> language-use, ought to infer from the text the emotional motivation that not only compelled a poet from silence into speech but also produced the originally unforeseeable contours of the evolving inner form of the work of art. (4–5)

It is her diligent adherence to these ideals, their intellectual generosity and the special capacity for readerly "effusing" on which they depend, that are the great strengths of these essays, as they are of Vendler's work as a whole. As a philosopher, I can muster disappointment that the book's thesis is not argued with greater rigour and sophistication. But as a poet and reader, I can only commend the example Vendler sets of close but passionate attending in the service of the text.

Jan Zwicky
University of Victoria

Morag Shiach. *Modernism, Labour and Selfhood in British Literature and Culture, 1890–1930.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. x + 291 pp. $65.00.

Morag Shiach undertakes to "discuss a wide range of writers [...] and consider a great variety of texts, including philosophical writings, novels, poetry, journalism, political theory and visual arts" (14). The wide range signifies an ambitious approach to the question of labour and Modernism, although it also makes it difficult to discern either temporal or thematic coherence in this study. Shiach begins with a long march through three centuries of thinking about labour. Locke argues that labour legitimizes individual claims to property; Marx, that labour is the sole source of value; Ruskin, that "life without industry is guilt" (42). So far, we can see a consensus that labour is not the curse of Adam but a founding virtue of any productive society. But by the end of the nineteenth century a labour-centric view of human existence is under attack from Modernism, and from other quarters as well.

Shiach's challenge is to chart the emergence around 1900 of cross-currents which render problematic the status of "labour" as a stable, unitary concept. Modernism, in its masculinist aspect at least, tends to see mass production as a threat to heroic manhood. What is taken from us by the machine needs to be restored through sexual, ritual, or primitivist self-assertion. Woman suffers too, like Eliot's typist who loses her femininity as she "lays out food in tins." Nor is mechanical sex any cure for the ills of mechanical labour. Yet, a generation earlier, novelists like Gissing or

Grant Allen had made the "Type-writer Girl" a plucky symbol of female emancipation. Feminist thinkers, notably Olive Schreiner and Emmeline Pankhurst, became relentless critics of "parasitism." The separate sphere had confined middle-class women to merely idle or ornamental roles; they could only gain respect, and self-respect, by taking on their share of the world's labour.

Andreas Huyssen has presented Modernism as an attempt to shore up masculinity against the threat of feminization. In the nineteenth century, women had used the privileges of their separate sphere to become the patrons and even the controllers of culture. Muscular Modernists like Pound or Wyndham Lewis proclaimed that they were not the lapdogs of feminine salons. The contested association between art and feminization stands out in Shiach's account of the erratic career of Sylvia Pankhurst. Originally trained at the Royal College of Art, Pankhurst wrote poems celebrating working women and painted them at their factory workbenches. Her art was in a traditional style, closer to Socialist Realism than to Cubism or Surrealism. Later, though, she denounced even her own art practice. "As an artist," she said, "the world has no real use for you; in that capacity you must fight a purely egotistical struggle" (148).

Instead of art, Pankhurst chose a feminist calling based on collective experience in the workplace. Both she and her mother Emmeline were deeply suspicious of identities based on female sexual experience. Labour, rather, was the necessary and defining activity for women, and labour protected them from "the damaging and disabling charge of 'parasitism'" (105). For Pankhurst, labour created identity, whereas Modernism typically decried the Taylorist regime of mass production as identity's destroyer.

It is disappointing that Shiach repeatedly frames such contradictions in the role of labour but then slides away from telling us how to resolve them. Her discussion of the "Type-writer Girl" is one of the best sections in the book, because it deals with a well-defined moment in the emergence of feminized labour, one that was represented and debated in contemporary novels. These novels give a specific sense of how people actually lived with the problem of labour. Conversely, Shiach's opening chapter suffers from trying to do justice to vast realms of speculation about labour, from Locke to Schopenhauer, Marx, and Nietzsche.

Shiach's chapter on D. H. Lawrence considers "the role that labour plays in his models of history and of selfhood" (149). She looks for these models first in Lawrence's murky theoretical writings, such as *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*, where he struggles to schematize the flux of experience. Shiach's conclusions are drawn from *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, where

"a text in which Lawrence has tried to expose the alienation of the physical as the condition of modernity lands up re-enacting the process of abstraction through the rigidity of its imaginative and intellectual categories" (197). Lawrence certainly seems often to violate his own maxim: "Never trust the teller, trust the tale." But Shiach's emphasis on *Study of Thomas Hardy*, "England, My England," and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* may give undue weight to Lawrence's more programmatic texts. In those singled out by Shiach, the problem of labour is presented as an interior and individual struggle for self-definition: "Should I work?"; "How should I work?"; "What does work have to do with the essential me?" This approach turns the question of labour into a drama of identity politics. Labour does make individual identities, and gender identities too, but what of the ways in which labour makes classes, makes masses, makes history?

Lawrence's earlier novels show how the individual search for identity is necessarily embedded in the collective structures of a local society and a particular time. His best thinking on labour is not in his philosophical treatises but in such representations as Walter Morel in the mine in *Sons and Lovers* or Ursula Brangwen in the classroom in *The Rainbow*. To approach the experience of labour through literature seems a peripheral concern of Shiach's book; it is simply assumed that her eclectic group of philosophers, activists, or journalists has an intrinsic relation with literature written at the same time as their texts. This assumption is particularly questionable in Shiach's final chapter, on the 1926 General Strike. She examines at length the syndicalist John Waugh Scott, a faded figure with no discernible relevance to Modernism. Lawrence's meditation on the strike, "Return to Bestwood," is ignored; instead, Shiach points out that Virginia Woolf was writing the "Time Passes" section of *To the Lighthouse* while the strike was in progress. True enough, but Woolf considered the strike "unutterably boring and quite unimportant and yet very upsetting" (*Letters* III, 260). It is not the real world of the General Strike that impinges on "Time Passes" but something deeply important for Woolf, the First World War. Modern labour and Modernism are still awkwardly separate at the end of Shiach's study, though the reader will have a useful introduction to the difficulty of bringing them together.

Paul Delany
Simon Fraser University