

her study the multifaceted mirroring effects of various cultural and ideological imaginaries, and observes the necessity to have “a re-evaluation and a reimagination of relationships between us all” (187). In this sense, this valuable volume serves well as a prolegomenon to further study in this area, encouraging us to find new ways of comparing and theorizing Asian North American literary texts “in a rapidly shifting transnational society” (186).

*Benzi Zhang*

*Chinese University of Hong Kong*

*Making Avonlea: L. M. Montgomery and Popular Culture.*  
Ed. Irene Gammel. Toronto: U Toronto P, 2002. 347 pp.  
\$70.00 cloth. \$27.50, paper.

The L. M. Montgomery Institute at the University of Prince Edward Island, which hosts the biennial International L. M. Montgomery conference, is responsible for significant contributions to Montgomery criticism in the past ten years. *Making Avonlea* collects revised papers from the 2000 conference, L. M. Montgomery and Popular Culture, as well as some new and reprinted articles. True to its title, this volume examines Montgomery’s general contribution to popular culture rather than her specific literary productions. The editor, Irene Gammel, has done a fine job of pulling together various articles and “snapshots” that deliver a multi-faceted portrait of Montgomery’s international cultural impact.

The first section of the book, Mapping Avonlea: Cultural Value and Iconography, explores Montgomery and her work for their iconic value. Carole Gerson’s article, “Anne of Green Gables Goes to University” examines “the thorny relationship between academic culture and popular culture in Canada” (21), outlining the extent to which academia has not valued Montgomery. Investigating Anne’s significance as a cherished cultural icon, Cecily Devereux’s “Anatomy of a ‘National Icon’: Anne of Green Gables and the ‘Bosom Friends’ Affair” recounts the media ruckus after an academic paper reportedly claimed Anne was a lesbian. Devereux purports to examine “What, exactly, does she [Anne] represent?” (33), suggesting that the media outcry “foreground[ed] some of ‘our’ assumptions about Anne, about the limits of her popularity, about national identity, and about how we read and value ‘national icons’” (41). However, Devereux does not offer an explanation of precisely what ‘our’ assumptions are. Brenda R. Weber’s

first-person narrative “Confessions of a Kindred Spirit with an Academic Bent” attempts to explore the emotional popularity of Montgomery’s books and does so from a largely uncritical and highly sentimental perspective. Juliet McMaster’s “Taking Control: Hair Red, Black, Gold and Nut-Brown” suggests that, in *Anne of Green Gables* and *Emily of New Moon*, Anne and Emily’s desire to control their hair is emblematic of their independence. Margaret Steffler’s “‘This has been a day in hell’: Montgomery, Popular Literature, Life Writing” discusses the experience of reading Montgomery’s journals after a lifetime of reading the novels. Steffler suggests that the publication dates of Montgomery’s journals mirror “the stages of our own womanhood”: “marriage, motherhood, work, domesticity, leisure, and society”(74). However, not all women follow, or can follow, or want to follow, such a life trajectory, and Montgomery also has a male readership. Elizabeth R. Epperly’s “The Visual Imagination of L. M. Montgomery” describes the types of photographs that Montgomery took. One of the strongest articles in this section, Andrea McKenzie’s “Writing in Pictures: International Images of Emily” looks at the covers of the Emily books from different countries for how they “embed the dominant, mostly hidden, value and power structures that inhabit a given culture at a particular time in history” (99). McKenzie argues that the covers educate “readers’ in the attitudes towards women writers that were considered appropriate for the time and culture” (100). Irene Gammel’s article, “Safe Pleasures for Girls,” revised from one that previously appeared in *ESC*, argues that Montgomery’s heroines sidestep “the traditional model of male dominance and female submission” (117–118), an optimistic thesis arguably not borne out by Montgomery’s later novels.

The second section, Viewing Avonlea: Film, Television, Drama, and Musical, generally places the scholars in dialogue with one another. This tension makes for an engaging discussion of the various visual manifestations of Montgomery’s works, highlighting a debate over the extent to which the new work should be faithful to the “original.” Eleanor Hersey’s “‘It’s all mine’: The Modern Woman as Writer in Sullivan’s *Anne of Green Gables* Films” argues that Sullivan strays from the novels to make Anne resemble Montgomery in order to create “a powerful narrative of women’s struggle to balance professional work and domestic life that reflects the central concerns of many late twentieth-century viewers” (132). On the other hand, K.L. Poe’s article “Who’s Got the Power? Montgomery, Sullivan, and the Unsuspecting Viewer,” takes issue with positions like Hersey’s. Poe argues, rather emotionally, that “By taking the characters away from their original stories and placing them in an adaptation that has been anachronistically

gerrymandered to fit an agenda that was in no way suggested by the novelist, these films ... may in fact erode the subversive feminism of the original text" (146). Continuing with the debate, Ann F. Howey's article, "She look'd down to Camelot': Anne Shirley, Sullivan, and the Lady of Shalott," examines the adaptation of Tennyson by Montgomery, and Montgomery by Sullivan, making the case that "Translating a novel into a movie inevitably constitutes an act of transformation" (162). Pulling away from this debate and delving into analysis, Benjamin Lefebvre's persuasive article, "*Road to Avonlea*: A Co-production of the Disney Corporation," explores what it means that Disney co-produces this very "Canadian" television show. Christopher Gittings' article, "Melodrama for the Nation: *Emily of New Moon*," looks at the Emily television show suggesting that the adaptation makes "Montgomery more consumable as a national icon compatible with the nation's late-twentieth-century diversity and official policy of multiculturalism" (197). George Belliveau examines Paul Ledoux's stage play, *Anne*, and suggests that the play alters Montgomery's narrative structure to appeal to the sensitivities of a contemporary youth audience. Following this, Carrie MacLellan reflects on her experience listening to the musical in what the volume calls a "snapshot," or a short personal narrative.

The third section, *Touring Avonlea: Landscape, Tourism, and Spin-Off Products*, begins with Janice Fiamengo's strong analytical article "Towards a Theory of the Popular Landscape in *Anne of Green Gables*." Examining the portability of the landscape, Fiamengo argues that "*Anne's* popularity tells us something about our contradictory desires for an authentic connection to the land" (226). E. Holly Pike's "Mass Marketing, Popular Culture, and the Canadian Celebrity Author" makes interesting points about Montgomery's home site becoming a tourist attraction; yet, Pike's connection between Montgomery and Shakespeare, as celebrity authors, is tenuous as Montgomery does not have the same cultural significance as Shakespeare. "Through the Eyes of Memory: L. M. Montgomery's Cavendish" by James De Jonge describes the "evolution of the Cavendish landscape" (264). A reprint from *CCL: Canadian Children's Literature*, Jeanette Lynes's "Consumable Avonlea: The Commodification of the Green Gables Mythology" is another powerful contribution to the volume. Lynes argues that "the consumable articulation of the Green Gables mythology is of an intensely aestheticized, sentimentalized, and intertextual nature" (268), and she shows that "Montgomery's heroines continue to be revised in ways that harmonize with their respective societal contexts" (268). Two "snapshots" follow: one describes the making of Anne and Emily dolls and the other recounts living as "Anne" in Japan. Danièle Allard's article "*Taishu Bunka*

Often, Montgomery criticism seems to face a difficult task: how to engage in intellectual inquiry that might require specialized language, and balance that inquiry with an appeal to an emotionally-driven fandom.

and Anne Clubs in Japan” explores, primarily through interviews with Japanese women, the many Anne clubs in that country. Alice Van Der Klei’s “Avonlea in Cyberspace, Or an Invitation to a Hyperreal Tea Party” describes the various “open” Montgomery discussion lists, as opposed to the one scholarly-based L. M. Montgomery List which attempts to limit participants to those who have published academically. An epilogue follows, which is a highly sentimental letter by Beate Nock to Irene Gammel and translated from the German by Gammel. Nock rhapsodizes, for example, “With Anne, the personification of Life itself moves into Green Gables” (319).

Nock’s emotional letter preceded by Van Der Klei’s acknowledgement of the on-line conflict between academic scholars and academically-curious Montgomery fans underscores a quandary within Montgomery criticism in general and the volume, *Making Avonlea* in particular. Often, Montgomery criticism seems to face a difficult task: how to engage in intellectual inquiry that might require specialized language, and balance that inquiry with an appeal to an emotionally-driven fandom. To its credit, *Making Avonlea* demonstrates a blending and blurring of academic and “popular” responses to Montgomery’s work, enacting in some regards what it is exploring. However, Montgomery criticism has been solidly entrenched in popular discourse—hers is the domain of the popular, after all. It might be time for Montgomery scholarship to venture in a new direction, one that does not ground analysis of the author in sentiment. With some very notable exceptions, such as Lefebvre’s and Fiamengo’s articles, *Making Avonlea* maintains a laudatory approach to Montgomery’s work and influence. Brenda R. Weber’s first-person article presents an example:

Though it is certainly possible to make sound scholarly judgments about L. M. Montgomery, ... it seemed patently false for me to journey the 1,200 miles to Montgomery’s land of ruby, emerald, and sapphire, false to come to the literal and literary site that had filled so much of my girlhood imagination, false to speak and think publicly about Montgomery’s Anne, false to do all this in only intellectual terms. (43)

Since many of the articles in the volume, particularly Gerson’s, express a desire, either implicitly or explicitly, that Montgomery and the various offshoots of her work, be taken seriously and accorded intellectual merit, it is time that Montgomery scholarship pushed itself in this direction. That said, *Making Avonlea* highlights Montgomery’s significance to Canadian culture and other cultures around the world. It continues the important work of the L. M. Montgomery Institute in revealing the widespread impact of Montgomery’s creative productions.

Laura M. Robinson  
Nipissing University

Caroline Roberts. *The Woman and the Hour: Harriet Martineau and Victorian Ideologies*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. Pp. 253. Cloth. \$50.00.

In 1855, convinced she was about to die, Harriet Martineau prepared her own obituary, began to write her autobiography, and waited for death to take her. It did not. Instead, Martineau lived for another 21 years, publishing regularly on subjects as diverse as political economy, the 1791 Haitian revolution, and mesmerism; corresponding with Elizabeth Barrett, Jane Welsh Carlyle, and Florence Nightingale (among others); and campaigning to repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts, which legislated often brutal gynecological examinations for any woman merely suspected of soliciting in English port towns. "Female Industry" (1859), Martineau's trenchant argument for pay equity published in the prestigious *Edinburgh Review*, aptly describes not only the women's work she enumerates in that article but also her own *modus vivendi*.

Long neglected, Martineau's industry has increasingly attracted scholarly attention, not only among Victorianists working in the disciplines of English and History, but also among sociologists, some of whom have recently claimed her as "a founding figure in the discipline" (Hill and Hoecker-Drysdale ix) alongside Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Émile Durkheim. As Helena Znanięcka Lopata remarks, "Martineau's recent ascendancy ... lags somewhat behind Martineau's earlier popularity and fame among the literate public in England and America" (Hill and Hoecker-Drysdale xv). Caroline Roberts makes clear, however, that Martineau's "earlier popularity and fame" were always controversial. In her valuable new book, *The Woman and the Hour: Harriet Martineau and Victorian Ideologies*, Roberts traces the controversies surrounding seven of Martineau's early publications, from 1832 to 1851, ending her study just shy of the illness that prompted Martineau to pen her autobiography in 1855.

Roberts reconstructs what she felicitously terms the "noisy reception" (4) of Martineau's works, but eschews a strictly biographical focus. Making use of historical analysis, exegesis, and theory, Roberts focuses on "Martineau's texts and nineteenth-century culture rather than on her life" (6), "[situating] these texts historically in order to understand why they were controversial" (3). Given Martineau's intellectual interests and commit-