

REVIEWS

Jill Bradley. *'You Shall Surely Not Die': The Concepts of Sin and Death as Expressed in the Manuscript Art of Northwestern Europe, c.800–1200.* Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008. 2 vols. Pp. 727. €150.00.

Jill Bradley's accomplished study focuses on the iconographic depiction of sin and death in the artwork of medieval manuscripts produced in transalpine Europe, focusing on what is now France, Germany, the Low Countries and England from the Carolingian period to the aftermath of the Third Crusade. Concentrating on images of the Fall and the depiction and personification of death, Bradley considers how the twin concepts of sin and death were presented, defined, and recognised during the period of c. 800–1200, and seeks to uncover the context and changes in attitudes which may account for the development of this type of iconography during this four-hundred year span. The strength of this comprehensive — indeed occasionally exhaustive — study is largely due to its innovative approach, as Bradley considers the relationship between text, image and social attitudes in order to examine the extent to which iconographic evidence can reveal contemporary social beliefs.

In the brief Introduction Bradley outlines her methodology. She acknowledges the limitations of her study, confronting the potential problems raised by attempting to access social and mental attitudes of the past through visual sources which, by their very nature, are open to a range of interpretations. In light of this judicious acknowledgement, Bradley asserts that her approach demonstrates that manuscript art is reflective of 'the ideas, attitudes and opinions of a relatively small group of people in each period' (2), and that such images are not without bias or agenda: 'visual representation, to a certain extent, is propaganda' (3). She goes on to emphasise the importance of the relationship between text and image and states that in their manuscript context, illuminations 'must be regarded less as a subtext and more as a parallel text' that provide an 'insight into the mentality of the makers' (4). Thus, the images under examination should be understood as a reflection of the attitudes of the society which used and produced them and any iconographic developments should be regarded as significant of mental shifts in attitude. In order to substantiate this premise in exact terms, Bradley also explains the systematic approach she undertook to gauge the prevalence and importance of the depiction of the Fall and the theme of death in the wide range of manuscript art produced during the period under discussion. Using the information provided in the Princeton Index of Christian Art housed in Utrecht University, Bradley measures the

frequency of images of the Fall in relation to such other popular subjects as the Crucifixion and Last Judgement, as depicted in the visual arts of each of the centuries under discussion, and from the same geographical catchment areas. This method enables Bradley to determine that the Fall in relation to the themes of sin and death was more prevalent in the manuscript art produced at certain times and in certain specific regions; information which allows Bradley to group the miniatures into the specific clusters which form the topic of each of the opening four chapters. Although the Introduction clearly explains the methodology used to generate these groups of images, its brevity means that a reader with no background in art history may well be at a loss regarding the methods of execution and stylistic analysis of the miniatures which form the basis of the detailed discussion which follows.

The overall structure of the work is chronological: Chapters One and Two discuss Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon manuscript art respectively, while the argument in Chapters Three and Four is not so governed by geographical region. Chapter Three focuses on the late eleventh to early twelfth century, and Chapter Four on the late twelfth century, culminating in the year 1200 when ‘the personification of the eschatological death made way for the development of that of the physical death’ (4). Each of these chapters follows the same basic outline and begins with a broad description of historical context and the general conditions of the period under consideration. This examination of social and religious attitudes is consistently examined in the light of written evidence that reflects contemporary views of sin and death, including liturgical texts, annals and chronicles, and poetry. Each chapter then moves on to discuss specific examples of manuscript art, commencing with an outline of what Bradley considers to be the ‘basic type’ (5) of iconography used to depict the Fall with regards to each period. Each subsequent illumination discussed is measured against this ‘basic type’, which perhaps begs the question as to whether such a paradigmatic, iconographic template actually exists. Indeed, as Bradley herself points out, the only occasion where a single illumination can be seen to embody this ‘basic type’ is the Genesis frontispiece of the Vivian bible (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Lat. 1, f. 10v), analysed in Chapter One. In spite of the questions raised by this rather reductive taxonomy, it does allow Bradley to classify the iconographic features specific to each period. This information is particularly helpful as it not only serves to heighten how the choice of illuminations under discussion may deviate from this norm, but also enables Bradley to account for these emendations in contextual, iconographic, and political terms. Bradley concludes each chapter with a discussion of the personification of death

in manuscript art, pointing out the main iconographic types which signify death — most notably the *super aspidem* motif derived from Psalm 90 (91) — with a view to how these images relate to the depiction of sin and the Fall.

Her discussion in Chapter One is particularly noteworthy for its reading of images of the Fall as reflective of the themes of loyalty and disobedience to one's lord in a religious as well as a political context, in light of the instabilities that dogged the reign of Charles the Bald. The discussion of the personification of death in Chapter Three is also impressive, particularly in its description of the *super aspidem* motif in the high middle ages, whereby the Psalmist's vision of an asp and/or a basilisk is frequently depicted as a defeated dragon under the foot of the triumphant Christ. Chapter Five consolidates Bradley's earlier conclusions drawn from manuscript art through a consideration of contemporary sculptural evidence. This chapter is particularly rich, as sculpture can perhaps more reasonably sustain Bradley's claim that the iconographic types reflect widely held beliefs as, unlike manuscript illumination, the iconographic programmes of later medieval ecclesiastical sculpture were conceived with a wider audience in mind. Indeed, Bradley raises a number of pertinent questions regarding the prominence of this more public form of iconography, particularly with regards to its place within a church milieu.

Although this study must be applauded for providing illustrations of all of the artwork discussed, some of these images are reproduced on such a small scale that the reader is unable to examine them in a manner which would do justice to Bradley's thorough analysis. Perhaps fewer but larger images, or a selection of details, would have been more beneficial and would certainly strengthen Bradley's analysis, as some of the finer points of the illustrations as discussed by Bradley cannot be seen clearly in the plates. In spite of this emphasis on illustrative breadth, as opposed to depth, the strength of Bradley's approach lies in the fact that she does not consider the illustrations in isolation but views them in the light of other miniatures, both from the same manuscript and in other texts from the same period, as well as considering their relation to a variety of written sources. This serves to reinforce Bradley's argument, particularly when the visual evidence under discussion could be seen to be open to a number of interpretations, and thus helps Bradley to persuade her readers, who are often not able to judge for themselves as the accompanying illustrations are so small.

Bradley's study covers an impressive range of artwork across a number of mediums and opens up new vistas as to how we might consider the symbiotic relationship between a succession of medieval

societies and the visual arts. The sheer number of illustrations is testament to the breadth of this ambitious work, notwithstanding the restriction of Bradley's discussion to a series of specific geographical contexts. Indeed, this allows her to observe the gradual developments in iconography and social attitudes with greater specificity, while also providing a sense of cohesion and structure to the work. In spite of some minor lapses, such as a scattering of typographical errors and rather inadequate referencing in a few instances — such as the overly general discussion of Anglo–Saxon Penitentials (145) — Bradley's extremely thorough investigation prioritises the important symbiosis between text, image and society and, in so doing, yields a wealth of fresh insight into medieval attitudes toward sin and death.

Natalie Jones

James Robert Allard. *Romanticism, Medicine, and the Poet's Body.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. Pp. 166. £50.00

The purpose of James Robert Allard's monograph is to explore 'the complexities and possibilities, the anxiety and the promise, of the interconnections between poetry and medicine' in the Romantic period (5). Despite a stated challenge to 'periodicity', and apart from some rather sketchily related medical contexts from the eighteenth century, the coverage is very firmly in line with an early–nineteenth-century Romantic time span, from the preface to *Lyrical Ballads* to the mid-century 'late Romanticism' of *Death's Jest Book*. This is an important and suggestive brief, and the many affinities and tensions between contemporary medical thinking and the Romantic 'science of feelings' can hardly be denied. However, there are many problems with this frustrating piece of work. Regarding overall argument, the first and most limiting defect is an over-emphasis on what Allard calls medicine's 'rhetoric of legitimacy' (there are over a dozen reiterations of this phrase in the first fifty or so pages of the book: thereafter I lost count). In the run through 'Romantic medicine' which constitutes the first section, all discussion of (often very different) medical theories is re-routed to the issue of medicine's disciplinary and professional authority, its 'position of almost absolute power and proprietorship over the body and even the body politic' (141), as the author finally claims. Of course, this Foucauldian aspect is important in the medical thinking and practice of the period, but it is not the only feature worth discussing, nor is it so monolithically powerful as is claimed here. The continual

return to questions of authority also means important distinctions and doubts in medical theory and culture are overridden, and critical concerns are overlooked. Most obviously, the book's coverage of mind–body relations is severely deficient. Although the author jumps at any opportunity to demonstrate a 'body consciousness' (another over-employed phrase) in the texts at hand, very little is said of psyche's relation to soma. This relationship was central to a period when many medical debates and models (vitalism, nervous irritability, Idealism–influenced German medical thinking) sought to address and reconcile it; indeed, when the word *psychosomatic* was coined in English (by Coleridge, who is given very short shrift here). There is a brief nod near the end of the book to 'nineteenth-century medical culture's treatment of the soul (uneasy with the notion of its existence yet unable to deny the possibility)' (114), but it would not be unfair to characterise the depiction of medical culture as, in a literal sense, mindless.

There are positive things to be drawn from this study: it makes good use of some original sources, such as students' notes drawn from William Hunter's lectures, and is generally better when it turns to specific authors in the second half — although an extraordinary sidestep is made to justify the inclusion of John Thelwall and Thomas Lovell Beddoes as poets, 'even if the works I treat here are a novel and a play, respectively' (4). The second part begins with Wordsworth's intention (stated in the preface to *Lyrical Ballads*) to 'keep the Reader in the company of flesh and blood', although analysis is ultimately limited to the rather bald and obvious point that the body is invoked here. Indeed, this is often repeated as a conclusive fact, rather than as the starting point for more subtle arguments, and is sometimes asserted in the face of the evidence that the author produces to illustrate his argument. For example, the psychosomatic interaction suggested by Wordsworth's emphasis on the kinetic qualities of thought, 'the motions of their own minds', is overlooked, as is the contradictory depreciation of the body in the passage later quoted from 'Tintern Abbey' ('when we are laid asleep In body... We see into the life of things'). Generally in *Romanticism, Medicine, and the Poet's Body*, the reading of the texts used (especially poetry) is simplistic, insensitive to nuances or gradations of metaphor. The book is also too content to conflate important distinctions: any discussion of the material world is taken to automatically imply the somatic. This weakens the section on Joanna Baillie and her 'Introductory Discourse' to *Plays on the Passions*, where all reference to physical realities (such as the space of the theatre) is taken to be necessarily foregrounding the body and 'embodying' the text. A better chapter on John Thelwall provides a sensible discussion of the role of the

‘political physician’ and a reading of Thelwall’s *The Peripatetic* against his treatise on *Animal Vitality*, but even the most plausible argument, that ‘the public and political sphere he moves in is dominated largely by body language and the language of bodies’ (84), is never really convincingly substantiated or developed further. The chapter on Keats usefully addresses the role of the poet’s medical training in shaping his public image, especially in the infamous periodical attack by ‘Z’; there is also a sporadically interesting discussion of the body in ‘Hyperion’ and ‘The Fall of Hyperion’. In both these chapters promising avenues are closed down, however, by a return to questions of medical authority and the totting up of language implying (however slenderly) representations of the body. The last chapter, on Thomas Lovell Beddoes, is probably the most successful, as it pays closest attention to textual detail and the contradictory impulses of Beddoes’ literary–medical career and thought.

A final (and fatal) problem with *Romanticism, Medicine, and the Poet’s Body* is its awkward and congested style. The book declares its intent to put the ‘the body at the crux of literary Romanticism and medical discourse’ and claims that it ‘interrogates the division of knowledge and periodicity in Medicine and Literature, even as it increases our understandings [sic] of both’ (1); the torturous metaphors deployed here are unfortunately all too apt for its prose. Important sections, such as that concluding the first half of the book (59), are derailed by awkward expressions such as ‘ways of means’ (an error?), and key distinctions are often fudged; everything is ‘both’, ‘at once’, or ‘even as’. Several times the text quoted is glossed ‘in other words’, and then turned around to suit the argument. For a scholar so concerned with the ‘rhetoric of legitimacy’, Allard is curiously blind to his own.

The book is also poorly presented, for which Ashgate, a usually reliable publisher, must take some editorial responsibility. Other reviewers have noted errors in punctuation (quotation marks replacing possessive apostrophes, etc.) and uneven formatting of notes. To this list of complaints I would add an irritatingly abbreviated citation style (e.g. Nicholas Roe’s *John Keats and the Culture of Dissent* is referred to as ‘Roe, John’) and a list of spelling errors in names, which may be far from complete: the real name of ‘Barry Cornwall’ was Bryan Procter, not Proctor (87), the biographer of Thomas Lovell Beddoes was H. W. Donner, not H. L. Donner (passim), and there are several instances of ‘Romanticism’ in the bibliography. All of this suggests a book on an important subject that could and should have been much more carefully thought out and executed.

James Whitehead

Angelia Poon. *Enacting Englishness in the Victorian Period: Colonialism and the Politics of Performance.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Pp. 184. £49.50.

Enacting Englishness is a well-theorised study of the role of literature in the performance of Englishness. It will fit usefully with works which examine the internal fragmentation of Englishness within Victorian England, and with other studies of English identity. Angelia Poon focuses upon fragments of Englishness, emphasising that Englishness is never only events or single performances of even performativities, but rather ongoing battles and negotiations for voice, for space on stage, and of a varying act for different audiences.

Angelia Poon examines the performance of Englishness as an elemental accoutrement of British colonialism. She is alert to theoretical issues of national identity and selfhood, stating that ideas of national identity are ‘more easily felt than described, and more susceptible to recognition in the breach and the negative’ (2). She is also observant of the importance of the distinction between English and British identity. She states her intention to ‘specifically locate Englishness in terms of textual performance and performativity’ (2), and presents an assured theoretical foundation from authorities including Benedict Anderson, Judith Butler, Edward Said, Michel Foucault and David Cannadine. Raymond Williams’ ‘structures of feeling’ are also applied to the concept of Englishness, seeing Englishness as patterns of interlocking “‘forms of practice and social and mental habits” just at or beneath the threshold of awareness and often accompanied by a strategic elision of historicity’ (6).

In her introduction, Poon stresses the notion of performance and renewability of identity. She refers to the theoretical areas of hybridity, space and performative subjectivity, and related discursive constructions of embodiment, as ways of explaining the mutating nature of Englishness. The key literary figures on whom she focuses include Charlotte Brontë, Harriet Martineau, Charles Dickens and H. Rider Haggard. Poon devotes a chapter to discussing *Jane Eyre* alongside Victorian conduct literature. In this chapter, ‘English Homebodies: the Politics of Spectacle and Domesticity in...Conduct Literature and *Jane Eyre*’, Poon compares *Jane Eyre* with the ‘foreign, racialized woman’ whose ‘too prominent visibility’ was troubling for Victorian society (37). *Jane Eyre* is small, plain, industrious, and inconspicuous, and in this view *Jane Eyre* is the English Homebody, contrasted with the spectacle of the idle, exoticised foreign woman. Poon draws out instances in which the paleness of *Jane* is contrasted with the darkness of the opposing

women in the novel, Bertha Mason of course, but also Mrs Reed and John Reed who have ‘dark and opaque’ skin. There are many interesting examples provided from conduct literature of the period, including that of Charlotte Elizabeth’s, *The Wrongs of Woman* (1844). Elizabeth feels that a working–class revolt can be stalled by the domestic duties of women: ‘the quiet home, the clean–swept hearth, the industrious wife, and many prattling children that hailed [the man’s] return’ will ‘reconcile him to his lot’ (26). Poon further highlights the fundamental contradiction within conduct literature: if domesticity was so instinctive and intrinsic to women why do they need to be taught it at such length? Poon also refers to Dickens’ satire of the artificial nature of conduct literature in *Our Mutual Friend*. *Jane Eyre* though is no typical English homebody, she is far too defiant to be such a role model, and as Poon states *Jane Eyre* ‘could not...be more ostensibly different from the essentially conservative politics of mid–century Victorian conduct literature’ (34). Poon presents the conflictual nature of this novel, which ebbs and flows between rebellion and conformity, and she refers to the anxious reviews of the novel by Sarah Stickney Ellis and Elizabeth Rigby in which *Jane Eyre* is seen as heralding the downfall of England. Yet, as with much of the work of Charlotte Brontë, there is a failure to escape convention: ‘*Jane Eyre* proceeds in single–minded fashion towards the triple attainment of romantic marriage, family, and middle class domesticity’ (35). Poon suggests that the ending of *Jane Eyre* sees Eyre take on the mantle of English Homebody, and she points out that the final page of the novel can be seen as presenting the two mainstays of colonial life: the wife at home, and the missionary at work. These are entertaining ideas, and raise some new viewpoints regarding the novel, but I think that there are more versions of Englishness at work here. My main disagreement with Poon’s discussion relates to the idea that Blanche Ingram is also racialised as an exotic foreign woman, in comparison with Jane’s ‘true’ Englishness. Although Poon refers to ‘competing Englishnesses’, which there certainly were, she lists these as ‘constellated around race/whiteness, moral feeling, righteous behaviour, God fearing Christianity, heritage and beliefs in empire’ (6), whereas there were many more divergences and competing discourses of Englishness taking place at this time, within as well as outside England, between different internal socio–geographic groups, for instance. However, Poon is analysing the concept of Englishness from a colonial viewpoint, and as such the further intricacies and complications of English identity cannot be included or expanded upon.

A further chapter in the book recounts the performance of Englishness by Mary Seacole, the Jamaican born ‘doctress’ who worked

with Florence Nightingale. Chapter 3 concerns Emily Eden and Harriet Martineau and their accounts of British rule in India. Martineau's work, *British Rule in India* (1857) attempts to explain India's rebelliousness as a result of a colossal misunderstanding rather than as a revolt against foreign external control. Emily Eden, from a more upper-class background, published *Up the Country*, which is a collection of letters to her sister, in 1866. Eden is more disdainful of British rule and sees the problems of control as emerging from too much attention being accorded to the cash-nexus. However, she explains the rebelliousness as a result of careless disregard for the Indian landscape. Chapter 4 centres on Dickens and the policing of the English body. Poon investigates Dickens' later views of the savage, as shown in the novel *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*, and in his article *The Noble Savage* published in *Household Words* (11 June, 1853). In the article, Dickens denounces the English public's sentimental celebration of the noble savage as a symbol of the pre-industrial age, but Dickens' racializing of the savage assumes a great gulf between the 'civilized European' and the 'barbarous Africans'. Poon argues that Dickens actively cultivates a sense of nostalgia in his novels and that his writing can seem disarmingly innocent (99). Poon refers to D.A. Miller's *The Novel and the Police* (1988), a Foucauldian study of Victorian novel and social control as an impetus for us to critically rethink the impression of innocence that Dickens' writing tends to convey. Chapter 5 focuses upon the concept of renewing Englishness, and presents Henry Rider Haggard's *Allan Quatermain* (1887). Here, Poon shows the imperial fantasies and the politics of reproducing Englishness via the enactment of English masculinity and the repetition of hegemonic norms and ideals. She also provides examples from Rudyard Kipling's *The Man who would be King*. Poon disputes that 'invocations of hybridity are performances which are invariably sited' as she explains how Englishness can change but retain its hegemony and adapt to different circumstances (9).

Having explored Englishness from a colonial point of view, Poon sums up by reminding us that Englishness is an activity, a performance rather than an attribute (153), and that 'performing Englishness was an intrinsic part of colonial expansion and imperial domination, involving strategies of representation which harnessed the normalizing and naturalizing force of the form to its internal motivating desires' (153). She refers to Judith Butler's theories of performativity and is concerned to 'understand how Englishness is produced or rather reduced to essence in order to privilege a particular arrangement of power relations'. Poon does not ignore the essentialist perspective of Englishness, and emphasises that in essentialist epistemology and the ensuing nostalgia

‘nations are commonly imagined as *original* communities, the ghost of a purer past frequently haunts the performance of Englishness, which in order to succeed as “authentic” must provide a clear sense of temporal succession and continuity’ (154). She looks beyond the Victorian enactment of Englishness to consider enactments of Englishness since the loss of empire, which she states ‘have been variously marked by melancholia, provincialism, a self-conscious sense of decline and nostalgia’ (155).

Jane Mansfield

Anna Barton. *Tennyson’s Name: Identity and Responsibility in the Poetry of Alfred Lord Tennyson.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Pp. 174. £50.00.

Tennyson once related that he was able to achieve ‘a kind of waking trance’ by repeating his name over to himself. Anna Barton’s study, part of Ashgate’s excellent Nineteenth Century Series, proposes that a deep sensitivity to the multiple resonances of names and naming is evinced throughout Tennyson’s work. This, she suggests, goes along with Tennyson’s growing awareness and embrace of his own name and its importance to his poetry in the variety of forms (from ‘A. Tennyson’ to ‘Alfred Lord Tennyson, D.C.L., Poet Laureate’) in which it appeared in print. On this principal claim, Barton is persuasive. The relation between Tennyson’s conception of names and the terms of the book’s subtitle, however, is not always apparent. Much of Barton’s study is usefully concerned with ‘Identity and Responsibility’, themes which allow her to range widely through Tennyson’s work. Her close readings yield consistently valuable insights. Often, though, these appear only tangentially related to her central thesis, and there is too much reliance on a dubious kind of word-play (‘making a name for himself’, ‘in name only’, ‘living up to his name’) to provide coherence.

The argument is at its most cogent in the first chapter. Here Barton compares the change in approach to authorial identity between *Poems by Two Brothers*, the volume Alfred published anonymously with his brother Charles in 1827, and *Poems, Chiefly Lyrical* (1830), the first volume to which he attached his name. The earlier volume attempts an artful display of immaturity in the manner of the young Tennyson’s hero, Byron. But whereas Byron in his first collection, *Hours of Idleness* (1807), was concerned to fashion a reputation by striking a pose, Barton suggests the identity of the Tennyson brothers remains shadowy,

betraying a lack of confidence in their productions. This strategy of concealment gives way to an assertion of the poet's authority over the named subjects of his creations in *Poems, Chiefly Lyrical*.

Inheritances were a vexed issue for Tennyson: his father's disinheritance by his grandfather meant that the first half of his life was fraught with emotional and financial difficulty; the fear that he might be heir to the family's 'black blood' proved a constant source of anxiety. Chapter Two finds that Tennyson's poems about the relations of parents and children are apprehensive about how succeeding generations might eclipse rather than advance familial legacies. Barton makes a case for the significance of a song intended for *The Princess* (1847) but excluded from any published version, 'The Losing of the Child'. While it is usually considered subordinate to a concern with gender, this song shows the disappearance or supplanting of children to be one of the poem's distinct themes. All of this is engaging analysis, supported by sensitive reference to Tennyson's notes and letters, but its relevance to the book's ostensible subject is hard to see. As I have suggested, this is a recurring difficulty.

The broader contention is clearer in Barton's third chapter, which examines *In Memoriam* (1850) and the *Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington* (1851) in the context of nineteenth-century memorial traditions. She interestingly relates the isolation of Arthur Hallam's place of burial — and the plainness of the acts of commemoration which followed his death — to Tennyson's sense that the extent of his grief cannot be fully articulated. The Wellington ode, in a different way, also owes much to Victorian mourning rites, for the elaborate ceremonial of the Duke's funeral finds its reflection in the grandiloquence of Tennyson's lines. I would have liked to see Barton engage further with Tennyson's revisions to the ode: she cites briefly the work of Edgar Shannon and Christopher Ricks on the Tennyson manuscripts, but does not discuss their discovery that many of the most significant alterations made by Tennyson are concerned with the place, or, more often, the absence of names in the ode. Acknowledgment of the sensitive attention given to this aspect of the ode in the poet's revisions might have allowed for the moderation of her view that it is a 'distasteful' aberration from Tennyson's usual subtlety in the elegiac mode (79).

Barton sees the duties of the Laureateship as the cause for this deviation, a theme returned to in the following chapter, where Tennyson's willingness to attach his name and title to the Wellington ode stands in contrast to the anonymous poems he occasionally submitted to newspapers and periodicals. Setting these against the background of a gradual decline in anonymous reviewing, she observes

how anonymity freed Tennyson from both poetic and political responsibilities, with sometimes unfortunate results.

By the time the first volume of *Idylls of the King* appeared in 1859, Tennyson's name 'had become a highly marketable brand' (109). Chapter Five proposes that Camelot in the *Idylls* functions as a commodity culture, in which names are a fulcrum for a variety of political and social transactions. The book's central argument is more consistently applied here than in some other chapters, and Barton's discussion of how the mystery over Arthur's origins make the establishment of his name all the more pressing is perceptive. It would have been interesting to know if Barton thinks her emphasis on the commodification of literary culture in the mid-century in relation to the *Idylls* reflects upon the tussle between modern and medieval subjects in Tennyson's own oeuvre as well as in Victorian poetry generally.

The final chapter is perhaps the book's most rewarding. Here Barton explores the differences between Tennyson and Edward FitzGerald's attitudes to their names. These, Barton suggests, are indicative of the wider divergence between the two men. Thus, while FitzGerald's dislike of his name led him to adopt a variety of alternative appellations ('Old Fitz', 'Geraldine', and the like), Tennyson was concerned to fashion a reputation on the basis of his name. Their estrangement, however, was never complete, and the chapter culminates in a deft close reading of 'To E. FitzGerald' (1883), teasing out the ways in which FitzGerald's suspicion of public and successful poetry finds acknowledgement in Tennyson's elegy.

This final chapter brings the strengths of Barton's book to the fore, blending careful attention to textual detail with illuminating contextual research. In placing a new emphasis on the centrality of names and naming to the poet's achievement, her study is a helpful addition to Tennyson scholarship. It is unfortunate that there are errors in the order of the bibliography ('Rosenberg' appears ahead of 'Ricks', for instance).

Martin Dubois

Stanley Fish. *Save the World on Your Own Time.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. 189. \$19.95.

Fish begins his latest polemic with the obvious but all-too-often overlooked point that 'it is only when you know what [a] job is that you can know if you are really doing it, rather than doing some other job you were neither trained nor paid for' (7). The job in question here is that of

higher education in the United States, with a particular emphasis on those branches of education pertaining to literary and legal studies. *Save the World on Your Own Time* is a brief but compelling account of what universities are, what intellectual activities legitimately might occur within them, and how best to combat those in favour of extending the roles of universities and university instructors to the level of moral tutoring (and beyond). Fish typically exaggerates his case from the outset so as to make a persuasive argument for limiting faculty members to the precise objectives of their respective professions, but he would probably justify this by saying that the situation in the American university system is already exaggerated to such an extent that an extravagant approach is the only way to have one's argument heard, or that his case does not amount to an exaggeration in the first place. Fish's point here is that teachers should restrict their agendas first to the explanation of institutionally–authorised forms of knowledge, and second to the teaching of the traditional methods by which such knowledge is evaluated, debated, and increased. Those who seek to hijack the university classroom for moral coaching receive nothing but Fish's censure. In his view such individuals are both abandoning their professional obligations and attempting to influence a domain (ethics) to which the mechanisms of higher level education have no application: 'teachers cannot, except for a serendipity that by definition cannot be counted on, fashion moral character, or inculcate respect for others, or produce citizens of a certain temper' (14). Fish has been advancing this argument and its variants for some time now — see, for example, 'Profession Despise Thyself: Fear and Self–Loathing in Literary Studies' in *Doing What Comes Naturally* (1989) — and the force with which it is remobilised in the present text is a sign of the extent to which it has been persistently ignored or opposed, and the need, in Fish's view, for it to be restated.

Save the World turns on a precise distinction: educators should not try to live and educate 'apolitically' (whatever that might mean), but instead ought to calibrate the nature of the politics they bring to the classroom in accordance with the demands of a strictly professional understanding of what education is and might do. That is, academics should refrain from politicizing their teaching (for example, teach an ideologically radical body of work in the hope that doing so will have ideological effects) in favour of discriminating between which politics are appropriate to the halls and offices in which they influence their students. For Fish, politics such as 'things like curriculum, department leadership, the direction of research, [and] the content and manner of teaching' are relevant issues to bring to the departmental table (20). Irrelevant issues are things which

have no bearing on the professional matter at hand, such as whether or not a political leader is a good person or not. Political leaders may, in fact, be reprehensible, for instance, but for Fish determining the answers to such questions at a seminar level has no relation to the specifically academic activities of exploring the ancestry of such leaders, which belief systems formed their policies, who responds or responded well to them, who doesn't or didn't, where those leaders went or might go politically, and so on. Fish's restriction, that is to say, is not on content, but 'on *what is done with the content* when it is brought into the classroom' (24, original emphasis). Thus Fish: 'the idea of teachers and students joined in an effort to determine the truth of a disciplinary matter — the interpretation of a poem, the causes of an event, the origins of a virus — limits both the kinds of questions that can be asked and the answers that can be appropriately given' (176). To the comeback that one cannot simply 'step out of' one's politics into a neutrally professional space from which learners might be instructed, Fish replies by saying that while a value-free perspective is certainly unfeasible, the everyday task of moving between perspectives according to context is not. University instructors cannot help being who they are, but they can attempt to shape which parts of who they are emerge in a classroom setting just as they can generally ensure they behave in different ways in different, non-academic scenarios (the opera vs. a football game, for example).

In all cases Fish's concern is to keep academic instruction a 'this' and not a 'that'; as precisely an *academic* enterprise rather than a project of an extra-academic cause. 'To academicize an issue is to detach it from those contexts where it poses a choice of what to do or how to live — shall I join the priesthood or join the army? — and insert it into an academic context where it invites a certain kind of interrogation' (170). *Save the World* unarguably has relevance to those teaching and researching in the United Kingdom's higher education infrastructure, where the demands placed on instructors to aid students in ventures such as Personal Development Planning (PDP) necessarily take time and attention away from the core pedagogical activities that those instructors are sought to perform. There is also a link here to the current emphasis in Britain's university framework on 'interdisciplinarity', in which questions of whether or not alliances between disciplines (especially disciplines in the Humanities) are not just eroding disciplinary identities, but also, as there is an increasing need for disciplines to justify whether or not they can 'have an impact upon' or 'make a difference within' the community at large, increasingly subordinating academic disciplines to the conflicting demands of extra-academic organizations. The point is

not that Fish's book includes any particular policies for remedying situations of this kind: *Save the World*, like much else in Fish's work, seeks to describe rather than directly influence. Rather, the point is that the distinction he urges — between the concerns appropriate to an academic situation and those relevant to situations elsewhere — is all too easily lost in discussions of what academic work is and what it should produce.

This division cannot be reiterated often enough, and Fish repeats it tirelessly throughout this text. As per usual, he flavours his claims with a sprinkling of Milton, as in his spirited defence of one of his readings of *Samson Agonistes* from the view that Fish himself is 'an apologist for murderous bigots and an advocate of violence to boot' (50). Like almost all of Fish's other work, the line between describing how values come into being and attempting to impose values upon others appears again and again here as part of his reasoning against those who would accuse him of being dangerously relativistic. It is a new book, but familiar territory. On the one hand, *Save the World* offers a neat and implicit summary of almost the full range of Fish's views on the nature of pedagogy; on the other, it repeats arguments he has already made in texts like *Professional Correctness: Literary Studies and Political Change* (1995) without adding anything substantially new to them. This may be symptomatic of the *need* for such arguments to be remade, of course, but for this reviewer at least it would be refreshing to read Fish discussing a new or newly-framed set of issues, such as the content promised from the long-awaited study of the 1960s *Fugitive* television series. At the same time, I would recommend *Save the World* to teachers entering the Academy for the first time as a handy means of challenging and sharpening up their views regarding what should and should not be done or entertained in the classroom. This is perhaps of especial significance for English tutors, who may feel as if they are entering a world evaluated not by how successfully they can help others to read and interpret literary texts, but by how many extra-literary, CV-strengthening skill sets they can ensure their students adopt.

Nathan Waddell