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But this gloomily realistic view is not the end of Egri's story. It is with much sympathy that he describes how Stoppard personally rediscovered those lost values; human initiative, integrity, energy and courage in Czechoslovakia, the country of his birth, after the devastating events of 1968, and how Stopppard's personal involvement in political activities changed his social and moral commitment, all of which went into the writing of, among other texts, Cahoots; Macbeth, where basically the forms and means, including Dogg, of his earlier work are turned to radically different purposes; Egri admits, in conclusion, that maintaining a new unifying viewpoint and “regaining and renewing the field of play of autonomous individuality” may not be easy; [...] but it is worth a try as a dramatic chance for human survival” (p. 91).

There is only one major objection to Malvern Games, the almost complete absence of illustrations in a book concerned with interpreting visual art. The one illustration we are granted shows an anonymous Shakespearen the Rocks (1966) in miserable quality of reproduction. There cannot be the slightest doubt that adequate reproductions of at least La Gioconda's various individual and serial transformations would have much enhanced the value of this stimulating book to the reader.


Nünning’s titular quotation from Burke characterizes her historiographical approach in two ways: she privileges culture, more precisely the notion of mentality, in her account of historical change, and she perceives history in an implicitly hermeneutic manner, as an interpretation of facts; that is, she believes history serves a (contemporary) need for constructions of identity and difference.” (Though Nünning’s own complex historiography understandably presents a certain constructivist optimism as a re-construction). While Burke’s assessment refers to the French Revolution, Nünning investigates a change in political culture before this decisive event. She looks at texts by the so-called English radicals, particularly the work of Catharine Macaulay. These texts are presented within the context of diverse political traditions, cultural values and popular movements and contrasted with conservative attitudes of the time. Nünning’s goal is to develop a complex picture of contemporary political culture, to uncover ambiguities and contradictions in political discourses, and to trace some non-linear developments in the history of political rationalism.

Nünning’s enlightening study draws on a large body of material, much of which is difficult to obtain. Macaulay is a highly influential female historian who is far too often neglected by modern scholarship. By concentrating on her, Nünning helps to remedy this deplorable situation. Traditional historians may quarrel with Nünning’s approach, but a cultural history of mentality adds an essential dimension to understanding the past. Nünning offers two reasons for the initial success of radical ideas; first, their focus on the citizen as a responsible individual, and second, the construction of national identity through a strategic account of history. The subsequent decline of English radicalism in the nineteenth derives from a failure of radical thinkers in their efforts to merge the popular values of the culture of sensibility with a rationalist theoretical framework, and from an increasing reluctance to ground political thinking in a particular account of national history.

In view of Nünning’s painstaking and innovative work, it seems distinguishable to offer any criticism at all. Still, the book does not entirely live up to its theoretical premises. Frequently, the assessment of radical political culture stays within a framework of binary oppositions like ‘traditional’ versus ‘modern’ or ‘progressive’ (e.g. 178–9 and 371ff). In order to do justice to the complexity of political discourse, Weber’s ‘ideal types’ is perhaps not the most helpful approach to organize material, since it tends to confirm preconceived ideas or create contradictions where none are necessary. Also, presenting social hierarchy as the ‘great chain of being’ suggests a rather homogenized “Mentalität der Ungleichheit” (59) which is questionable for two reasons: first, the 18th century is justly infamous for its cultural representations of the transgression of social boundaries; and second, the tremendous increase in the number of socially didactic texts indicates that contemporary political literature’s varied register society’s transformations; or, to quote Nünning: “Wenn ein Weltbild thematisiert wird, so läßt sich daraus schließen, daß es seine unbefragte Gültigkeit bereits verloren hat” (12).

Socio-economic conditions like the distribution of property are particularly important for the class structure and the issue of political participation. These, however, being relegated to the footnotes (compare 283), only play a marginal role in Nünning’s account, which is a common problem in cultural histories. Concepts like hegemony (Gramsci) and ideology (Althusser), which have been developed for the reconstruction of the relationship between culture and social hierarchies, could have been helpful here. For instance, attention to social structures of power might have clarified the ostensible contradiction that political radicals support principles of liberty and equality while expecting obedience from the lower classes (see 340 and 375). This “Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen” (388) can be described as the wish of the (wealthy) middle classes to deny those lower on the social scale the personal privileges they desire.

Nünning’s study demonstrates that the question of power cannot be neglected in any analysis of culture. Even though power is never explicitly discussed as a theoretical concept in Nünning’s otherwise precise
treatment of terminology, her study shows that the discursive power struggle that is always present in the textual and symbolic inscriptions of meaning in political culture. Discussing key words like liberty, equality, public virtue, patriotism and the people, Nunning gives a detailed account of how certain groups or movements strive for power and influence by legitimizing and disseminating their readings of history. The variety of material analyzed, particularly historiographic texts, political pamphlets and educational writings, reveals by whom and for whom patterns of political explanation are produced and popularized in certain discursive fields. (However, in view of the vast ground covered, an index might have enhanced the book’s usefulness as a work of reference.) Nunning shows that the interdisciplinary approach of cultural studies is as relevant for history and the social sciences as for literary criticism, linguistics and philosophy. Such interdisciplinary work is still hampered by the structure of the German academy, but, as this book aims to show, it is not impossible.

Doris Feldmann and Ina Habermann
(Erlangen)


To those with a knowledge of 18th-century English literature, the title of Richter’s book will sound familiar, since it repeats the title of a book by Clara Reeve, published in 1785. Indeed, Richter’s The Progress of Romance reveals an intention parallel to Clara Reeve’s: He wants to reassess and explain the success story of Romance, especially of the Gothic Romance or, to use the better known term, Gothic Novel. Behind this is a twofold dissatisfaction. According to Richter, the existing false notions about the significance and evolution of the Gothic Novel are the outcome of the failure to develop efficient and comprehensive historiographic tools.

The Gothic Novel comprises an extensive tradition of narrative texts that, at least during the first 50 years (1764–1820), could fairly easily be identified as a genre. However, until the 1970s, those texts fell outside the literary canon. After 1980, approaches came into fashion that pretended to be historiographic but actually projected on these texts phenomenological and psychological patterns. One of the most important studies of this type is surely Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s The Madwoman in the Attic (1979), which helped to establish, in Richter’s words, “the Gothic as Feminist Critique.” That is, the Gothic Novel is seen as harboring hidden references to what women in the 18th and 19th century could express only indirectly (6–9).

In 1970, the German scholar Hans Robert Jauss had drawn attention, in his book Literary History as Challenge, to the fact, that real concern with literary history had disappeared. Richter notes that nothing much has changed since, including the field of Gothic literature. Even the highly praised New Historicism, beginning in the late 1980s, did not tackle this problem satisfactorily. Behind that school, Richter recognizes an uncritical acceptance of Foucault, especially of his hypothesis (in Les Mots et les Choses) that there are three great intellectual fault lines in Western history since the Late Middle Ages.

In view of the obvious limitations of the existing approaches to literary history, Richter pleads for a synthesis. The concepts he combines are (1) Marxism (in the modernized versions of Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams and Terry Eagleton), (2) formalism (reaching from Tynyanov’s notion of ‘literary evolution’ to the Chicago neo-Aristotelians), and (3) reception history (as it was formulated by H.R. Jauss).

In Chapters 3–5, then, we are confronted with these three approaches successively. From a Marxist point of view, the Gothic Novel appears mainly as a reaction to the French Revolution. But, as Richter admits, Ronald Paulson, Kate Ferguson Ellis, and Terry Eagleton have demonstrated that this can be shown in a fairly complex and sophisticated manner, for example by looking at the ways in which the moral legitimacy of the aristocracy was called into question.

From a formalist point of view, the Gothic Novel appears as a modification and variation of the pattern presented by Richardson in Pamela. In contrast to Pamela, the Gothic Novel has two equally important protagonists, personified in Walpole’s The Castle of Otranto (a) by Isabella and (b) by Manfred: the virtuous heroine and the heroic villain. The further development of the Gothic Novel tends to emphasize either the one or the other strand, Richter writes.

From the point of view of reception history there is the basic problem that mass audiences hardly provide useful data or documents. Richter accepts only three facts as relevant:

1. the original Gothic Novel was no longer en vogue after 1820;
2. it had a primarily female readership;
3. Walter Scott, however, whose novels surpass and thus liquidate the original type of Gothic Novel, had a predominantly male audience.

In discussing all these aspects, Richter offers many interesting observations and discovers new continuities. The Gothic Novel appears as an archetypically early form of the Historical Novel. This is not a new discovery but Richter gives it new emphasis. I would even go so far as to call the Gothic Novel of the 18th century ‘Historical Sentimental Novel’

In Chapter 6, Richter ultimately presents his own conjectures. In tables and diagrams he constructs genealogical trees of the Gothic Novel, its textual environment and its descendants. Even if one does not agree with his analysis, he still offers interesting coherences and lineages, especially in the 19th century. For example, he subsides works by Robert Louis Stevenson, Oscar Wilde, George du Maurier, Bram Stoker, H.G. Wells, and Henry James, written between 1890 and 1900, under the rubric of a Neo-Gothic genre. The link between the preceding ‘Novel of Sensation’ and this constellation of writers, he concludes, is to be found in Fred J. Fargue’s ‘(Hugh Conway’s) novel Called Back’ (1884). Unfortunately, Richter does not provide detailed information or evidence to prove this.

This criticism applies to the whole of Richter’s book. In fact, the book offers no history of the Gothic Novel, not even the outline of a synthesis of pre-existing attempts. It only discusses the possibility and possibilities of such histories and makes sketchy suggestions that it does not verify.

Throughout his text, Richter remains grounded in the Chicago Formalist School and is unwilling to move away from it into the contextual field, for example, which he generously cedes to cultural studies: “[T]here is no reason cultural studies should not coexist in a large world of scholarly practices with literary histories in all their various sorts. But they shouldn’t be confused with literary history either” (175). Thus Richter commits himself to the model of an immanent literary evolution. From this angle, Althusserian Marxism is shrunk to ‘a story about origins’, reception history is reduced to ‘an explanation of the Gothic’s decline’, whereas formalism shines as essentially a story of how the Gothic novel continued” (176).

Richter’s study is a peculiar mixture between a differentiated awareness of deficiencies in the writing of literary and cultural history and a refusal to really do something about it. He prefers not to care about the astonishing number of monographs published in the late 1980s and 1990s that make possible a differentiated contextualization of literature. One of Richter’s major omissions is the aesthetic discourse and developments parallel to the Gothic Novel in other genres than narration and in the other media. The concepts of the Sublime and the Picturesque play a very important role for the Gothic Novel, both in the texts and as contextual orientations and/or determinants. In fact, the aesthetics centre around ‘the Sublime and the Picturesque’ and their modifications