

Investigating *Wilderness Tips*, Goldman cleverly demonstrates how Atwood invites readers “to look in the mirror, reflect on our own greedy behaviour—the legacy of imperialism at the heart of our disaster narratives—and acknowledge the face of the white cannibal” (181).

Concluding the collection is Geoffrey Sanborn’s survey and critique of recent publications dealing with cannibalism, comprising a wise choice for a final essay, since it self-reflexively questions cannibalistic critique at the same time that it provides a thoughtful conclusion to the collection.

Guest’s text is remarkably even in its consistency, offering provocative readings of cannibalism that span the field of literary studies. I highly recommend *Eating Their Words*, for it is a fine work of scholarship that compares well with other texts in the area, such as Barker, Hulme, and Iversen’s *Cannibalism and the Colonial World*, and Creed and Hoorn’s *Body Trade*. In short, Guest’s excellent collection is a must read for anyone even remotely interested in this topic.

Priscilla L. Walton
Carleton University

M. Elizabeth Sargent and Garry Watson, eds. *Approaches to Teaching the Works of D. H. Lawrence*. New York: MLA, 2001. Pp. 270 + xviii. Paper u.s. \$50.60.

The series of which this collection of essays and brief teaching-strategy suggestions forms part now numbers in excess of seventy volumes, evidence of a lively contemporary market for various kinds of pedagogical handbook. The motivations of the MLA Publications Committee that sponsors the series are not only to “improve the craft—as well as the art—of teaching but also encourage serious and continuing discussion of the aims and methods of teaching literature.” A review is perhaps not the best place to engage the perennially provocative question of how or whether good teaching *can* be taught. But it does provide the opportunity to express overtly the reservations that so many teachers, including a lot of outstanding ones, articulate more cautiously in corridor grumbles.

We now function in a college and university milieu in which institutional pressure to acknowledge the importance of teaching—never in any serious doubt amongst those enthusiastic about doing it, but seemingly discovered relatively recently by senior university administrators—often

runs foul of the difficulty of assessing what it actually comprises. A whole industry for the promulgation of ways of announcing one's commitment to the cause has been created over the last few years. Centres for University Teaching are allotted generous budgets, even in supposedly straitened economic times, and have therefore found increasingly creative ways in which to use them up. Teaching portfolios bulge with ever more glossy materials, prepared for delivery via more and more technologically sophisticated means on expensive but incipiently obsolete computers, bought with public funds from private industries anxious to demonstrate their selfless commitment to the life of the mind by forming lucrative partnerships with educational institutions. Disaffected student "clients," of whatever ability or degree of informed involvement with their studies, distribute world-wide over the internet brusque judgements on their teachers in defamatory phrases that would result in the severe disciplining of any teacher who elected to reciprocate in kind. Declarations of "teaching philosophy" are now routinely required from applicants for tenure-stream jobs, unkindly forcing them to state the obvious in touching but repetitive outpourings of pedagogical earnestness. This is a particularly eccentric way for university administrations to attempt to achieve collective instructional nirvana, since such protestations can serve a genuine discriminatory purpose only if it is assumed that other, less-enlightened, aspirants to professional security are naively plumping out *their* application letters with passionate revelations of their commitment to a dismissively authoritarian lecturing style, a comatose teaching environment, and the inculcation of a life-long distaste for imaginative literature.

Against this climate of confused ends, means and vested interests, this book delivers a reasonable part of what it promises in the way of thoughtful engagement with productive methods of introducing Lawrence to students. Divided into sixteen essays and seventeen shorter "course-context sketches," with a preliminary section that provides a thorough summary of the critical, textual, biographical, archival and electronic context and resources, the collection contains material of potential help to both established teachers and those less experienced in the classroom. It is perhaps inevitable that such a heterogeneous grouping of suggested pedagogical strategies should be somewhat mixed qualitatively, and this volume's reflection of the vagaries of critical fashion certainly generates some relishable ironies. Among them is the presence of a number of broadly feminist approaches that bravely attempt to rescue Lawrence's reputation from the "political correctness" that is deemed to have tarnished it over the last twenty to thirty years. This tired catch-phrase, the flimsy rhetorical straw

Against this climate of confused ends, means and vested interests, this book delivers a reasonable part of what it promises in the way of thoughtful engagement with productive methods of introducing Lawrence to students.

clutched at by indignant right-wing tub-thumpers the world over, proves no less fragile when grabbed by feminist theoreticians, who, thankfully, have hitherto not usually felt much need to warn against the depredations wreaked by a surfeit of ideologically-based fastidiousness.

Unusually for scholars contributing to a book in celebration of someone conventionally regarded as a major writer, many of the Lawrence apologists gathered together here, including the two editors, obviously feel that some kind of apology is indeed required. This exculpatory mission is conceived of as an essential preliminary to Lawrence's rehabilitation for modern students, who are largely unaware of the quasi-messianic status, courtesy particularly of the confidently judgmental Dr Leavis, he enjoyed in the 1950s and '60s. On occasion here, special pleading is resorted to for its restorative properties, nowhere more brazenly than in Sandra M. Gilbert's essay, "Some Notes toward a Vindication of the Rites of D. H. Lawrence," which makes the astonishing claim (as the culmination of an attempt to explain the appeal of the sexist Lawrence to so many women writers) that "most of Lawrence's female admirers must have sensed that, because the working-class culture in which the artist was reared was in many ways politically radical and egalitarian, women in that world—even the oppressed wives of coal miners—frequently had more privileged roles than did some of their upper-class counterparts." Admittedly middle-class intellectuals have never been known for the soundness of their hold on the realities of working-class experience, and feminist scholars in particular have sometimes had difficulty in reconciling gendered generalisations founded in their own intellectual imperatives with the actual needs and aspirations of less advantaged women. But even Virginia Woolf at her most aloofly condescending did not manifest so blithe an incomprehension of the circumstances faced by the overwhelming majority of women, for whom during much of Lawrence's life-time a "privileged" role would have been more likely to mean a meal of one's own than a room of one's own.

For all the emphasis here on Lawrence as a dialogist with a highly developed sense of the importance of recognising the Other, there is a restrictively programmatic impulse informing some of the contributions. Wayne Templeton, for example, apparently tells his classes that "there are three categories of literature: popular, scholarly and subversive," distinguished in the early twentieth century "as, respectively, popular, Edwardian, and modernist." Not content with this, he further announces that "[i]f we were to define each literary category as either simple or complex and either uncritical or critical, we would have simple-uncritical (popular) literature, complex-uncritical (high-brow, scholarly, or Edwardian) literature,

and complex-critical (subversive, or modernist literature).” And, predictably, “[c]ritics also fall into three categories: the populist, the conservative scholarly . . . and the radical.” These earnest formulations are distractingly reminiscent of Polonius’s taxonomically laborious introduction of “[t]he best actors in the world, either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral.” One hopes generous classroom provision is also made for dissenting student voices.

Some essays seem to be paying not much more than lip service to the presiding rationale for the collection. For example, neither Luba Slaby’s essay “Fathoming Flood and Father in *The Rainbow* and *The Virgin and the Gipsy*” nor Marie Aline Seabra Ferreira’s “The Foreigner Within: Teaching *The Rainbow* with the Help of Cixous, Kristeva, and Irigaray” are really about teaching: “students” are merely glancingly invoked to create the illusion that straight critical explication is advancing a pedagogical strategy. By contrast, Gordon Harvey’s “‘Odour of Chrysanthemums’ and the Freshman Essay: Teaching Literature by Contextual Sequence” offers an admirably centred and thought-through approach to inculcating critical acumen and confidence in first-year students by taking them through clearly conceived and sequenced units that move out in expanding rings from a core text. In the present instance this happens to be a Lawrence short story, but the suggested modular structure could be productively applied to virtually any text. Some of the contributions make suggestions for taking Lawrence beyond the bounds of courses devoted either to Lawrence himself (inevitably a small part of the total), to the English novel, or to an introductory survey. One of the most invigorating and original of these is Isobel M. Findlay’s and Garry Watson’s “‘Learning to Squint’/the Critic as Outlaw: Teaching *Studies in Classic American Literature* as Cultural Criticism,” which has some suggestive things to say about using this text in both American literature and cultural theory courses. Were the whole collection up to the standard of the Harvey and Findlay/Watson essays, this would have been a very different review.

This book is one to be used selectively by those instructors who feel the need to freshen up the equipment in their pedagogical armouries. Overall, it doesn’t have a great deal to offer Lawrence scholarship, but might be worth consulting as a stimulus to the generation of ideas for classroom trial.

Keith Wilson
University of Ottawa