the Book has now achieved international recognition as a discipline in its own right, and the essays in this volume reflect the contributors’ experience and confidence in the methods and principles of book history. The volume also looks forward to the future, and in particular to the growing international dimensions of the discipline. Books have always travelled across regional and national boundaries, and it is pleasing to see in this *Companion* a movement away from scholarship that bases itself narrowly on national and regional issues towards a broader international vision.

Jonathan Rose and Simon Eliot’s introduction to the volume is a manifesto for the importance of books, and of book history. Books, they argue, both make and are made by history. The study of any literate society must therefore include the study of the books it produced, distributed, collected, censored and read. Since the creation, production, distribution, collection, censorship and even reading of books is always a collective endeavour of some kind, we must also be prepared to consider the agents, and the relationships between different agents (authors, printers, publishers, editors, lawyers, legislators, readers), in each part of the process. The aim of the *Companion to the History of the Book* is to bring together scholarship on all aspects of the book’s relationship to the wider world in a survey of all historical periods. It is a vast and an ambitious project, but the abundance of subject matter is controlled by a tight and intelligently-conceived structure.

The volume is divided into four parts. The first introduces the variety of methods used by book historians and scholars from other associated disciplines, such as textual scholarship and bibliography, and includes chapters on the uses of statistical method and the study of readers. Part Two (which constitutes the bulk of the volume) focuses on the history of the material text, dealing with an extremely wide chronological and geographical range of material. This section starts with two chapters that discuss the world before the invention of the codex, followed by six chapters dealing with the history of the book beyond the Western world, and finishes with eighteen chapters on the codex in the West from 400-2000 AD. Part Two nicely demonstrates the scope of the volume as a whole, discussing not only the history of the book itself, but the cultures surrounding its production, movement and consumption, from the manuscript culture.
of the medieval period to the global markets of the late twentieth century. Part Three places the book in relation to other forms of textual production: periodicals, ephemera and new textual technologies, and Part Four considers wider issues, such as literacy, art, censorship, copyright and the role of libraries. Angus Phillips’s Coda to the volume considers the future of the book in the digital age. All the chapters are unified by a focus on the text or the book as a material object. In this volume, as Eliot and Rose put it, “the text always takes an embodied form” (3).

The major strength of *A Companion to the History of the Book* is its synthesis of extremely diverse material; nonetheless there are individual contributions that are worthy of mention. Eleanor Robson’s essay on the clay tablet book provides a fascinating introduction to the intellectual culture of the ancient Middle East. The chapters by Emile G.L. Schrijver on the Hebraic book, and Michael Albin on the Islamic book, are both wide-ranging and informative. The description of the industrialization of the book by Rob Banham will be invaluable to those interested in changing methods of book production, while Claire Squires’s chapter on consumers in the global market 1970-2000, and Stephen Colclough’s, on the historical reader, will be relevant to anyone with an interest in book consumption. Rowan Watson’s exposition of non-textual uses for the book, which includes sections on the book as ornament, status symbol, relic, talisman, ritual object and more, also sheds new light on the consumption of books. Patricia Crain’s discussion of histories of literacy is a helpful addition to the body of work on the subject, and highlights ongoing difficulties in defining and measuring literacy. The chapters in the section entitled ‘beyond the book’ are a salutary reminder about the prevalence of other textual forms throughout history, and Martin Andrews on ephemera is particularly enjoyable, as he includes relevant, and often beautiful, illustrations. John Feather’s section on copyright and literary property provides a very helpful summary of a complex topic. It is also worth noting that the index is comprehensive and easy to use.

As a whole, the volume draws our attention to the importance of the material text, in its various shapes and forms, over five millennia. Much of the material considered in this volume will be unfamiliar or new, even to experts in book history. The chapters on the book beyond the West, and the world beyond the codex in particular, add substantially to our knowledge of cultures and practices largely ignored by the Western academy. Those chapters dealing with more familiar territory summarise useful information and the main arguments and issues lucidly and helpfully. Indeed, *A Companion to the History of the Book* is distinguished by a constant attention to clarity of expression. Contributors are careful to explain their terms, and to avoid unnecessary jargon. The considerable learning distilled in these pages is worn lightly, and the result is a volume that will appeal to experts and non-specialists alike. It will also prove to be a valuable teaching resource.

Katie Halsey (London)


Parrinder’s *Nation & Novel* is a plot-based survey of hundreds of English novels, from the beginnings of English fiction, which Parrinder dates to Sir Thomas Malory’s *Morte...*
With this definition and with his book in general, Parrinder self-consciously contributes to the discursive field of Englishness. Hence, before he sets out on his *tour de force*, he needs to explain what the connection between nation and the novel – the “&” of his title – and specifically, between the English nation and the English novel, is. However, while obviously aware of constructivist approaches to concepts of nationhood and national identity – at least the bibliographical materials provided for each chapter include Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* (1983) as well as Homi Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture* (1994) – the first chapter of *Nation & Novel*, which purports to explore the links between national identity and fiction, signally fails to critically engage with these approaches. As a result, and in spite of Parrinder’s distinction between ‘national character’ and ‘national identity,’ the ‘unfashionable’ first a fairly static and circumscribed notion of what ‘the English’ are ‘really’ like, the second a more fluid and historically variable sense of what it is like to be ‘English,’ the epistemological status of ‘Englishness’ remains uncertain: on the one hand, Parrinder claims that “the history of the English novel reveals […] a changing sense of what it is to be English” (29); on the other hand, there does seem to be a kind of core identity which can be labelled ‘English,’ as distinct from British or, for that matter, European, and which can be traced through more than five centuries of literary representations of English society.

By and large, Parrinder seems to incline towards the latter of these two positions. It is thus hardly surprising that the overwhelming impression which *Nation & Novel* creates is that of a continuity of fictional forms, preferred settings, and historical (or perhaps historic) divisions in English society, across the centuries. A case in point is the opposition between Cavaliers and Puritans, which Parrinder finds not only in its actual historical context, that of the English Civil War, but in as late, or belated, a novel as Kingsley Amis’s *Take a Girl Like You* of 1960, which, according to Parrinder, is a “self-conscious rewriting of the Richardsonian novel of seduction” (408). Another example of continuity is the persistence of English myths such as that of Dick Whittington: although Parrinder concedes that this myth has, like others, undergone transformations, it still appears to be remarkably intact when it emerges in novels of immigration, for instance in V. S. Naipaul’s *The Enigma of Arrival*.

On the whole, Parrinder’s choice of authors is orthodox, that is, he remains within the English canon, as “before 1950 the work of canonization has largely been done” (5). He is, however, selective not only with regard to fictional genres, but more strikingly with regard to modern and contemporary fiction: there are some notable absences, from Peter Ackroyd to Adam Thorpe, from A.S. Byatt to John Fowles, and from Malcolm Bradbury to David Lodge, to name only a few of those authors who are either merely referred to in passing or else not mentioned at all. One could probably quibble with virtually every single one of Parrinder’s readings, some of which are distantly partisan, but it is difficult to deny that *Nation & Novel* is eminently readable, with a useful bibliography and bio-bibliographical sketches of over 200 novelists.

At the same time, Parrinder’s book is seriously flawed. Thus, for instance, he comments on another Naipaul novel as follows: “It is not only English novelists [the reference here is once again to Kingsley Amis’s *Take a Girl Like You*, SM] writing about
English characters who feel the urge to rewrite the English tradition. V. S. Naipaul's *Guerrillas* (1975), for example, portrays a modern Heathcliff who – having taken a writing course and studied *Wuthering Heights* – sets up a Caribbean agricultural commune which he names Thrushcross Grange.” (408) The operative word, in this quotation, is “rewrite,” which to anyone familiar with post-colonial theory resonates with phrases like “The Empire Writes Back,” that is, has come to refer to strategies through which writers like Naipaul dismantle the binarism of (English) centre and (in the case of *Guerrillas*, Caribbean) margin by the complementary processes of abrogation and appropriation. Hence, while Amis and Naipaul may well both “rewrite the English tradition,” they do so, arguably, from within that tradition and from without it, respectively – unless, of course, this “English tradition” has, in its turn, appropriated Naipaul.

However, one does not have to proceed to Parrinder’s final chapter to realise that his book is not merely free of jargon such as “complementary processes of abrogation and appropriation” (which might, after all, be a blessing), but also of any sustained effort to take on board the critical theories which employ this kind of terminology: as has already been demonstrated for Anderson and Bhabha, these theories are, quite literally, relegated to the margins of Parrinder’s purely descriptive text. In this respect – that is, in its empiricism – *Nation & Novel* is, curiously, as ‘English’ as its subject matter.

*Silvia Mergenthal (Konstanz)*


Mary Wortley Montagu (1689-1762) was one of the most illustrious women in the first half of the eighteenth century – society lady and wit, adventurer and defender of the feminine cause, nonconformist and self-righteous aristocrat, as well as accomplished letter-writer and a minor figure in English literature. As Isobel Grundy puts it in her biography *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (1999), “she has been celebrated since her own day as a letter writer, as a traveller to the east, and as the introducer to the west of inoculation against small-pox. She has been notorious as an enemy or victim of the poet Pope. Now, belatedly, she is coming into her reputation as a writer” (xvii). Montagu’s letters and selected literary pieces have been intermittently published in various editions in England since her death to the present day. A number of *Lives* appeared during the twentieth century (Paston 1907, Melville 1925, Berry 1928, Gibbs 1949). The ‘late reputation’ began in 1956, starting with an authoritative biography by Robert Halsband (*The Life of LMWM*), followed by his edition of the *Complete Letters* in 1965-67. It was consolidated by Halsband’s pupil Isobel Grundy, who edited *Essays and Poems* and *Simplicity a Comedy* (1977 and 1993), *Romance Writings* (1996) and a Penguin book of *Selected Letters* (1997), along with her new biography. In addition, Clare Brant introduced an Everyman book of *Letters* (1992) and Malcolm Jack edited *The Turkish Embassy Letters* in a separate volume (1994). In Germany, after 1945, *Briefe aus dem Orient* were published in 1962, 1967, 1982, 1991 and 2006.

Until now, Montagu has been a blind spot in German secondary literature (with the exception of a short appreciation by Arno Schmidt, 1994). For this reason, the new, German, *Life of Lady Mary* fills a true void. Gentsch, who was an audacious editor of Western literatures in Leipzig publishing houses for many years, has an intimate
knowledge of eighteenth-century culture. He has been diligent in scrutinizing Montagü’s letters and literary output, along with English biographical research. He was certainly the right person to write a ground-breaking and novel biography of her extraordinary personality. What he offers us, is not a stringent academic study, but rather a ‘literary’ documentary (including citation and name indexes of Montagü’s life and times which sets out to entertain as well as to instruct the reader).

Gentsch paints a vivid picture of the triumphs and disasters of the protagonist’s life, of her aristocratic background, her unconventional marriage, her travels, exile and return to England, her contested role in the world of ‘men-of-letters,’ her friendship and vituperative battles with Pope, her passionate love affair with bisexual Francesco Algarotti, her self-conscious feminine position and her criticism of the inequities of marriage law. Gentsch’s narration heavily relies on Montagü’s letters, which very often speak for the biographer himself. The plethora of quotations gives authenticity to the discourse, besides providing many-faceted insights into Lady Mary’s sharp-minded and sharp-tongued style and thoughts. The overall effect, however, is slightly dampening. The biographical story is only diffusely outlined. Moreover, strangely enough, the surplus of citations seems to bar the biographer from properly entering into the discussion of the secret world of Montagü’s psyche, emotions and mentality. Questions of sexuality, for instance, are suppressed. It is a very literary portrait of Lady Mary. In a luxurious way, however, Gentsch allows himself extended interludes of historical, local, social, political, geographical, and cultural (literary, musical, architectural) information. At many points, the biography broadens into a cultural history.

Every biography is a narrative, inevitably tied to the bias of the biographer’s position. Gentsch’s portrait is compelling evidence of the suggestion that the ‘desire’ of the biographical writer becomes a subject in itself. In the face of this condition sine qua non, it is at his discretion to fix the limits of the blending of fact with fiction. But inevitably, his style will be personal and susceptible to subjective peculiarities and eccentricities. Thus, Gentsch’s consistent use of the present tense when describing the past is a bit confusing. In many cases, his foible for tangled sentences, adjectival attributes and far-fetched allusions has a slightly mannered touch. The long-winded title can hardly be said to be irresistibly appealing to a potential readership. But these are minor, and perhaps too subjective, points of criticism. Taken as a whole, Gentsch’s book is a major contribution to the expanding market for literary biographies in the German-speaking countries and to English Studies. His portrait of a Lady brings a remarkable personality to life and is absorbing to read.

Wolfgang Wicht (Krauthausen)


This is a book about John Keats’s afterlife, about the ways in which nineteenth-century poets and painters constructed various versions of ‘Keats’ (both man and work), so that the net result of these interpretive acts of creative reception and appropriation was a “Multiple Keats” (2) – appropriate, I think, for the man who famously claimed that a poet has no identity, no self. Understandably, more often than not these different versions
of ‘Keats’ say more about the age that produced them than about their purported sub-
ject – a fact even acknowledged by scholars who are less constructivist than Wooton is.

Chapter 1 traces elegiac engagements with Keats, beginning, of course, with P.B. Shelley’s “Adonais,” followed by Robert Browning’s “Popularity,” Christina Rossetti’s “On Keats,” Alice Meynell’s “On Keats’s Grave,” Swinburne’s “In Sepulcrets,” Oscar Wilde’s “The Grave of Keats,” “Endymion,” and “The Garden of Eros,” and, finally, Thomas Hardy’s “At the Pyramid of Cestius Near the Graves of Shelley and Keats.” All these poems – except for Shelley’s – plus four more, including Tony Harrison’s marvellous “A Kumquat for John Keats,” are given in the 11 appendices (146-70), which, together with an extensive bibliography (199-210) and a helpful index (211-5), round off the volume.

Wooton is very critical of Shelley’s “egotistic elegy” (9) and of other poets who seem to have appropriated Keats for their own ends, but there is a triple problem here: To begin with, Shelley was the first to admit that he had been “carried too far by the enthusiasm of the moment,” obviously projecting his own plight on the dead poet-
friend; second, it is the characteristic function of the elegy as a genre to console the mourning and reconcile them with the fact of the death of the departed – generically, elegies are acts of appropriation and rites that serve the living, rather than the dead; third, Wooton’s indignation seems to stand in contradiction to her premiss that there is no original, no ‘real’ John Keats, and that all we have is a series of interpretive acts. If that is so – and I tend to agree – then we do not have an objective gauge to measure which appropriation is more adequate than another. Wooton’s examples of what she sees as less dominating engagements with the dead Keats only prove that they are closer to her idea of Keats.

Chapter 2 interprets the most famous pictorial representations of scenes from Keats’s narrative poetry by Pre-Raphaelite painters (who significantly focussed on The Eve of St. Agnes and Isabella; or, the Pot of Basil), and Wooton’s readings are fittingly accom-
panied by black-and-white reproductions of these paintings and drawings. This is, of course, well-covered ground. The John Keats of the Victorians is largely a PRB con-
struct. But Wooton has an interesting tale to tell: “The first interpretations of these narratives depicted the rebellion of women fleeing from patriarchal ownership into the arms of romantic love, a representation of Keats’s discourse that is rendered even more controversial by the Victorian preoccupation with gender spheres and feminine sub-
mission. Yet the same female characters in paintings of the 1860s reflect the male artist’s compulsive display of women in sexualised positions, an endorsement of patriarchy and a testament to the increasing polarisation of gender roles during this period” (76-7). This shift coincides with the increased acceptance and commercial success of the PRB. It is here, in this centrepiece of her study, that Wooton’s play on the different mean-
ings of ‘consumption’/‘consuming’ (TB, consuming passions, consumption as a sexual and as an economic phenomenon) is most convincing (it hardly figures in the second half of the book). But it is curious that a writer who sees phallic symbols almost every-
where (but no vaginas or vulvas, only “wombs” – an almost Victorian displacement), a writer who identifies the PRB as a “homosocial group” (79) and dead Keats as part of a “homoerotic triangle” (92), should sound so censorious when confronted with the open female eroticism of Millais’s The Eve of St. Agnes (“Millais’s Madeline is effec-
tively the victim of a gang-rape,” 69). Yes, it is undeniably the male gaze that defines this female eroticism. But after all, Keats’s poem does have very sensuous passages, and
it is discernibly told from an exclusively male point of view, a mode that Millais successfully replicates.

Chapter 2 excludes Dante Gabriel Rossetti, who is given a chapter of his own (3), but in spite of its brevity, Wooton does not always escape the danger of losing sight of her subject, because she is more interested in Rossetti’s relationship with Thomas Hall Cain (it is with these two that dead Keats forms a “homoerotic triangle”). Paradoxically, Keats is “desexualised within an overtly homoerotic discourse” (69) (which is in itself remarkable), although then again “Rossetti becomes the passive receptor of the predecessor’s insertor” (106).

In the last chapter, the axis of inquiry is shifted once more – we have moved from literary genre to art, then to one single artist’s engagement with Keats, now there is a thematic approach. Wooton analyses depictions of “La Belle Dame Sans Merci” by Waterhouse, Dicksee, Flint, three by Jessie Marion King, and a late one (1926) by Frank Cadogan Cowper, and she finds an interesting evolution from (scarce) “Victorian images of ‘La Belle Dame’ predominantly reproducing a misogynist discourse that controls and inhibits the female subject” (108) to “the materialisation of a strong, bold and forceful female sexuality gaining social credence” (139) at the beginning of the Modern period (this culminates in Cowper’s depiction of a knight who is, to all intents and purposes, dead, and a triumphantly towering Belle Dame who, apparently unconcerned, does her hair). Although Wooton posits that the power of Keats’s Belle Dame character resides in her very indeterminacy, she nevertheless seems to like this clear outcome very much. Cowper’s painting adorns the dustcover jacket of Wooton’s monograph. Another appropriation, I suppose.

In the Introduction, Wooton says, “this is the first interdisciplinary study to concentrate on the creative legacy of Keats’s work” (11). This is a strong claim, and it has to be taken with a grain of salt, I’m afraid. Of course, Wooton can base her work on previous ones, like George H. Ford’s Keats and the Victorians (1962), Joseph A. Kestner’s Masculinities in Victorian Painting (1995), and, most notably, James Najarian’s Victorian Keats (2002), not to forget innumerable articles on Keats and the Pre-Raphaelites. Regrettably, her study is not always free from jargon, and as the strangely obligatory second-hand Bakhtin is thrown in, it is not always clear who said what. Surely, the term “(M)other” (6) is not an original Russian coinage? But the text suggests it is one of Bakhtin’s key concepts. There are some sweeping generalisations, for example: “The Belle Dame has invariably been regarded as a version of Robert Graves’s White Goddess” (109). Invariably? Or, referring to lines 105-20 of Keats’s Isabella: “These stanzas are generally quoted as a critique of capitalism” (53). Generally? Sometimes an ambiguous grammatical reference creates more gender confusion than is intended, for example: “Approaching Keats as a transvestite as opposed to a transsexual, Anne Mellor describes him as a poet who [...]” (7).

When Wooton concludes, “The network of artistic interpretations generated by the subject combine [sic] to formulate what we experience as Keats. Ultimately, representation constitutes that which is represented” (145), I, for one, can only concur. Only that sometimes along the way the author herself seems to have forgotten that this is so, and that this is all we have. This is the only game in town, as Stanley Fish once remarked. Still, a fine and thought-provoking study.

Christoph Bode (München)


Conrad biography is a notoriously difficult terrain. Working on what was to become *A Personal Record* (1912) Conrad wrote to Sidney Colvin that he thought he was “not a personage for an orderly biography, either auto or otherwise” (Jean-Aubry: 1927, ii, 92-3). While this was certainly one of Conrad’s ubiquitous and almost habitual self-deprecatory remarks, the idea itself may be seen to contain a grain of truth. It is not without reason that more than one biographer has ascribed to Conrad more than one life, among others, Frederick Karl in *Joseph Conrad: The Three Lives* (1979) and John Stape in *The Several Lives of Joseph Conrad* (2007).

In the final third of the eighteenth century, Poland had been partitioned three times, and the spoils had been divided amongst Russia, Prussia and Austria. Despite great efforts to re-gain its political freedom and independence, Poland did not reappear on the map of Europe until the end of World War One. Joseph Conrad was born Jósef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski in the Russian-dominated Ukraine, 3 December 1857, the only son of Apollo Korzeniowski, a poet and translator, and Eva, née Bobrowska, who were ardently patriotic members of the Polish szlachta (i.e. landowning nobility). In 1861 Apollo Korzeniowski was arrested for anti-Russian conspiracy, and in 1862 the family was exiled to Vologda (Russia). After his parents’ early deaths, hastened by the deprivations of exile, young Konrad was adopted by his maternal uncle, Tadeusz Bobrowski (1829-94). At the age of seventeen, he left Poland for Marseilles to join the French merchant navy (and to evade military service in the Russian army). As he had been taught French since he was a small child, this first move from one culture to another was not as difficult as his second one in 1878, when he joined his first British ship and had to learn English from scratch. He passed the first mate’s examination in 1884, became a naturalised British subject and passed the master’s examination in 1886; three years later he was released from the status of Russian subject. In 1890 he secured a three-year appointment as officer on a steamboat on the Congo, but returned prematurely after six months because of severe illness. After further voyages from Britain to Australia and back he ended his sea career on 17 January 1894.

A year later his first novel, *Almayer’s Folly* (1895) was published; the master mariner had become a writer who, over the next three decades, was to publish fifteen novels (including two in collaboration with Ford Madox Ford), twenty-eight novellas and tales, and two volumes of memories and reminiscences. Characteristically, his artistic credo appeared in an obscure letter to the editor of the *New York Times* ‘Saturday Review’ (2 August 1901): “Fiction, at the point of development at which it has arrived, demands from the writer a spirit of scrupulous abnegation. The only legitimate basis of creative work lies in the courageous recognition of all the irreconcilable antagonisms that make our life so enigmatic, so burdensome, so fascinating, so dangerous – so full of hope. They exist! And this is the only fundamental truth of fiction” (*Letters*, 2: 348-9).
In his lucid lecture “On Conrad Biography as a Fine Art” John Stape distinguishes between three “generations” of Conrad biographers (The Conradian 32.2 [2007]). In the first group he includes the early memoirs and biographies of people who had known Conrad personally (as, for example, his wife Jessie Conrad, Ford Madox Ford, Richard Curle and G. Jean-Aubry). The second group was the result of a re-evaluation of Conrad’s works after World War II. (The critics mainly responsible for this critical reassessment were F.R. Leavis in England and Morton Dauwen Zabel in the US.) To this group belonged, amongst others, the first academically serious life-cum-works biography by Jocelyn Baines (1960), the results of Norman Sherry’s detective work (1966, 1970), the first psychoanalytically oriented biography by Bernard Meyer (1968) and the memoirs by Conrad’s sons Borys (1970) and John (1981). The third group begins with the seminal scholarly works by Frederick Karl (1979) and, above all, Zdzisław Najder (1981 in Polish, English translation in 1983). The latter gave space and thought to Conrad’s Polish cultural and political background as no other book had done before. These two were complemented by biographies by, amongst others, Cedric Watts (with a focus on Conrad’s “literary life”, 1989), Jeffrey Meyers (1991), John Batchelor (1994) and, finally, Claudine Lesage (2003 [in French]) who explored Conrad’s relations to the Continent. This last group greatly benefited from the availability of Conrad’s letters, which were successively published in nine volumes by Laurence Davies et al. (1983-2007).

Given this wealth of material one may be allowed to ask “what next?” Is there anything new to be discovered? Have new sources been unearthed? And if these questions can be answered in the affirmative, do the new facts merit new Conrad biographies? Reading the three books under discussion the answer must be a straightforward “yes.” On the one hand, to give just two examples, the end of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe has made new archival material (particularly relevant to Conrad’s Polish background) available for scrutiny, while the disclosure of the censuses (of England and Wales) between 1841 and 1901 has allowed more specified research into the social context of Conrad’s life on land during his seafaring years. On the other hand, as every generation needs a new reading of Conrad’s (or any other writer’s) works, so every generation appears to be in need of its new batch of biographies. The reason for this simply is the shifting perspective(s) of the reader(s) which demand(s) a re-ordering of the available facts and, as a result, a re-orientation of the readership.

Najder’s book is a thoroughly updated and revised version of his Conrad biography of 1983. According to the preface, “about one quarter [of the book] is new” (vii), but as in the earlier version, Najder’s forte is not only Conrad’s Polish background but Conrad’s Polish perspective which describes and ‘translates’ attitudes, mental states as well as cultural norms and values (as they appear, for example, in Conrad’s letters) unfamiliar to non-Polish readers. Najder’s motto is that “the proper study of the biographer is a study of culture” (ix), and although he claims to do no more than “document the facts of Konrad Korzeniowski’s – Joseph Conrad’s – life as we know them today and examine the available data” (viii), he gives his readers more than that, namely a cultural biography which is anything but “dispassionate” (ix) and combines great respect for its object with a candid appraisal of its enigmas, idiosyncrasies and contradictions.

Stape’s highly readable book ideally complements Najder’s because it provides a British perspective. Stape’s approach is, in intention and execution, even more matter-of-fact than Najder’s, but although it may be at times somewhat arid, the book is a convincing synthesis of already established and new original research. While Conrad
tended to ascribe to himself two lives (*homo duplex*: Pole and Englishman) or three (Polish youth, sailor, author), Stape correctly opts for Conrad as *homo multiplex*, adding other selves such as spouse, father and friend (13). Stape avowedly aimed at brevity (cf. 12), but his book is densely packed with useful information and the non-specialist reader may ask himself whether he needs a particular bit and, if so, what he needs it for, if there is no follow-up argument. One example must suffice: In July 1920 Lawrence Holt of the Ocean Steam Ship Company (Liverpool) asked Conrad to write a “Memoandum on the Scheme for Fitting Out a Sailing Ship” for a five-mast bark the company intended to build for the training of cadets (375). Conrad readily complied with this request but we do not learn from Stape’s book what effect the memorandum had (if any).

Comparing the two books one can find one or two odd contradictions. Again one example must suffice. Although Najder and Stape politely acknowledge their debts to each other, Najder still contends that both, Conrad and his wife, “came from Catholic families” (223; cf. also Schenkel, 139), while Stape just mentions Conrad’s denominational allegiance (152). In his lecture (*The Conradian* 32.2 [2007] 65), however, he convincingly argues that Jessie Conrad was a Protestant. This may be a minor matter (and a quite recent find), but it sheds some light on the reason why the Conrads opted for a civil ceremony only.

Schenkel’s book is something different altogether. His approach is not chronological but topical. In a series of essays which circle around, for example, Conrad’s languages, philosophical views, relationships to women, etc., Schenkel creates a network of impressions which enable him (and his readers) to imaginally ‘construct’ Conrad, the writer and his work. Many of Schenkel’s speculations are extremely intriguing. For example, he suggests, that when Conrad travelled to Poland in the summer of July 1914 he passed through Berlin, where he could have met Kafka, if the latter, on his return from the Baltic Sea to Prague, had not just passed through the city but stayed for a day or two. I immediately thought that we know of Thomas Mann’s appreciation of Conrad’s *The Secret Agent* (cf. Schenkel, 338-40) but given Conrad’s strong affinity with French writers, would not Heinrich Mann be the one who might have been even more interested in (or have something more in common with) Conrad? It is this way of encouraging the reader to start reflections of his (or her) own that makes Schenkel’s book so valuable. It is true that not all of his ideas are equally suggestive but on the whole the book makes fascinating reading.

*Jürgen Kramer* (Dortmund)


In her rather unwieldy dissertation, Gabriele Hußmann concentrates on a topic widely ignored in recent studies of contemporary British fiction. She analyses the construction of identity in working-class novels, focusing on women authors like Pat Barker, Livi Michael, Agnes Owens, Andrea Levy, Joanna Traynor and Laura Hird.

The scope of this work is large. Hußmann positions her analysis at the interface of literary and cultural studies, incorporating approaches from various disciplines such as psychology (Keupp), philosophy (Baudrillard), cultural studies (A. Assmann), sociol-
ogy (Bourdieu), etc. She draws on historical and sociological material in order to define her subject matter. To establish a theoretical frame, she discusses constructivist approaches which she parallels with neurophysiological theories, thus drawing attention to the constructed nature of our knowledge of reality and the self. Starting from the assumption that identity is determined by gender and influenced by the integration into processes of production, the author also considers theories of the feminine (Beauvoir, Rich, Butler) and concepts of work (Marx, Sennett, Gorz). She then attempts a synthesis of the two thematic strands in a short passage that draws on the findings of Richard Hoggart (*Uses of Literacy*, 1957) and Joanna Bourke (*Working-class Cultures*, 1994) concerning class-specific gender roles.

In her readings Hußmann investigates whether the novels in question depict a particularly female way of constructing identity and considers the role that class and different forms of work play in this process. She establishes politics, class consciousness, local community, ethnicity, religion, leisure, social relations and the body as fields where the protagonists are to construct their identity. Since most of them fail to do so, she proclaims the existence of a so-called “zero-identity” as a result of the marginalisation of the protagonists and their limited options.

After an informative account of the critically underrated tradition of female working-class authors, Hußmann claims that her thesis fills a gap, especially as it concentrates on relatively unknown authors such as Owens, Hird and Traynor. At the same time, she ignores current critical writing on the topic such as John Kirk (*Twentieth-Century Writing*, 2003), the elucidating essays on Barker’s early novels or Sharon Monteith’s publications (*Pat Barker*, 2001; *Critical Perspectives*, 2005) on the same author. Furthermore, Hußmann has difficulties applying her extremely heterogeneous theoretical approach to the novels. She often blurs the boundary between cultural analysis and literary text, as she does not clearly differentiate between fictitious narratives and non-fictional texts. Accounts of social phenomena repeatedly serve as an explanation for fictional representations of working-class life and vice versa, thus obscuring the actual subject of the study, which, according to the title, is working-class novels. Important questions also arise with regard to the methodological frame. Hoggart’s study is based to some extent on his childhood experiences in the 1930s, and it seems at least dubious to apply its concepts to novels set in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Moreover, Hoggart’s work has been criticised for its biased essentialism by female critics like Beatrix Campbell (*Wigan Pier Revisited*, 1984), whom Hußmann quotes without paying attention to these observations. Andrew Tolson (*Limits of Masculinity*, 1977), Paul Willis (*Learning to Labour*, 1977) and Beverley Skeggs (*Formations of Class and Gender*, 1997) provide more recent studies that examine gender roles and their dependence on social position.

This dissertation gives an overview of a wide range of theoretical approaches and offers insight into an impressive number of thematic aspects in the writings of women authors from a working-class background. However, in its attempt to synthesise too much disparate material it ultimately lacks a clear focus and does justice neither to the novels nor to their social and political implications.

Beate Rudlof (Rostock)

From Tocqueville on, US culture has interested the European observer as a model of modernity. While definitions of the modern are disparate, theories tend to assume progressive secularization. Herein lies the intriguing paradox of American modernity. The United States is hardly marked by increasing secularization. On the contrary, public and private life are rather deeply interwoven with the religious. This discrepancy between theoretical modernity and actual US conditions can, in the worst case scenario, lead to eye rolling about American oddity or, in the best case scenario, to the serious investigation of the religious dimensions in contemporary American life.

Birgit Högn’s dissertation *Alttestamentliche Frauengestalten in US-amerikanischen Romanen von Autorinnen seit 1990* offers an example of the best case scenario. Her focus is a seemingly narrow one: novelistic adaptations of Old Testament material in US-American women’s writing of the last decade. This concentration, however, allows Högn to place her analyses in contexts that include, but also go beyond conservative evangelical discourses. For large segments of the Christian Right, the Bible is an unerring text, neither to be questioned, nor modified. Högn, however, traces modifications which in various ways aim to supplement and potentially question the representations of women’s lives offered in the scriptures.

Adrienne Rich’s concept of ‘re-vision’ as a looking back with new eyes offers Högn her primary theoretical framework. The revision model enables Högn to work at the interstices of literary and cultural studies as well as theology. Moreover, the approach allows for a consideration of identity and gender that foregrounds classical feminist concerns swept under the carpet of recent academic and political agendas. Against such trends, Högn insists on the power of alternative histories as a means for working through female self-definition and life models as part of a “lived religiosity” (38).

An exploration of the alternative models which female authors articulate via revision is the aim of the study. Högn lays the foundation for individual readings in two introductory sections. Part one sketches the very broad cultural contexts important for the novels that are analyzed as well as the paradigms guiding the author’s analytical perspective: most prominently, feminist hermeneutics and Wolfgang Iser’s reception theory as well as the narratological model of Gérard Genette. In part two, Högn outlines the initial vision of femininity in the Old Testament that is revised in the textual examples analyzed in the third and central section of the study before concluding with a summary and a consideration of further consequences in parts four and five.

The novels are grouped according to the roles accorded their protagonists: witnesses, king makers, bearers of female culture. The real strength of the text corpus lies in the fact that the revisions considered are part of a broad cultural, religious spectrum. While Jean Shaw’s *Job’s Wife* (1990) is clearly located within conservative evangelical culture, Yael Lotan’s *Avishag* (2002) is manifestly critical of this culture’s conceptions of feminity. Both works, however, are revisions which Högn examines with an eye to their intended function as well as to the role of narrative structure in their transformation of Biblical pre-text. The readings of Anita Diamant’s *The Red Tent* (1997), India Edghill’s *Queenmaker* (1999), Angela E. Hunt’s *The Shadow Woman* (2002) and Brenda Ray’s *The Midwife’s Song* are equally careful in this regard.
Given the nuanced consideration of revision, the presentation of the initial vision seems oversimplified. Are all representations of female figures in the Old Testament one-dimensional, as Högn asserts (34)? The example of Ruth seems at odds with this estimation, as Julia Kristeva’s lengthy analysis of the figure in *Strangers to Ourselves* (1991) suggests. Högn’s assertion is, however, characteristic of a study that strives for clear structures throughout: an approach which generates patterns that make the readings occasionally read like routines composed according to a checklist and that on occasion produces overly long summaries of argumentative preliminaries.

However, such quibbles regarding structure do no detract from what the book has to offer. Although the author primarily sees her book as a contribution to the study of the Bible and literature, this dissertation has a great deal to offer for the Americanist scholar. Högn moves from a simple reiteration of religion’s importance for the study of North American culture to a thoughtful consideration of specific contexts and practices. In so doing, she familiarizes us with texts and discourses outside the paradigms dominating the study of American literature abroad. The novels considered neither fall within the range of the traditional canon, nor are they centered around questions of ethnicity, diversity and diaspora. One hopes that many further studies will follow this promising, horizon-expanding beginning.

*Mary Ann Snyder-Körber* (Berlin)


For the past twenty years or so, scholars in the humanities and social sciences have explored the phenomenon of diaspora with ever increasing theoretical and methodological sophistication. Sudesh Mishra’s *Diaspora Criticism* provides both an extensive metacommentary and a sustained critique of that genre of interdisciplinary cultural theory from its inception in the mid-1980s to the present. Thanks to Mishra’s rigorous typology of the prolific material, the argument and the architecture of his book are ingeniously (but also deceptively) simple: For Mishra, ‘diaspora criticism’ has developed three distinct though overlapping ‘scenes’ (rather than phases), with each ‘scene’ implementing its own idiosyncratic paradigm of diaspora. Accordingly, the bulk of the book comprises three main chapters, commenting on representative statements by prominent diasporists. Thus the “scene of dual territoriality,” gleaned from the works of Robin Cohen and William Safran among others, assumes a configuration of “three apparently stable entities – a homeland, a hostland and an ethnically unified diaspora” (27). In such linear, fixed and bipolar positionality between a supposedly stable ‘here’ (hostland) and an equally stable ‘there’ (homeland), diasporas emerge as “deracinated ethnonational entities” (61) located in-between allegedly given ‘nations’ and ‘cultures.’ It is precisely this rigidity that the proponents of the “scene of situational laterality” put into question. Drawing on the works of Paul Gilroy, Homi Bhabha, James Clifford and others, Mishra delineates how preference shifts from the insistence on dual territoriality to a celebration of the in-between as such. The effect of this shift is a reconceptualisation of the diasporic condition now deemed “to break up structured unities and pre-given stabilities” (83) in favour of liminal, hyphenated forms of social existence that cannot be circumscribed within the paradigms of ethnicity or nation. Identity is hence no longer negotiated through the tension between historically specific homelands and
In that sense, as Mishra wryly observes, the diasporic is taken “to represent the late modern subject” as such (146) – at the price of getting stripped of all its concrete specificities. It is here that the third of Mishra’s ‘scenes’ – the “scene of archival specificity” – intervenes as a corrective as it were: Introducing a “realist turn” (101) to diaspora studies, such scholars as Pankaj Mishra or Khalid Koser dismiss the generalist paradigms of the first two trends and opt, instead, for a particularist approach. Here, the stress falls on the ways in which diasporic groups, past or present, concretely articulate “political, economic, spatial, sociological, and (more broadly) historical factors” (119). Instead of positing diasporas as homogeneous collectives or as theoretical ideal types, this approach rigorously analyses the internal contradictions and multiple subject positions within diasporic communities.

Mishra’s discussion of the three ‘scenes’ is lucid, nuanced and highly sophisticated. Also, it is driven by his own critical agenda which finds its full explication only in the fourth main chapter, “The Three Pillars of Diaspora Criticism.” It is here that Mishra lets his cat out of the bag and frontally addresses what he considers the crucial shortcomings of diaspora criticism so far: Even though most diaspora critics routinely invoke ‘global capitalism’ as the determining force that gives rise and shape to contemporary migration and displacement, their analyses, Mishra complains, remain largely culturalist. As long as diaspora criticism fails to seriously “elaborate on the relationship between globalisation, transnationalism and modern forms of social dispersal” (147), any reflection on the material contexts of contemporary diasporas will not only remain vaguely impressionistic but, indeed, prone to overrate diasporic modes of self-fashioning. Thus, Mishra argues, the “transnational moment is invoked by diasporists as a mantra […] for expiating on the hybrid texture of diaspora aesthetics” (155). In his call for a systematic study of “the triadic interaction among social formations, cultural effects and brute economic processes” (154), Mishra obviously tries to encourage a fourth ‘scene’ of diasporic criticism, one that he himself might choose to christen the ‘scene of non-culturalist differentiation.’ In the field of diaspora studies, nothing would be more desirable than such a turn.

Dirk Wiemann (Tübingen)


In recent years Star Trek, one of the most successful products of popular culture world-wide, has increasingly become part of academic discourse. Numerous dissertations now deal with this popular TV-series and its various off-springs. Generally, Star Trek is described as a cultural phenomenon influencing everyday life in terms of idioms (‘Beam me up, Scottie’) and the sciences in terms of ideas for research. Christian Wenger is also concerned with Star Trek’s cultural significance but limits his perspective to the series’s fans. By bringing together aspects of culture, community and identity, he wants to analyse today’s society of ‘late modernity’ (7) in which the construction of identity has become increasingly difficult. Wenger uses a cultural studies approach which looks at how fans use the commercial product Star Trek for their own needs and make sense of their reality through participation. Coming from the field of sociology, he is particu-
larly interested in the series’s influence on the individual fan’s life-world and, more specifically, in the construction of identities and the formation of social groups.

The book starts with a general discussion of identity construction and group formation, and how this process is influenced by popular culture and consumers’ appropriations of popular media in fan-cultures (44-65). Wenger then continues to explain his methodological approach of ethnographical life-world analysis by means of questionnaires in detail. His basic strategy being ‘participatory observation’ (“teilnehmende Beobachtung,” 80), he went to Trek-Dinners over a period of two years and visited two Conventions. Additionally, he analysed fanzines and internet-forums, and drew upon a total of 817 questionnaires (95). The major part of the book is dedicated to the description of the ‘Star Trek Universe’ (ch. 4), starting with an overview and the history of Star Trek, followed by his various experiences of fan culture at Trek-Dinners and Conventions, with clubs and fanzines.

Wenger suggests that the text Star Trek is used as a shared cultural resource. It serves not only to make sense of the individual fan’s life-world but also as a reference point, i.e. shared experience, inside the fan-community, making it easier for the individual fan to come into contact with other fans. The values that are transmitted in the series, a utopian society living in peace and harmony, seemingly without racism or crime, are also an integral part of the value system of the fan community. All fans are treated the same no matter what their background is. However, Wenger’s conclusion shows that the values and attitudes in Star Trek’s fan community seem to be more like a myth (278). Individual fans use the community’s assumed support to fend off stereotyping tendencies from non-fans and to integrate fandom into their own identity (284f).

In this sociological analysis, Wenger had to undertake a large-scale survey of the life-world of Star Trek fans, evaluating a vast amount of data and immersing himself into the culture of fandom. This book is valuable for anyone who wants to do similar field-research, especially in its very detailed and elaborate description of the methodology: how he constructed his questionnaire (appended at the end), how he got into contact with fans, and also how he had to revise his earlier assumptions. For the cultural studies scholar the section on appropriating media presents a good overview. For anyone interested in Star Trek, Wenger presents an insightful look at the opinions and feelings of fans towards ‘their’ series that helps to explain the series’s global impact.

However, the book is flawed by many typing errors, it seems that the PhD-thesis went into print without revision. Wenger frequently uses terms that are specific to sociology without explaining them to readers from other disciplines, e.g. “Varimax-Rotation” (138) or “schiefwinklige Rotation” (153). Additionally, there would have been potential for streamlining the argument. A particularly unfortunate error occurs twice when he uses the wrong abbreviation to indicate from which franchise he quotes: the text says “TOS” (The Original Series) where it should be “DS9” (Deep Space Nine) (106 and 317). After spending so much time with Trek-Fans, he should be aware of the importance of such detail.

Katja Bay (Freiburg)
The volume was advertised in the Morning Chronicle of September 18 as well as several other leading periodicals. However, the reviews were negative and highly critical, primarily focusing on Elizabeth’s poems. One critic dismissed the collection as examples of nonsensical rhyme, whilst the British Critic review described the collection as filled up by songs of sentimental nonsense, and very absurd tales of horror.

The first American edition of Shelley’s complete poetry since 1892—with more poems, fragments, and collations than any previous collective edition. About the Author. Donald H. Reiman is the co-editor of Shelley and his Circle, a catalogue edition of relevant manuscripts in the Carl H. Pforzheimer Collection at the New York Public Library, and an adjunct professor of English at the University of Delaware. Neil Fraistat is a professor of English at the University of Maryland. [The poems which follow appeared, with a few exceptions, either in the volumes published from time to time by Shelley himself, or in the Posthumous Poems of 1824, or in the Poetical Works of 1839, of which a second and enlarged edition was published by Mrs. Shelley in the same year. A few made their first appearance in some fugitive publication such as Leigh Hunt’s Literary Pocket-Book and were subsequently incorporated in the collective editions. In every case the editio princeps and (where this is The life and works of Percy Bysshe Shelley exemplify English Romanticism in both its extremes of joyous ecstasy and brooding despair. Romanticism’s major influence on Shelley is the year of the Terror in France. Percy Bysshe Shelley (the Bysshe from his grandfather, a peer of the realm) was the son of Timothy and Elizabeth Shelley. As the elder son among one brother, John, and four sisters, Elizabeth, Mary, Margaret, and Hellen, Percy stood in line not only to inherit his grandfather’s considerable estate but also to sit in Parliament one day. In his position as oldest male child, young Percy was beloved and admired by his sisters, his parents, and even the servants in his early reign as young lord of Field Place, the family home near Horsham,