9 West Road
A Newsletter of the Faculty of English
Volume 12, 2012

The Judith E. Wilson Drama Studio

"studio, n.
Pronunciation:
/ˈstjuːdɪəʊ/
Etymology: < Italian studio: see study n.
†1. Fine Art. = study n. 10. Obs. rare—1.
1819 Shelley Let. 25 Feb. (1964) II. 80
The most remarkable is the original studio by Michaelangelo of the day of judgment.

2.

a. The work-room of a sculptor or painter; also, that of a photographer.
c. Cinematogr. A room in which a cinematographic film is shot. Hence, a film-making complex including film studios and attendant offices and premises (also in pl.); the company which runs this. Cf. film studio n. at film n. Compounds 5."

From: OED Online:
http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/192072?redirectedFrom=studio&

Poetry readings | Play readings | Prose readings | Readings | Live-streamed readings | recordings | film-showings | film-making| painting class | ballet | contemporary dance | dramaturgy | student plays | Clowning workshops | Experimental music | Classical music | Butoh | Miscellaneous Theatre Festivals | Space which it is difficult to negotiate | Unperformable theatre | multi-lingual readings & performances | Artistic residencies | Professional & student performances

For students and others, there are many venues in which to peruse or pursue one of Cambridge's most popular extra-curricular activities and exports.

Each eight-week term there is a hectic calendar of productions incorporating experimental theatre, musicals, plays classical and contemporary, as well as numerous other discrete cultural works and practices.

Trevor Joyce reading (Judith E. Wilson Poetry Fellow 2009-10)

Theatre, or 'The Theatre' or 'drama' or even 'performance' – all of which supply no official accolade or qualification for a graduate to depart with in hand, is everywhere. Many early career paths into show business have begun their excavation here, and indeed most of the country's 'top' jobs in theatre purportedly still salary people who read something other than theatre at Cambridge.

The Judith E. Wilson Drama Studio ~ located literally and notionally in the basement of the Faculty of English ~ is both a venue and a studio: a place where completed productions can be seen by the public, and also a place in which work can be developed and worked at, or worked out.

There have been poetry readings in almost total darkness, the speaker's delivery amplified yet as quiet as a whisper in your ear, and in another time, but perhaps not entirely at the other end of any notional spectrum, the entire room has been transformed into a beach, complete with sand, sea, mollusks and live-streamed whales.

This is perhaps a more unusual resource for a university department to have than it at first seems, as surely there are many technologically-equipped studio-like spaces in which the collision of debate and ideas between academics, students and the general public can take place. Over the more than eight years of its existence, the studio has been both a venue for significant cultural occasions, albeit on an intimate scale, as much as it has been an invaluable space for students and teachers to encounter one another in ways which newly challenge how innumerable forms of work are treated and considered.
First, the studio is a studio: and in this it serves its main function, providing a large isolated space – with an array of lighting possibilities from almost pitch darkness to stadium brightness, and a range of acoustic possibilities. There are props, costumes, objects and machines, materials which are free to use. You can play large and loud here, but also, crucially, miniscule and whisperingly. Primarily, it is a space in which activities related to the making and study of poetry and drama can be explored,

shared and studied – in a room whose infinite varieties of atmosphere can be handled directly by those present.

As a most rudimentary teaching tool or exercise in which any text may be encountered, the studio provides a space in which a text can be performed live, in fragmentary or complete form, in radically different ways, accommodating radically divergent voices and voicings, treatments of material and attitudes to its representation and reproduction. This is certainly one of the most effective uses of this resource in the delivery of its core activity: two or more entirely different – and, crucially, live– performances of exactly the same text can be heard in the same place, and there is nothing like the experience of such a thing, however the idea strikes you as simplistic or easily available via the web.

As a venue for public cultural events, the studio has always had a close relationship with the creative force of its function as a studio: a place where things are made, yes: but also the same place where they are tried and tested, first. Theatre history has been full of attempts to formulate terms for such spaces – 'laboratory' is a word often used across languages for the place in which artists carry out their 'experiments'. A lot of the work of theatre-making is not perhaps quite so hypothesis-led as this, though, yet there is still a requirement for a space in which to explore the anterior of what may ultimately come to be shown before an audience. Often, events at the Judith E. Wilson Drama Studio have felt very much like listening in to the processes by which the performance has arisen, rather than attuning to its complete accomplishment.

And actually, this is one of its most important features as a space for public dialogue, as a rehearsal room, classroom and occasional artsy-party room.

Whether you are entering the room in which the whole of Milton's *Paradise Lost* is being read, performed, sung and played by over a hundred people in one day, or whether you are facing the surprising raw hilarity of Sarah Kane's *4:48 Psychosis* played out by crazed clowns wielding semi-frozen chicken, there is something in the incompleteness or even instability that this space affords which facilitates its generous breadth of access.

Crucially in the Faculty of English, the studio provides space for activity whose primary material is not literature, and this vitally enhances the ways in which literature can be encountered and experienced.

Many places are venues for a variety of activities and events, and many may lay claim to their own distinctive cultural significance, but something which has persistently remained an integral aspect of a lot of the work produced in the studio is the porosity via which people can come to engage with it.

It is tricky to write about this aspect, or location, or activity of encounter – without sounding archly insistent upon the privilege of process over production, as if this were some elite hive in which genius-bees publicly evacuate the tantrum before the poem is born as mellifluous honey.

Indeed, a number of productions, performances, readings and even teaching events in the studio have drawn the epithet 'elitist' from some audience-members. The phrases 'self-indulgent' and, perhaps particularly poignant in the English language, 'pretentious' have been heard more than a few times by people leaving the studio. And that is perhaps because it has been a space in which people have felt encouraged to be 'brave', to risk failure, or simply to present something which is unsure of its sense of accomplishment. Or which, perhaps not altogether conversely, is outrageously assured of its own validity. But also, the studio very often affords the chance for the audience to encounter and challenge challenging work directly: to question it, critique it, even change it. These things, as well as the dissenting and different voices which can be heard among them, are integral to its openness as a space for genuine dialogue, between performers and audiences, as also between works and their makers.

All of this of course does not preclude the fact that the studio has always also been, and remains, a place in which excellent, highly accomplished, complete and cogent work can be transmitted or delivered with absolute clarity and distinction. What all studios should provide, however, is space in which these things as a given can be questioned, elaborated, modified or discarded or replaced entirely.

It is perhaps important to note that over the last six or seven years at least, there has been no stated 'artistic policy' governing or programming or choosing what goes on in the studio. It is available in the first instance to members of the English Faculty, but then also to a wider public both within the university and a little and far beyond, as a room which can be booked for private work or public performance.

Any studio space is of course really a tool box, and there are manifold applications to which the uses of the studio can be put. The current Judith E. Wilson Poetry Fellow, Caroline Bergvall, is already using the space in a radically enabling way, placing her own work in a context which allows people to consider it in the light of other practitioners, and her truly generous style of presentation is keenly attuned to the ways in which the studio can be used to make complex and difficult work accessible and compelling.

Jeremy Hardingham is a performance-maker & writer. He has been the Judith E. Wilson Drama Studio Manager since 2006.

For more information about the studio and its events, see the studio web-pages on the Faculty of English website: www.english.cam.ac.uk

There you will also find a place where you can contribute your own memories, images, recordings and thoughts to the steadily growing 'NOW in the past' archive of studio history.

Students performing a reading of *Enemy of the Stars* by Wyndham Lewis, Michaelmas 2006

Dr Leavis rides again

Dr Leavis's legendary bicycle was reunited with its handlebar-basket at the international Leavis Conference held at Downing College on 27-28 September 2012.

Before: Quentin Blake's sketch as commissioned for the 2004 edition of *9 West Road*: 'I used to see Dr Leavis arriving to give his morning seminars. He rode a tall gaunt bicycle and was able to dismount, park the bike against the wall and mount the steps to his room in one fluent movement'.

After

Quentin Blake (Downing, 1953), opening the second day of the Conference, said the omission from the first sketch had been an oversight. He was pleased to have had an occasion to restore the overflowing basket to its rightful place. In warm and entertaining conversation with Bruce Kinsey (former Fellow and Chaplain of Downing, now Senior Tutor at Dr Leavis's old school, the Perse) he said there had been no inconsistency between his having been taught by Leavis and his career as an illustrator, primarily of children's books (most famously in collaboration with Roald Dahl) and as the creator of hospital art (such as his work for Addenbrooke's). Text for him inspired image. He had been re-reading Q. D. Leavis's chapter on the Dickens illustrations, which had renewed his sense of the close imaginative collaboration possible between writer and illustrator. FRL had been an inspiring teacher. Nearly sixty years on, he retained the highest regard for him, a continued loyalty to Cambridge and a special affection for Downing.

Like Quentin Blake, Howard Jacobson (Downing 1961), winner of the 2010 Man Booker Prize, had read English under Leavis. Now an Honorary Fellow of Downing, he launched the Conference with a reading from his new novel *Zoo Time*. The book, he felt, had something of the quality of a 'Leavisian comedy': 'angry, elegiac and rude'.

He had often been asked whether having been taught by Leavis had been discouraging for an incipient novelist. Not so. True, in the early days he had found himself asking, 'What would Dr Leavis think?', but his teacher's legacy had been the way he encouraged critical discrimination – valuation in criticism – and the effort this involved to achieve personal inwardness with literature. A writer had to find his own voice, not take over or copy established styles. Agreeing with Leavis or not about particular writers wasn't the point. His great gift had been to communicate a passion for finding one's own way of feeling through words.

Many speakers emphasised Leavis's remarkable range as a critic. 'Cultivate promiscuity', he told his students! He was among other things a fluent reader of the great Italian poets from Dante to Montale, and of the French classical dramatists, an admirer of *Anna Karenina* as perhaps the greatest European novel, knowledgeable in the Greek classics (he had given his last public lecture on Greek tragedy), a perceptive critic on Shakespeare, and one of the pioneers in the appreciation of the literary Modernists.

His influence beyond British shores was brought out by speakers from India and China, one of whom, Professor Cao Li, had contributed to the conference reported in last year's *9 West Road*, 'Cambridge English and China'. Leavis had been introduced to China in 1932, when Chang Feng published 'Three Books by Leavis', and more recently reintroduced through the opened door of economic reform. His stance on cultural continuity, education and the university, literature and criticism had become widely influential as China evolved into a consumerist society. The growing responsiveness to his work there today reflects the transformations of that society in the postmodern era.

It was not only to China that such influence had extended. Professor

Quentin Blake (interviewer Bruce Kinsey, left)

Howard Jacobson reading from *Zoo Time* (left, Dr Chris Joyce, Chair, right Dr Cathy Phillips, R. J. Owens Fellow in English, Downing)

Howard Jacobson at a book-signing arranged by Heffers

Srinath from Mysore spoke of the revolutionary impact Leavis had had in his country. His father, C. D. Narasimhaiah, who had been tutored by Leavis, felt that Leavis's work had played an important part in the dynamic evolution of English Studies in India. A firm belief in the life of the text, the 'common pursuit of true judgement' and a total involvement with it because it matters as life matters: all these were reasserted in the Indian context, creating English departments as nuclei and vibrant centres of humanising influence.

But above all the conference – in the 50th anniversary year of Leavis's 'Two Cultures' lecture – underscored his achievement as a thinker: 'one of the great European minds' believed Dr Heward Wilkinson, speaking on 'Leavis and the Coleridgean Function in our Time'. But Leavis had eschewed the possibilities that certain philosophical approaches offered. In *Nor Shall My Sword* and *The Living Principle* he had claimed 'there is only one Culture'. Yet in doing so he lost touch with the 'importance of antagonistic modes of thought' which, in *Mill on Bentham and Coleridge*, he had approved. His reluctance to articulate philosophically the nature of enactment in literature, the equivalent in his thought to the place of Imagination in Coleridge and Kant, limited his contribution to the dialectic. It remained nevertheless a remarkable one.

Bernard Harrison (Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the Universities of Utah and Sussex), in a lecture sponsored by the British Wittgenstein Society, argued that Leavis had not recognised affinities between his own thought and the later Wittgenstein's. Wittgenstein was anti-Cartesian and anti-Lockeian in ways that not only mirrored Leavis's distrust of Locke and Descartes, but might have advanced his efforts to argue against them. Like Wittgenstein, Leavis was committed to the idea of 'the life of language': language as a living enterprise involved in the constitution of 'human worlds'. What a writer 'means' by a word (such as 'life') is not something we have to be taught in *order* to read him or her but something *we learn through that reading*. The thought of great creative writers and critics is exemplified through language in the fullness of its powers and potentialities.

Professor Laurence Steven from Ontario suggested a number of affinities between Leavis and Levinas. Both had explored language, sincerity and disinterestedness. For both, human responsibility was conditioned by and a condition of a tradition of thought enacted and embodied in texts – in Leavis's case literary ones, in Levinas's the Talmud. For Leavis a crucial term was 'life': the individual life known in and through the 'third realm' of the literary text. For Levinas the comparable terms are found in his distinction between the saying and the said. But Leavis, unlike Levinas, speaks of the 'human world' whose irreducible, non-measurable character is created by our sincerity and contributes to cultural continuity.

Of compelling interest too was Paul Dean's question, why Leavis published so little on tragedy. Answers might be found in his writings on Lawrence and Eliot. These address ideas which Leavis associated with the tragic, among which the concept of impersonality, used in different senses by Lawrence and Eliot, was central. A related question concerned the religious dimension of tragedy, about which there was, again, a wide divergence between Lawrence and Eliot. The tensions between their sense of the artist's responsibility towards his medium and his own creativity were arguably fundamental to tensions in Leavis's own thinking.

John Foster from the Department of Politics and Philosophy at Lancaster presented Leavis as fighter, one who might have espoused contemporary ecological concerns. Leavis had insisted that, looking ahead, 'mankind ... will need to be in full intelligent possession of its full humanity'. What could represent a contemporary form of this project now? The question had a vital urgency since the drives of 'technologico-Benthamite' civilisation had brought us to the verge of ecological disaster. The international green movement had failed to understand its own emphasis on living diversity and was bound up in Snow-like 'social hope', preventing it from acknowledging the real situation. Leavis's advocacy and practice remained directly relevant.

From Cambridge's Faculty of Human, Social and Political Science Dr David Fowler explored Leavis's position in relation to the student revolts of the '60s and '70s, arguing that he had been a 'mentor' to both radical students and radical dons. At Cambridge, Leavis had generated student revolt inside the English Faculty; at York he simultaneously observed the development of student radicalism in a new university and sought to create a new élite among his students there. The lecture was followed by lively discussion – even the occasional heated moment! – as to whether Leavis had sought to direct his students' political energies at the time of the succession crisis at Downing in 1964.

Further papers offered wide-ranging stimulus. Dr Ruiqing Zhang deepened the Chinese perspective; Rohit Dutta Roy considered cross-currents in Bengali literature in a Leavisian context. Edward Greenwood's 'Leavis, Tolstoy, Lawrence and 'Ultimate Questions"' grappled with issues raised by Leavis's dealing with a work in translation and the way his engagement with it threw light on his position with regard to ultimate questions and the nature of tragedy. He suggested how Leavis's admiration of Tolstoy's novel led him to certain reservations about Lawrence, and drew out the closeness of Leavis to Tolstoy's Levin.

The case for and against Leavis's later adverse view of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was argued by Malcolm Pittock and Bob Hayward. The first illustrated how, from his early essay on Lawrence (1930), Leavis's estimate of his achievement steadily increased. But as his valuation of Lawrence's work as a whole went up, so his estimate of Lawrence's now most famous novel went down, reaching its nadir when he refused to testify at the so-called 'Trial Of *Lady Chatterley*' in 1960. The speaker agreed with that later estimate, but wondered whether Leavis's otherwise almost unqualified praise of Lawrence was critically tenable. He argued that it was not and that *Lady Chatterley* took to an extreme the weaknesses in Lawrence's other works. Contrariwise, Bob Hayward offered a close examination of Leavis's grounds for calling it a 'bad novel' as set out in 'The Orthodoxy of Enlightenment' (in *Anna Karenina, and Other Essays*). An important question was whether Lawrence's biography or the novel itself supported this diagnosis. He argued that they did not. Leavis's estimate was internally inconsistent; his much earlier appraisal of the novel had been the juster and more balanced.

From an American perspective, Professor Philip Bufithis spoke of the limitations of literary study in the United States, where

teachers analysed and interpreted texts but seldom went on to evaluate them in sustained literary critical assessments. American students were trained to be exegetes, not critics. Nonetheless, Leavis was too important not to have a presence in the American academy. His paper attempted to gauge this presence during the height of his reputation and gave an account of his developing significance for the author himself.

Professor Jan Montefiore explained why, following her initial researches, including her interview with Kate Varney, the Leavises' daughter, she had abandoned her project to write a biography of Q. D. Leavis. She would have had to work entirely from materials in the public domain, which were scanty; Robin Leavis, his parents' literary executor, was unwilling to release crucial papers, including their voluminous correspondence; and publishing the story of her life could be painful for surviving relatives and close friends. An early conference on QDL's work was proposed.

Proceedings were brought to an adventurous conclusion by Dr Steven Cranfield. What continuing value is there in the kinds of critical arguments Leavis urged upon us, Dr Cranfield asked, notably about how to 'read' human creativity? One answer might lie in our seeing Leavis in relation to the work of the film director Stanley Kubrick (1928-99). Their *oeuvres*, while conceived independently in different media, could be seen to share socio-artistic and philosophic concerns: how to affirm the complex nature of human creativity, with its fragile sense of hope in the face of technologically enhanced destructiveness. In particular, Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) provided an illuminating foil to some of Leavis's ideas, and vice versa: about social learning, the dynamics of creativity and the nature of human intelligence.

Rare recordings of Leavis in discussion and reading out poetry were heard at various intervals.

For details of Leavis-related events planned for the 50th anniversary, in 2013, of the founding of the University of York, and in China, please contact the Chair of the Leavis Society, Dr Chris Joyce at chris.joyce.1969@pem.cam.ac.uk.

New Research and Teaching in the Faculty of English

Several of our new teaching appointees have kindly offered short descriptions of their interests.

Dr Kasia Boddy

Much of my teaching and research is on American fiction and, over the years, I've found myself attracted to its extremes – to the short story, on the one hand, and, on the other, to very long novels. I've just started writing a book about the Great American Novel or G.A.N. (as Henry James dubbed it). The notion of the G.A.N. was first formulated in 1868 by a former Union army officer called John W. De Forest, as an example of the kind of cultural work necessary for Reconstruction after the Civil War. What he wanted was a novel of 'national breadth', one that would offer a portrait of American society comparable to the European tableaux of Balzac and Thackeray. More specifically, he felt that the G.A.N. should represent an 'eager and laborious people, which takes so many newspapers, builds so many railroads, does the most business on a given capital, wages the biggest war in proportion to its population, believes in the physically impossible and does some of it'. A super-sized book, then, for a super-sized people.

Since the 1860s, the G.A.N. has retained a solid if uneasy place in American literary culture. Parodied almost as soon as it was conceived, a tribute as emphatic as it is ambiguous, the big state-of-the-nation novel remains the bench-mark for literary ambition, prestige and sales. I want to explore the ambitions and habits of mind which brought the idea into being, and have kept it going, in wave after wave, ever since. As well as considering what the G.A.N. was (and is), I also want to ask '*Why* the Great American Novel?' Exactly what needs (social, political, aesthetic, commercial) does the enterprise serve? Exactly what purposes might its realisation be expected to fulfil, that so many writers should have put so much effort into realising it?

Looking beyond American fiction, I also work on the cultural and literary history of what might be thought of as unacknowledged tropes. In particular, I'm interested in the imaginative resources offered by leisure activities such as sport and horticulture, which have become ubiquitous to the point of saturation in modern life, but which for the most part enter only obliquely into literature, almost without full acknowledgement from the writer. My topic in *Boxing: A Cultural History* (2008) and in the forthcoming *Geranium* (2013) is the often incidental representation in literature of events, activities and objects whose meaning and value is historically contingent. If geraniums had not been imported en masse from colonial southern Africa, Jane Austen would have had one less way in which to let it be known that Fanny Price, in retiring to her room to tend her own specimens, has become subtly complicit in the colonialist appropriations which created the institution of Mansfield Park. If Dubliners had not been prone to reflect on the several celebrated boxing-matches in which a nimble Irish (or honorary Irish) fighter had taken on a hefty Briton, James Joyce would have one less way in which to let it be known that *Ulysses* is not quite as pacifist as it is often thought to be. My method in these books involves the establishment of precise contexts for a wide range of representations, in literature and other art-forms and media. I had not expected that a cultural history of boxing and a cultural history of the geranium would each independently implicate *both* famous Eliots (British and American, female and male, novelist and poet).

Professor Steven Connor

The central focus of my interest is in nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature, with a particular interest in the work of Dickens, Joyce and Beckett, to all of whom I have repeatedly returned. But in the last decade or so, I have made literary writing the provocation for a series of books which I see as instalments in a history of the material imagination – the way in which certain kinds of material object are imagined, and the ways in which

imagination has materialised itself. These books include *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism* (2000), *The Book of Skin* (2003), *Fly* (2006), *The Matter of Air: Science and Art of the Ethereal* (2010) and, most recently, *Paraphernalia: The Curious Lives of Magical Things* (2011) and *A Philosophy of Sport* (2011). I am planning a sequel to *Paraphernalia* called *Matters of Concern*. Where *Paraphernalia* dealt with specific, if generic objects, this book would deal with blurrier, more diffuse kinds of stuff, or states of matter, like froth, glue, mud, wax and soap, aiming to show the different ways in which, in each substance, the material and the imaginary converge.

I retain the interest in the voice that was the prompt for my book *Dumbstruck*, and have just completed a book called *Broken Voices*, which will appear next year. This is really a ventilation of a remark of Aristotle's that has nagged at me ever since I encountered it, that, while what we call a voice is the sound of 'something that has soul in it', not all of the sounds that are in the voice are themselves possessed of soul – Aristotle's example is a cough. My book is about this area of what might be called imaginary phonetics: it is a book about the life of the noises that inhabit the voice, such as sobbing, growling, grunting, hissing, clicking, tutting and buzzing. It operates, not in the realm of phonetics proper but in a sort of phonophenomenology, or funnyfarm phonetics – in the daft yet deep ideas that many people, many of them literary writers, cling to about the specific, apparently indwelling powers of certain sounds.

I have a strong and continuing interest in the relation between technology, media and the senses, especially in relation to sound, questions which have come together in some of the writing I have done on, and for radio. At the same time, I look forward to contributing to the new configurations of research across the Faculty, especially in the newly-established Literature-Technology-Media hub, for which I hope to broach some new lines of thinking about technological objects and about the body and technology, and in the Performance hub.

Since the middle 1990s, I have been writing at intervals about the work of the philosopher and historian of science Michel Serres, a man who has published forty books, and, despite being in his early 80s, shows no sign of leaving off. Serres has provided the intellectual framework for a number of my books – most especially *The Book of Skin* and *The Matter of Air* – and I would like to make his work accessible to many more scholars and students than is currently the case, while also settling some of my own intellectual accounts with it. My aim is to write a book that considers the full range of Serres's preoccupations – identity, technology, ecology, music, narrative, time, violence, the senses – while also conveying something of the intricate way in which his themes are interlaced.

The most substantial research and thinking that I will be beginning at Cambridge will be in the relations between writing and the imagination of number. There is an ingrained assumption that art and literature stands opposed to the kinds of quantitative or calculative rationality that have become ever more important over the last two centuries. My feeling is that, while literature certainly found itself officially opposed to the order of number, it also found itself entering into it. It is this intimate participation of number in writing and writing in number, from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, that I aim to lay out. We have lived too long and too complacently with the assumption that number is simply inimical to literary writing; I want to show that there is a poetics of number, which is an important component of the imaginative, emotional and philosophical adjustment to counting, quantity and calculation that humans have undergone in the last two centuries.

Dr Alex da Costa

Before I came to Cambridge, I was at Oxford as a Fixed-Term Fellow at St Hilda's College, and before that as a Research Fellow and Tutor at Keble College.

My research focuses on incunabula and early printed books meant for an English readership in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. I'm particularly interested in cheaper books, which might sell for as little as 1d., and what they suggest about less learned and more 'popular' reading practices and tastes. In this period, this effectively means I spend a great deal of time working on religious tracts, but these speak to political and pastoral concerns too and are far from dry or one-dimensional. Indeed, my current work focuses on controversial religious tracts and ways in which printers and writers might try to negotiate restrictions on their publication and circulation.

I particularly enjoy challenging the ways in which we read apparently simple texts. This is well illustrated in my forthcoming article on 'Marketing the Shrine: Printed Pilgrimage Souvenirs, Guides and Advertising' which will be published in the *Journal of the Early Book Society*. In it, I look at three pamphlets – *The Life of St Joseph of Arimathea, The Shrine at Walsingham* and *Diverse Miracles in Hailes* – that have been treated as if they were just saints' lives, and argue that in fact these functioned as guides for visiting pilgrims, souvenirs for those returning and as advertising for those considering the journey. Although they may have been read as part of a reader's devotions, they are actually very pragmatic texts. For example, the writer of *The Shrine at Walsingham* addresses the reader as though they stood in front of, or inside, the chapel itself. There are insistent references to the building as 'this chapell' and 'here', as well as commands to 'se' or 'beholde and se', which emphasise its physical closeness to the reader. The reader is also addressed as one of those that 'visyte thys hir [Our Lady's] habytacle' and the text ends with a prayer for those that 'deuoutly visyte in this place'. Although the pamphlet might serve a reader undertaking an imaginary pilgrimage, beholding the site in their mind's eye, it seems clear that its initial function was as a more prosaic guide to those visiting the shrine.

My interest in such less 'literary' texts has influenced the way I teach medieval literature. So while I love introducing students to the complexities of Chaucer and helping them to hone their close-reading skills on *Piers Plowman*, I also encourage them to see the influence of sermons, church wall paintings and less textual forms of culture in the texts they study. As such, I'm thrilled to have joined a Faculty that so values the relationship between literary and visual culture that it created the *Medieval Imaginations* website!

Dr Malachi McIntosh

Samuel Selvon's 1956 novel *The Lonely Londoners* famously ends with its main character, Moses Aloetta, standing on the banks of the Thames and staring into London's streets. With a gaze made Olympian, Moses tracks 'the black faces bobbing up and down' in the crowds, watches 'everybody hustling along the Strand' and understands that 'on surface, things don't look so bad, but when you go down a little' and penetrate the facades of the passersby, 'you bounce up a kind of misery and pathos and a frightening – what?'. Selvon's novel, a largely humorous take on the trials and challenges faced by the post-World War II Caribbean migrants to Britain, is centrally focused on revealing the lives underneath the strained expressions of emigrated West Indians, on showing the day-to-day of the present but misrepresented black faces in the city's crowded streets.

Londoners was one of the first Caribbean novels I had ever read. I cracked it open along with several others in a frenzy of acquisition at age 22, while I was in the midst of an MA in Comparative Literature at King's College London. Just as the text itself was concerned with revealing the lives of those hidden in plain sight, for me, the novel itself was an example of what it portrayed: *The Lonely Londoners*, like other works by Caribbean writers, existed but didn't within the field of English Literature. It was literature, written in English, that reflected on a seminal moment in Britain's history, but it had quite decisively escaped any reference at any stage of my studies; my first reading a result of my own search to learn more of this odd thing called 'Caribbean Literature' that I thought I had, Columbus-like, just discovered.

The experience of burrowing into the huge stock of writing from the Anglophone and Francophone Caribbean during my first postgraduate year sketched an agenda for all of my study in the years that would follow. Namely, a desire to understand what has been present but neglected in contemporary literary studies has guided my research since that early encounter. My PhD thesis carried forward my interest in understanding the roles played by Caribbean authors in shaping the traditions that have largely forgotten them; it sought to analyse how World War II-era Caribbean writing was received in Europe, in order to understand how writers' positioning as emigrants affected both the content and reception of their texts and their later esteem. Toward the end of that project in 2010, I began a sustained analysis of Samuel Selvon – a seminal figure in the development of Anglophone Caribbean literature, whose *oeuvre* has been repeatedly forced down narrow interpretative channels and whose most challenging novels have been lost to even Caribbean-centred literary critics. Through Selvon I developed a desire to learn more about writing from his home colony, now country, of Trinidad and Tobago – a burgeoning body of work that has primarily been read for what it represents about the state of the Caribbean, rather than the state of the culturally distinct, singularly eclectic polity from which it grows. Most recently, and through my abiding fixation on depictions of immigration, I have begun study of the group of texts thus far dubbed 'Black British' and the ideas of biological/biographical authenticity upon which their category sits.

I always find it hard to summarise my research interests; when asked I tend to pause, unhinge my jaw, and then, after a few false starts, unravel some meanderings on 'My work to date…'. 'Postcolonial', 'Caribbean' and now 'World' literature are all matrices within which my interests fit but none of them quite contains all of the places my studies have gone or where I would like them to take me. I'm fascinated by the ways that canons are formed and by all the things that are lost in that taxonomic process. I'm continually drawn to works that issue from the Caribbean and its singular combination of peoples and cultural practices. And, perhaps most importantly, I'm captivated by writing that describes the elided in new ways; that violates convention and tries to explore, if not just grasp, Selvon's 'kind of misery and pathos' and the underpinning, hidden, 'frightening – what?'.

Dr Jan Schramm

My particular interests lie at the intersection of law, literature and theology in the long nineteenth century. Before I did my PhD in English literature here in Cambridge, I had spent several years working as a lawyer in Australia, and this experience left me with an enduring interest in the concept of evidence – how it works in the courtroom, and how its shape predetermines its reception by different audiences. My first book, *Testimony and Advocacy in Victorian Law, Literature, and Theology*, published by Cambridge University Press in 2000, paid attention to individual voice, and the ways in which the evidentiary status of a story changes if it is narrated in the first person (by a layman) or the third-person (by a professional representative). My second book, *Atonement and Self-Sacrifice in Nineteenth-Century Narrative*, published by Cambridge University Press in June 2012, takes as its point of departure this tension between first and third-person ways of knowing, and uses the tropes of sacrifice and substitution to investigate the extent to which the 'one' might 'stand for' the 'many' in various strands of Victorian public discourse – notably in arguments about the extension of the franchise, the impact of the Crimean War, and the meaning of the doctrine of the Atonement in the Established Church. In asking how the innocent might (or might not) be able to atone for the guilt of the many, this book puts pressure on our understanding of guilt and innocence, and how these moral states might be formulated (or complicated) by legal and literary language.

This year I am on leave, having been awarded a Leverhulme Research Fellowship to complete a book on Victorian sacred drama and dramatic poetry. The performance of scriptural drama was prohibited in the period by censorship (in the form of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century legislation, as well as custom and practice stretching back to the Elizabethan period), but, by the 1820s, the increasing popularity of antiquarianism, the possibility of Catholic Emancipation and, in the Established Church, the rise of Tractarianism, brought religious drama and ritual procession back to the forefront of theological controversy.

The texts of the medieval mystery plays were recovered and published by scholars (including the radical William Hone), and authors from Byron to Tennyson turned their attention to Biblical or religious themes in the dramatic genre. But even as (the largely Catholic) enthusiasm for religious drama became more widespread, popular protest and Chartist unrest ensured that the theatre remained suspect, and the

Examiner of Plays exercised caution in suppressing or bowdlerizing plays with the potential to excite sedition. Consequently, scriptural themes were often explored in drama that was written to be read rather than performed. My research has two distinct lines of enquiry – firstly, to interrogate the meaning of bodily performance and incarnational art, and to ask how the knowledge that the Victorians gained from reading a play differed from the experience of seeing it enacted. And secondly, I want to think about the pressures of self-censorship, and how sacred themes might be adapted to evade the censors. Such was the impact of the licensing laws that this study will be a history of fugitive presences and the recovery of traces – of pondering whether the translation of sacred material into something more secular in order to escape the censors is in fact a survival or an evacuation of religious meaning.

For the last twelve years, I have been a Fellow and College Teaching Officer at Trinity Hall, and for some of that time I have been a Newton Trust Lecturer in Victorian Literature here in the Faculty. I am very much looking forward to greater involvement in Faculty teaching in the years ahead.

Appointments 2012

Professor Steve Connor of Birkbeck College, London, was elected to the Grace 2 Chair of English formerly held by Professor Jacobus. He and all those listed below (except where noted) took up their posts in Michaelmas Term 2012.

Dr Michael Hurley was appointed to a Lectureship in nineteenth-century literature, with an associated Fellowship at St Catharine's College.

Dr Kasia Boddy was appointed to a Lectureship in American literature, with an associated Fellowship at Fitzwilliam College.

Dr Alex da Costa was appointed to a Lectureship in medieval literature (starting January 2013); she will hold the Valerie Eliot Fellowship at Newnham College.

Dr Malachi Macintosh was appointed to a Lectureship in Post-colonial and Related Literature (Caribbean literature), from 1 September 2012.

Dr Jan Schramm was appointed to a Lectureship in nineteenth-century literature, taking up her Faculty duties after completing her Leverhulme Research Fellowship.

Dr Nicky Zeeman was appointed to a Lectureship in medieval literature.

Dr James Riley was appointed to a Temporary Lectureship to cover for **Dr Macfarlane** while on research leave.

Dr Oliver Ross was appointed as a Teaching Associate, to cover for **Dr Gopal** while she is on research leave. **Caroline Bergvall** was appointed to the Judith E. Wilson Poetry Fellowship from 15 September 2012.

Dr Paul Gazzoli and **Dr Eva Urban** were appointed to British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowships.

Dr Rory Naismith was appointed to a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship.

We were also delighted to welcome two new members of the administrative staff during the year. **Charlotte Watkinson** is taking on the role of Senior Secretary (Academic Support) looking after the ASNC Tripos and supporting various academic activities in English. **Lisa Gold** is our new Senior Secretary (External Affairs) responsible, amongst other things, for events, academic visitors, outreach and alumni relations.

RETIREMENTS

Professors Heather Glen and **Stephen Heath**.

Dr Eric Griffiths has taken early retirement.

Events 2012/13

Festival of Ideas

25 October	*Night Thoughts and Waking Dreams* (Judith E. Wilson Drama Studio)
26 October	*Taking Pity on Things* (GR06/07)
27 October	*Poetry Writing Workshop* (Judith E. Wilson Drama Studio)
27 October, 30 October, 2 November	*How To Read* (GR06/07)
29 October	*Do I Wake or Sleep* (GR06/07)
31 October	Ghosts and Brains in Macbeth (GR06/07)
1 November	*Perfume and Poetry*
3 November	*New Cambridge Writers*

Other events

30 October	Book Launch and Poetry Reading: *Bones Will Crow: 15 Contemporary Burmese Poets*
14 November	The T.S. Eliot Lecture: *The Long Song of J. Alfred Prufrock: T.S. Eliot and Modern Poetry*, given by Dr Jeremy Noel-Tod (University of East Anglia)